

Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Editorial | 1 |
| Thematic Session – Fish welfare | 2 |
| EurSafe Executive Committee Update | 9 |
| EurSafe 2012 – First Call for Abstracts | 9 |
| Publications | 12 |
| Course | 12 |
| Conferences 2010/2011 | 13 |
| Funding | 17 |
| Contact | 17 |

Editorial



Dear EurSafe Members,

Welcome to the Spring issue of EurSafe News. In this first issue of 2012 we, as issue editors would like to take the opportunity to wish you all again a happy and productive year!

As always, this issue is packed with interesting information. Bernice has prepared a thematic section on fish welfare with a report of two meetings on the matter and an expert article about pain perception in fish. Surely a topic that will be high on the research agenda in the next years.

But, that is not all. This EurSafe News also contains the first Call for Papers for the next EurSafe conference. Time to get the inspiration running!

Topped off with the announcement of an International Summer School in Munich and a job offering in Bochum (both in Germany), a long list of relevant conferences, and some funding opportunities, we're sure there is something for everyone in this issue.

In the June issue, Assya Pascalev, will compile a section titled "Nanny Nation": Should the Government Regulate Our Diet? (The ethic and politics of governmental regulations of the citizen's food choices). If you have any thematic (or other) content, please contact director@bio-ethics.net.

Best wishes to you all,
Bernice Bovenkerk & Stef Aerts
Issue editors

Thematic section: Fish Welfare

Fish welfare: two meetings

Bernice Bovenkerk

Fish welfare and our duties towards fish are increasingly becoming topics of debate. Fish have always been regarded as a borderline case by animal ethicists, if they were even considered at all, but recently the moral status of fish and the possible morally relevant differences between fish and other animals have received more attention. The increased interest in fish becomes apparent in two recent meetings that were organised around fish welfare and moral status, particularly in the context of aquaculture. The first meeting was held in November in Utrecht, the Netherlands, and was titled 'Fish Welfare: the interplay between science and ethics'. The second, the 'International Workshop on Fish Welfare', was held just last month in Madrid. The following impression of the two meetings aims to show what an interesting and varied topic fish welfare is; a topic that I suspect will be debated for a long time to come.

On November 29 and 30, 2010, the Ethics Institute of Utrecht University organised an expert meeting about fish welfare and its moral implications. The expert meeting was organised in the context of an interdisciplinary research project about the African Catfish in aquaculture. In this project, which is funded by the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research, research groups from the Radboud University Nijmegen, Wageningen UR, and Utrecht University cooperate in order to examine how the welfare of African Catfish in aquaculture can be increased. This expert meeting brought together international experts from diverse academic backgrounds: marine biology, physiology, the philosophy of mind, and ethics. Speakers at the meeting were, amongst others, Canadian biologist/physiologist Michel Cabanac, Scottish biologist/physiologist Felicity Huntingford, American cognitive philosopher Colin Allen, German bio-ethicists Dieter Birnbacher and Kirsten Schmidt, and Swedish animal ethicist Helena Röcklinsberg, but also animal ethicists and welfare experts from the Netherlands, such as Robert Heeger, Berry Spruijt, and Frauke Ohl.

The goal of the meeting was first of all for ethicists to find out what the state of the art was in empirical research into fish welfare. But more importantly, the goal was to make a connection between empirical research into fish emotional and cognitive capacities and ethical theory about the moral status of fish and to reach cross-disciplinary understanding. The first day focused on the question what we can learn from research into fish emotion, cognition, and awareness. What research strategies are being used to find out whether fish can consciously experience pain and how should we interpret research results? It became clear that no consensus yet exists between biologists about strategies and outcomes in fish research. Cabanac argued that fish do not consciously experience emotions, but other researchers questioned his research methods; Cabanac looked at two signs of emotion, emotional fever and emotional tachycardia – increased heart rate and temperature – and these were not affected in fish after negative or positive stimuli. Also, he noted that there are no signs of sleep or clear play in fish. Huntingford and Allen, and in fact many others in the audience, argued that these research strategies did not take into account the special physical make-up of fish. They showed that we can learn a lot from looking at other parameters. While stressing the enormous variation between different kinds of fish, they argued that an examination of the central nervous system

and behaviour of fish gives us a lot of indirect evidence for cognition and emotion in many fish. They showed interesting footage of fish that displayed the ability to make choices and to learn, and even to sleep. They showed that some fish demonstrate flexible behaviour and this would be indicative of cognition and sophisticated learning.

The talks of the empirical researchers were followed by comments from philosophers of mind. They were asked the challenging question of how we should interpret research into emotional and cognitive capacities of fish. All of them focused on the ambiguity of certain central concepts that are used in the discourse about fish capabilities. Colin Allen, for example, showed that the concept of pain can be defined in many different ways and that these definitions show conflicting philosophical interpretations of pain. He also showed that awareness is a gradual concept and ethicists may be oversimplifying things if they argue, for example, that all animals that have awareness count morally and count equally. The other two philosophers of mind both showed the difficulties of speaking about consciousness. How do we even know that others have consciousness? We can never see their inner world. One argued that it may be better to speak of subjectivity rather than consciousness. Subjectivity shows that it is not just the brain that matters; it is the whole organism that is conscious, not the brain itself. Also, one of them raised the important question why researchers seem so preoccupied with cognition; why should cognitive sophistication make suffering worse?

On day two the results of the first day were related to current thinking in the field of animal ethics. The central question was whether we should take fish seriously in our moral decisions. When a number of ethicists addressed this question it became clear that different theoretical viewpoints frame this question quite differently. Nonetheless, consensus appeared to exist between different theories that at least some animals are part of our moral community. However, on the specific question whether fish should be included in this group, the experts were still unclear. More input of empirical research is needed, but it was concluded that empirical research is not value-neutral and that, therefore, more interaction should take place between empirical scientists and ethicists. Ethicists need to indicate what empirical research questions would be relevant in order to answer the moral status question. Finally, it became clear that ethicists can learn from philosophers of mind, who can critically reflect on their assumptions. It became clear during this meeting that interdisciplinary research projects are a challenging undertaking, because biologists, philosophers of mind, and ethicists, use central terms, such as pain and consciousness, quite differently. All in all it was a very thought-provoking meeting that can be regarded as the start, rather than the end of a debate.

The COST 867 International Workshop on Fish Welfare in Madrid showed how many different facets the topic of fish welfare includes. A bewildering amount of talks by a broad range of international speakers, from Australia to Portugal and Canada to Norway filed past in two fully packed days. Most of the presenters were biologists, but there were also animal ethicists, representatives of animal welfare organisations, and even the odd computer programmer. I could discern at least seven basic questions that the different talks addressed. Firstly, the stage was set wonderfully by Victoria Braithwaite, who addressed the question whether fish feel pain. She showed what it takes to prove that pain in fish exists; what sort of questions need to be answered, regarding nociception and

awareness, and what research methods could be used to answer them? While she did answer with a cautious 'yes, fish experience pain', she problematised an issue that most other speakers seemed to take for granted. Most other presenters assumed that fish experience pain and went on to ask questions about fish welfare. Secondly, for example, the question was raised how to define fish welfare. This concept used to be defined as balanced organic functioning, but later subjective experiences of fish became the focal point. Certain basic elements appeared in many different working definitions. For example, the five freedoms, as conceptualised by the Farm Animal Welfare Council, were frequently mentioned. This concept includes subjective elements, such as the freedom from discomfort, and functioning elements, such as the freedom to express normal behaviour. Peter Sandoe noted that Marian Dawkins' traditional definition that 'good welfare is defined as animals being healthy and having what they want' is a deceptively simple one. Having what one wants is limited by one's lack of imagination. If our everyday existence is boring and we do not know what we are missing, we never have frustrations either. However, as Dan Weary stressed, positive experiences are as much part of animal welfare as the mere absence of negative ones.

If we consider the recent focus on subjective welfare and positive experiences, it becomes clear that it is quite difficult to unambiguously measure fish welfare. Thirdly, therefore, many talks gave insight into the variety of strategies that are being used to answer the question of how to measure fish welfare. Some focused on the question whether animals have what they want by designing choice experiments tailored for specific fish. Leonor Galhardo, for example, developed a special push-door for measuring motivation in a cichlid fish; a fish with a strong enough snout to open the door and go after what it wants. Also, several groups have developed systems for measuring welfare on fish farms, namely the Welfare Quality Project in Spain and the Dutch/ Norwegian Salmon Welfare Index Model. Once we have measured welfare in fish, the fourth question obviously is 'how can we improve welfare?'. Studies were done, for example, to establish whether an exercise regime benefits farmed fish. Also, Hans van de Vis reported on a machine his group developed to be able to electrically stun eel and Catfish so that they are unconscious, before letting them die on a mix of ice and water. Improving the welfare of farmed fish will, of course, be influenced by the abilities of the industry and a fifth question, therefore, was what challenges are faced by the industry. One major challenge identified was climate change, which could lead to changing environments, such as an increase in algae blooms and sea water temperature, and an increase in disease.

All presentations about fish welfare implicitly assumed that fish well-being matters, but from a moral point of view one can ask, sixthly, if and why fish are part of our moral community and what this means for the question of how we should treat fish. For example, the author of this contribution argued that neither animal welfare nor moral status are theory-neutral concepts and that more cooperation should take place between ethicists and biologists. If we agree that fish matter for their own sake an important question, finally, is how we can influence the industry to pay attention to fish welfare. What can the role of consumers be in this development? Adrian Kole reported the results of a study into consumer perception of fish, which appeared to show four dimensions: production methods, intrinsic values of the meat, safety concerns, and an extrinsic dimension (such as convenience, price, and nutrition).

Contact

Bernice Bovenkerk,
Ethics Institute, Utrecht,
the Netherlands,
b.bovenkerk@uu.nl

Providing extra information to consumers turned out to be a useful strategy to influence their buying behaviour. Looking back, the organisers can be proud of having put together a meeting that covered every conceivable dimension of fish welfare and having created an interdisciplinary network of researchers that all aim to improve the conditions of farmed fish.

How can we tell whether a fish feels pain?

Victoria Braithwaite

Many of us consider fish to be mysterious creatures. They live in a strange under water world, and unlike their terrestrial cousins they have gills not lungs, fins not limbs. Their faces are fixed and unexpressive – indeed, their often down-turned mouths give them a rather sad, dopey look. Is it any wonder that they are so often caricatured as dim-witted creatures with a three second memory? But scientific experiments are beginning to challenge this image. Recent research has revealed some species of fish are capable of quite sophisticated forms of behaviour.

As we discover that fish are more cognitively competent than we had previously realized, questions are being raised about the way we interact with and handle them. This is particularly the case for the rapidly expanding aquaculture industry - should we be concerning ourselves with the welfare of the fish we farm?

When we reflect on the welfare of terrestrial farm animals one key component that we strive to minimize is pain and suffering. Considering the welfare of farmed fish therefore begs the question, do fish feel pain? This deceptively simple question has turned out to be quite a challenge to answer. Yet it is an important question to address, because an inability to suffer from the experience of pain would suggest that caring about fish welfare has little real value. We would want to care for the health and basic needs of the fish, but affording them welfare beyond that would be difficult to justify if they have no capacity for suffering.

So, just over a decade ago along with my colleagues - Mike Gentle and Lynne Sneddon - I set out to determine whether fish feel pain. We decided to tackle the problem by taking three different approaches. First, could we demonstrate that fish possess the basic neuroanatomy that will allow them to process pain stimuli? Second, if specialized pain receptors and associated fibers are present, are these active when something damaging happens to the fish? Finally, could we show that the fish do more than just respond reflexively to a damaging stimulus? To be convinced that an animal feels and suffers from pain, we need to demonstrate that higher order cognitive processes are involved, not just changes in the animal's physiology. When we are hurt, our bodies sometimes respond by increasing the rate of our heartbeat and altering how quickly we breathe, but such processes occur without us consciously reflecting on the changes. We may eventually become aware of them, but they initially begin subconsciously. So physiological changes do not reliably inform us about the effects of experiencing pain, or feeling something hurt. For that we need to explore more complex cognitive processes. We began our experiments using farmed rainbow trout. Focusing on the head and face, we searched for specialized pain receptors - free nerve endings within the skin - that were sensitive to specific kinds of noxious stimulation. The receptors that detect damaging stimuli are called nociceptors. They are well described for birds and mammals, but we did not know whether we would find them in fish. Nociceptors

come in different forms - some are sensitive to noxious chemicals, some to excessive temperatures and others detect mechanical damage such as pinching or squeezing. Our survey of the snout and face of trout confirmed the presence of at least twenty two different nociceptors – so they are there.

The next step was to look for the specialized fibers within the nerves that convey signals about tissue damage. In mammals and birds, when something cuts or pierces the skin the nociceptors are triggered and this information is then passed through the nerves in two specific forms of fiber; A-delta and C fibers. To search for these we looked at thin sections of the main nerve that innervates the head and face of the fish; the trigeminal nerve. This nerve has three main branches, one curves up around the eye, a second serves the upper jaw and the third branch innervates the lower jaw. The latter two may be familiar to you – these are the nerves that your dentist will numb before they begin to drill away on troublesome cavities. When you look inside the trigeminal nerve you see bundles of fibers in a range of different sizes. As we inspected the different kinds of fiber, we were able to identify both A-delta and C fibers by their very characteristic dimensions and features. So, our first aim was successfully completed, we now had evidence that the basic pain processing neuroanatomy seen in birds and mammals is also present in fish.

Moving onto the second task we tried to record responses to tissue damaging stimuli in deeply anaesthetized fish by placing electrodes into the trigeminal ganglion where the different branches of the nerve converge. Could we detect an electrical signal in response to a drop of weak acetic acid (vinegar) carefully placed onto one of the chemically sensitive nociceptors on the snout of the fish? If you have ever felt the nip and sting of vinegar or lemon juice in an open cut this was because nociceptors around the cut were triggered by the acidic ions. Would the fish respond in a similar way? Sure enough when a tiny drop of vinegar solution stimulated a nociceptor on the skin of the fish, a few milli-seconds later we recorded a burst of firing in the nerve. So the neuroanatomy for pain perception is there, and it is activated by stimuli that cause some form of damage.

Finally, we needed to search for a higher order cognitive capacity that might be impaired by the feelings associated with pain. When we have a headache we often find it hard to concentrate and pay attention to events that are going on around us. Could we somehow devise a way to give fish a 'headache'?

To investigate this we worked on a standard response that fish make to novel objects – they avoid them, at least until they establish that the object is not dangerous or threatening. To successfully avoid something novel, the fish must pay attention to the location of the new object and prevent movement towards it. But how do fish respond to novel objects if they are also experiencing pain - are they distracted and so less concerned by them?

To explore this idea we simulated a potentially painful event using a small injection of weak vinegar solution just under the surface of the skin in the snout of the fish. We then compared the behavioural responses of these fish to fish that were given a small injection of saline. Colorful towers constructed from Lego bricks, which served as novel objects, were placed at a fixed distance from the head of individually housed fish. We then monitored how the fish reacted. The contrasting responses of the two groups were very clear. The trout that received saline showed the characteristic avoidance responses

hardly ever approaching the Lego tower during trials. The acetic acid treated fish, however, seemed much less wary of the Lego bricks and in many cases they moved quite close to them. So treating the fish with a noxious injection seems to impair the normal avoidance behaviour.

We believed that the fish treated with acetic acid were impaired in their ability to focus and pay attention to the novel object because they were distracted by the pain of their treatment. If this is the case, we should be able to help these fish express their normal avoidance behavior by providing them with some form of pain relief. When we have a headache we can take an aspirin, and after a little while we can concentrate again. So, we repeated the experiment with new fish, but this time, we gave them a small amount of morphine in addition to with saline or acetic acid. Now, we found no differences in the way the fish reacted to the Lego tower - both groups showed avoidance. So if we give the fish a noxious injection we hamper their ability to focus and concentrate on something that could potentially be dangerous, but if we give them pain relief they once again show avoidance responses. For us, this seemed quite a compelling result. It really does seem that the fish are cognitively disadvantaged by a painful experience.

After we had published our results, a number of other labs in different countries began to report related and supporting observations. For example, a prod with a needle or a small electric shock to the tail triggers brain activity in the fish forebrain. Others have reported that nociceptors are present in fin tissue – an area of the body that fish often choose to bite during aggressive fights, presumably because these parts of the body are sensitive to damage. Fish can also rapidly learn to avoid areas within a tank where they receive aversive, electric shocks.

As these various studies have been published, a debate has arisen. Some are now convinced there is sufficient evidence that fish are sentient creatures and that they have the capacity to suffer from pain. Others, on the other hand, continue to deny that fish are consciously aware of their actions and experiences. Determining whether any animal is sentient and aware is a tricky process. From an evolutionary perspective, it is hard to imagine that consciousness just suddenly appeared in humans. Surely precursors to consciousness, simpler forms of awareness and sentience, will be present in other animals?

The mystery presented by consciousness has attracted interest from a diverse array of people from philosophers and psychologists to neuroscientists to those working on cybernetics and artificial intelligence. In humans we consider consciousness to underlie our thoughts and sensations, affect our moods and emotions, provide us with an ability to integrate complex information to make informed decisions, and give us self-awareness and the ability to communicate through language. Getting to grips with consciousness is not easy – particularly because it plays such divergent roles. But these multiple roles are in fact helpful, because they provide us with specific processes or categories of consciousness.

Current research exploring the capacity for pain and suffering in fish is using this modular approach to look for different kinds of evidence. To date the results are confirming that fish do possess conscious-like modules, such as mental representations and anticipation of 'fear'-like states. For aspects specifically related to fish feeling pain, we need evidence of phenomenal consciousness – the experience of sensing what is around you and the feelings and emotions that this creates.

This captures the concept of sentience – the capacity to feel and experience your environment. We have some way to go to formally demonstrate this, but small components are coming together in an encouraging way. For example, we now know that fish have an area in their forebrain dedicated to processing stimuli related to emotions such as 'fear'. If this area is damaged or lesioned the fish no longer show appropriate avoidance responses.

On balance, the evidence would seem to indicate that fish can feel pain. I would argue that the data are certainly compelling enough to give fish the benefit of the doubt, and so we should afford them welfare consideration.

Contact

Victoria Braithwaite,
Penn State University, USA,
v.braithwaite@psu.edu

Victoria Braithwaite is professor of Fisheries & Biology, Penn State University, USA - v.braithwaite@psu.edu. She is the author of the popular science book, 'Do Fish Feel Pain?' 2010, Oxford University Press

**6th World Fisheries
Congress**
7 - 11 May 2012
Edinburgh, UK

Sustainable Fisheries in a Changing World

The 6th World Fisheries Congress will be held in Edinburgh, UK from the 7th to the 11th of May, 2012, hosted by the Fisheries Society of the British Isles on behalf of the World Council of Fisheries Societies.

The conference addresses the important topic of *Sustainable Fisheries in a Changing World*, through four key themes:

- Adaptive management and tools to cope with changing environments
- The social and economic costs of failure and the route to success
- Sustainable fisheries under a changeable climate regime.
- Meeting the increased protein demand through cultivation.

These themes will be covered by a program of lectures, symposia, workshops and discussions. The program is designed to meet the concerns and interests of the fisheries industry (catchers, processors and retailers), as well as of fisheries managers and academics and a high level of participation from all these groups is expected. An especially warm welcome is extended to students and young scientists and there will be a satellite program before the main meeting particularly aimed at this group of delegates.

The previous World Fisheries Congress (in Yokohama in 2008) included a symposium aimed at discussing the ethics and welfare of fish captured in commercial fisheries, making links to recreational angling and aquaculture. A 1 day symposium on Welfare, Fisheries and Aquaculture is being organized at the 6th congress to follow up on themes identified at that meeting, focusing on similarities and differences in ethical and welfare issues between aquaculture and commercial fisheries, with the aim of identifying strategies aimed at improving the welfare of fish in both aquaculture and commercial fisheries.

Further information about the conference as a whole can be found at: <http://www.6thwfc2012.com>.

For more information about the symposium on welfare, fisheries and aquaculture, please contact Ian Mayer (Norwegian School of Veterinary Science) at ian.Mayer@nvh.no

EurSafe Executive Committee Update

Welcome to the Spring issue of the EurSafe 2011 Newsletter. The EurSafe Board is delighted to announce the dates of the 10th Congress of the European Society for Agricultural and Food Ethics (EurSafe) that will be held in Tübingen, Germany, 30th May – 2nd June 2012.

The Congress is being hosted by PD Dr. Thomas Potthast and Simon Meisch. This Congress will focus on the very prominent and timely theme of: "Climate Change and Sustainable Development: Ethical Perspectives on Land Use and Food Production". For further details of the Congress theme and for information on the sub-themes please see the full announcement included in this Spring Newsletter or visit the Congress website at: www.eursafe2012.eu, a link is also available on the EurSafe website: www.eursafe.org. Abstract submission is due on 1st September 2011 (electronic submission via website). Further details on registration will be available shortly. A diverse group of keynote presentations are planned by the organisers and updates on the programme will be available on the Congress website www.eursafe2012.eu. We are also pleased to confirm that the Congress proceedings will be published once again by Wageningen Academic Publishers (WAP) and will be available at the Congress.

We would strongly encourage all of our members to circulate this first Congress Announcement as far and as wide as possible. Thank you!

In order to give EurSafe members further details of the organisers' institution and research interests, our Germany hosts will kindly provided a brief of their academic activities in the July 2011 issue. So please watch this space!

Finally, the Board will be meeting on Tuesday 10th May 2011 in Utrecht, The Netherlands. If any Member wishes to comment on recent EurSafe Congress planning, raise an issue or propose new activities, etc, please do not hesitate to contact the Board via our Secretary, Dr Frank Meijboom (F.L.B.Meijboom@uu.nl).

We wish you all a flourishing academic Spring session. In addition, we wish you enjoyable April / May holidays with your families and friends!

Kate Millar on behalf of Executive Committee

EurSafe 2012

**30 May – 2 June 2012,
Tübingen, Germany,**

First call for Abstracts

10th Congress of the European Society for Agricultural and Food Ethics (EurSafe)
Tübingen, Germany,
30. May – 2. June 2012

**Climate Change and Sustainable Development:
Ethical Perspectives on Land Use and Food Production**

Climate change is one of the major framing conditions for sustainable development of agriculture and food production. This is connected to ongoing changes in and of land-use practices which are related to local, regional and global scales, often dubbed as 'glocal' situations. That characterisation also applies to the closely related land and waters use domains of forestry and fisheries.

Agricultural and food ethics and its adjacent fields need to address well known, but aggravated 'old' problems. These are, among others, desertification due to temperature increase, changing precipitation regimes, unsustainable and/or unfair land-use and water regimes, pressure on arable land due to the loss of coastal areas, soil degradation and suburban sprawl, and the strain placed on both environment and animal welfare as a consequence of a growing worldwide demand for animal products. Also the manifold socio-economic implications on justice and fairness have to be investigated from different ethical perspectives.

At the same time, however, climate change creates specific effects: There are and will be new irreversible changes of natural and anthropogenic systems. Mitigation and adaptation measures to counter or slow down climate change have already resulted in considerable changes in agri- and silvicultural land-use. This is mainly but not only due to the significant increase in growing plants for energy supply ("biofuels"). Another perspective is the purchase or long-term tenancy of arable land or of water rights in the countries of the global south by wealthy nations and by transnational enterprises. In the case of animal production, specific dilemmas arise when a narrow focus on carbon efficiency favours intensive production systems which are decoupled from many traditional agricultural considerations.

These issues are only some of the many dimensions which demand reflection from an agricultural and food ethics perspective and thus examination by the community of scholars involved in EurSafe. The 10th EurSafe Congress will address the topic of climate change and sustainable development under four main perspectives: (1) food production, (2) preservation of natural resources, (3) lifestyles (4) general philosophical and historical issues of climate change, sustainable development and food ethics. There are overlaps, so sessions within the programme will examine different foci providing a stimulating and challenging array of contributions to the Congress.

The deadline for electronic submissions of abstracts is due on 1st September 2011.

Further details can be found at: www.eursafe2012.eu.

All submissions will be reviewed by the Scientific Committee and authors of selected abstracts will be asked to submit their extend abstract (paper) by early December 2011 in order to ensure that the Congress book will be ready for the EurSafe 2012 Congress 2012.

You will be asked to submit your abstract under one of the four main themes. The sub-themes are issues of major interest and papers should address at least one of them. However, the structure of both the conference volume and the sessions at the conference will be adjusted according to the thematic scope of papers accepted.

THEME 1: CLIMATE CHANGE AND FOOD PRODUCTION

This section is devoted to questions of climate adaption and mitigation measures with regard to agriculture, fisheries and the related technologies for food production. Problems such as changing land-use, agricultural water consumption, reduction of greenhouse gases, degradation/pollution and animal welfare will be addressed. These issues are of course also related to overall perspectives of sustainable development.

- 1.1 Agricultural and aquacultural production systems adapting to climate change
- 1.2 Land ownership and land grab
- 1.3 Animal farming and animal welfare
- 1.4 Intensive vs. extensive production practices
- 1.5 Role of genetically modified organisms
- 1.6 Production priorities: food vs. fibre vs. fuel

THEME 2: CLIMATE CHANGE AND PRESERVATION OF NATURAL RESOURCES

This section focuses on how natural sources that support food production can be maintained, hence providing basic capital for sustainable development under conditions of climate change.

- 2.1 Land-use changes
- 2.2 Water rights and regimes: demands and supplies
- 2.3 Local breeds and cultural traditions in a changing world
- 2.4 Biodiversity and/or ecosystem services
- 2.5 Patenting, food/feed markets and global socio-economic perspectives
- 2.6 Sustainable transport systems related to agri-food
- 2.7 Managing change – new options for sustainable development

THEME 3: CLIMATE CHANGE AND LIFE STYLES

This section focuses on the issue of new lifestyles that are compatible, or not, with climate adaption and mitigation (also referred to as compensation) measures with regard to food. Different types of actor responsibility (individual, regional, collective, state, global) in coping with climate change could be discussed here.

- 3.1 'Glocalization' and food: the role of local actors in addressing global challenges
- 3.2 Lifestyles and institutional perspectives: regulation, law, governance
- 3.3 Lifestyle and its relation to animal welfare
- 3.4 Lifestyle and resources (e.g. mobility, "virtual" water content of products)
- 3.5 'Ethical' or 'green' consumerism
- 3.6. Education and food ethics

THEME 4: GENERAL PHILOSOPHICAL AND HISTORICAL ISSUES

This section focuses on more general philosophical and historical questions of climate change, sustainability, agricultural and food ethics.

- 4.1 Towards a general philosophy of agriculture and food production
- 4.2 Teaching sustainable development and ethics: concepts and practical cases
- 4.3 Values and norms in sustainable food production: links to international governance
- 4.4 Historical perspectives on colonisation, globalisation and land use

Conference Date

30th May (Wed evening) – 2nd June 2012 (Sat afternoon)

Venue

Tübingen - Theology Building of Tübingen University,
Liebermeisterstr. 12-16, 72076 Tübingen, Germany

Local Host

International Centre for Ethics in the Sciences and Humanities
(IZEW), Tübingen University, Wilhelmstr. 19, 72074 Tübingen,
Germany

Contact persons

PD Dr. Thomas Potthast and Simon Meisch, IZEW

Contact E-Mail: eursafe2012@izew.uni-tuebingen.de

Websites: www.eursafe2012.eu www.eursafe.org

Abstracts due: 1st September 2011

(electronic submission via website)

Book Award

Publications

The American Library Association awarded its 2010 Outstanding Reference Sources Award to the Encyclopedia of Environmental Philosophy and Ethics by J. Baird Callicott and Robert Frodema. (2 vols, Macmillan Reference USA, 2008; ISBN 9780028661407)

Course

Does size matter? Ethical, societal, legal and biological aspects of large animals as biomedical models

*International summer school, 10–14 October 2011,
Wissenschaftszentrum Weihenstephan, Freising near Munich*

Organisation

Europäische Akademie Bad Neuenahr-Ahrweiler and Chair of Livestock Biotechnology of the Technische Universität München (subject to final confirmation of funding by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research, BMBF)

Topic

Genetically modified mice and other rodent models have undoubtedly made major contributions to biomedical research, revealing the molecular basis of many human diseases and enabling proof-of-principle studies for novel diagnostic and treatment strategies. But mice are not men, and their predictive value for preclinical studies is often called into question. Alternative animal models with greater predictive value are therefore being investigated, in order to gain useful information using the minimum number of animals. Larger animals, notably pigs, are gaining attention because they resemble

humans in size, physiology and the anatomy of many organ systems. However the general public and the regulatory authorities may view large animal research more critically than the use of rodents. We will examine the inter-relationship between animal research, the ethical discourse and the balance of interests necessary for the framing of rational regulations and guidelines. We will specifically focus on the comparison of rodents with large animals and use this to highlight various aspects of animal experimentation ethics.

Procedure

The international summer school will accept up to 15 young European researchers (graduates, Ph.D.-students, post-docs) from a variety of disciplines such as biomedicine, animal biotechnology, animal welfare, ethics, law, social sciences and related areas. Participants will present and discuss their own work, and there will be a number of lectures covering relevant topics. The summer school will close with a public podium discussion event to take place at the Carl von Linde-Akademie in Munich on Friday, 14 October 2011.

To apply please send an abstract of 400 words or less describing your own research, a current CV and a publication list by 14 April 2011 to:

Dr. Kristin Hagen
Europäische Akademie GmbH
Wilhelmstr. 56
53474 Bad Neuenahr-Ahrweiler
Germany
or via e-mail to: kristin.hagen@ea-aw.de

Successful applicants will be reimbursed for travel and accommodation expenses. Applicants are also encouraged to submit a manuscript by 16 September 2011 for publication as a book chapter, for which an honorarium of €300 will be paid.

Further information: <http://www.large-animal-research-ethics.de/>

Conferences 2011/2012

April 1-2

The Bowling Green Workshop in Applied Ethics and Public Policy "Freedom, Paternalism and Morality". Bowling green, Ohio, USA
www.bgsu.edu/departments/phil/conferences/paternalism

April 4-8

International Conference Zoosemiotics and Animal Representations, Tartu, Estonia
http://www.ut.ee/sose/conference/2011_zoosemiotics/index.html

April 6-8

International Conference on 'Global Land Grabbing'
Institute of Dev. Studies (IDS), University of Sussex, Brighton, UK
http://www.future-agricultures.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=1908:global-land-grabbing-call-for-papers&catid=127&itemid=505

April 6-7

Fifth African Regional Conference on Sustainable Development
Ambrose Alli University, Ekpoma, Edo State, Edo State, Nigeria
www.irdionline.org

| | |
|------------------|--|
| April 7-9 | Undergraduate Ethics Symposium DePauw University, Indiana, US http://prindleinstitute.depauw.edu/programs/ethics_symposium.asp |
| April 15 | PHC Annual Health Ethics Conference Segal Graduate School of Business, Vancouver, BC http://www.providencehealthcare.org/ethics_services/health-ethics-conferences.html |
| May 5-6 | Conference for e-democracy and open government Krems, Austria http://www.donau-uni.ac.at/en/departement/gpa/telematik/edemocracy-conference/edem/vid/14978/index.php |
| May 5-8 | The economies of Balkan and eastern Europe countries in the changed world Pitesti, Romania http://ebeec.teikav.edu.gr/ |
| May 6-8 | Scientix European Conference Brussels, Belgium http://www.scientix.eu/web/quest/conference |
| May 12-13 | The 4th International Seville Conference on Future-Oriented Technology Analysis (FTA) Seville, Spain http://foresight.jrc.ec.europa.eu/fta_2011/FTA2011_call_final.pdf |
| May 13-15 | Metaphysics & the Philosophy of Science Conference University of Toronto http://www.facstaff.bucknell.edu/mhs016/mpsc2011/index.html |
| May 16-19 | 6th Annual International Symposium on Environment Athens, Greece http://www.atiner.gr/environment.htm |
| May 18-20 | First International Conference on Organic Food Quality and Health Research Diplomat Hotel Conference Centre Prague, Czech Republic http://www.fqh2011.org/fqh2011_announcement.pdf |
| May 18-21 | 7th International Conference on Clinical Ethics Consultation: "Moving Ethics" Amsterdam, The Netherlands http://www.iccec2011.org/ |
| May 19-21 | Climate change, Agri-food, Fisheries and Ecosystems. Reinventing research, innovation, and policy agendas for environmentally- and socially-balanced growth Agadir (Morocco) http://nrsc.webnode.com/scientific-events/iccaff2011/english-version/ |
| May 19-22 | 5th Global Conference: Ethics, Evil, Law and the State Warsaw, Poland http://www.inter-disciplinary.net/at-the-interface/evil/evil-law-the-state/call-for-papers/ |
| May 27-28 | Interdisziplinäres Symposium „Kampf um Ressourcen und die (De-)Stabilisierung der Weltordnung Hochschule für Philosophie, München, Deutschland www.hfph.mwn.de |

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| June 1 | 2nd International Conference on Ecological Theology and Environmental Ethics (ECOTHEE 2011) Chania, Crete, Greece http://ithe.webs.com/ |
| June 6-7 | Dilemmas of choice. Responsibility in nanotechnology development Rovigo (Italy) Center for Environmental Law Decisions at the University of Padua and the Institute for Technology Assessment and Systems Analysis at Karlsruhe Institute of Technology www.ciga.unipd.it |
| June 6-10 | 19th European Biomass Conference and Exhibition Berlin, Germany http://www.conference-biomass.com |
| June 9-12 | Food and Agriculture under the big sky: People, Partnerships and Policies The University of Montana – Missoula http://www.afhvs.org/2011callforpapers.pdf |
| June 16 | Westminster Food & Nutrition Forum: Innovation in the food chain London, United Kingdom http://www.westminsterforumprojects.co.uk/forums/event.php?eid=222 |
| June 21-23 | Agriculture Investment Summit Europe 2011 London, United Kingdom http://www.terrapinn.com/2011/agri/ |
| June 21-23 | First International Conference on Food and Environment - The Quest for a Sustainable Future New forest, UK http://www.wessex.ac.uk/11-conferences/foodandenvironment-2011.html |
| June 28-29 | 7th Conference of the Global Consortium of Higher Education and Research for Agriculture Beauvais, France www.gchera.com |
| June 30 – July 1 | Agrigenomics Congress Hamburg, Germany http://www.selectbiosciences.com/conferences/AGWC2011/ |
| July 8-11 | 10th Global Conference: Environmental Justice and Global Citizenship Oxford, United Kingdom http://www.inter-disciplinary.net/critical-issues/ethos/environmental-justice-and-global-citizenship/call-for-papers/ |
| July 21-22 | The third international conference on climate change: impacts and responses Rio de Janeiro, Brazil http://www.Climate-Conference.com |
| July 26-29 | 3rd International Conference on Sustainable Animal Agriculture for Developing Countries (SAADC 2011) Nakhon Ratchasima, Nakhon Ratchasima, Thailand www.saadc2011.com/home.php |
| August 5-8 | Third International Conference on Science in Society Washington DC, United States http://science-society.com/conference-2011/ |

| | |
|---------------------------------|--|
| August 17-20 | Conference of the European Society for Philosophy of Medicine and Healthcare (ESPMH) Zurich, Switzerland http://www.ethik.uzh.ch/ibme/news/espmh-conference/ESPMH-Zurich-2011.pdf |
| August 22-24 | ACES 2011: Conservation Conflicts: Strategies for coping with a changing world Aberdeen, Scotland, UK http://www.aces-2011.org |
| August 24-27 | Symposium on Ethics of Environmental Health Prague, Czech Republic http://www.seeh2011.org |
| September 2-4 | 14th ICPP: Ethics, Experience and Evidence: Integration of Perspectives in Psychiatry; Gothenburg, Sweden http://www.phil.gu.se/sfp/sfp_eng.html |
| September 4-8 | 6th Science Centre World Congress Cape Town, South Africa http://www.6scwc.org/ |
| September 5 – 15 | Medical Ethics & Legal Medicine Civitavecchia, Italy http://www.continuingeducation.net/course/details.php?program_number=886 |
| September 12 – 15 | 3rd Symposium on Environmental Weeds & Invasive Plants (Intractable Weeds and Plant Invaders) Ticino, Switzerland http://www.ewrs.org/coming_events.asp |
| September 29 – October 2 | Die Selbstbestimmung des Patienten und die Medizin der Zukunft. Perspektiven einer Medizinethik des 21. Jahrhunderts. Jahrestagung der Akademie für Ethik in der Medizin 2011 Göttingen, Germany www.aem-online.de |
| October 15-19 | The IDF World Dairy Summit 2011 Parma, Italy http://www.wds2011.com/enter.html |
| October 28-29 | Bucharest Conference in Applied Ethics 2011 University of Bucharest, Romania http://www.bcae.ro/ |
| 2012 | |
| May 7 - 11 | 6th World Fisheries Congress Edinburgh, UK http://www.6thwfc2012.com/ |
| May 30 – June 2 | EurSafe 2012 Tübingen, Germany www.eursafe2012.eu |
| July 1-7 | Minding Animals Conference Utrecht University, The Netherlands www.mindinganimals.com |

Funding: FP7 Calls

ERC Advanced Investigators Grant

Identifier: ERC-2011-AdG_20110406 for the domain Social Sciences and Humanities (SH)

Deadline: 06 April 2011 at 17:00:00 (Brussels local time)

http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/dc/index.cfm?fuseaction=UserSite.IdeasDetailsCallPage&call_id=386

MARIE CURIE CAREER INTEGRATION GRANTS (CIG)

Identifier: FP7-PEOPLE-2011-CIG

Deadlines: 06 September 2011 at 17:00:00 (Brussels local time) -

OJ Reference: OJ C283 of 20 October 2010

<http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/dc/index.cfm?fuseaction=UserSite.FP7CallsPage>

MARIE CURIE INTRA-EUROPEAN FELLOWSHIPS FOR CAREER DEVELOPMENT (IEF)

Call Identifier FP7-PEOPLE-2011-IEF

Foreseen Date of Publication: 2011-03-16

MARIE CURIE INTERNATIONAL OUTGOING FELLOWSHIPS FOR CAREER DEVELOPMENT (IOF)

Call Identifier FP7-PEOPLE-2011-IOF

Foreseen Date of Publication: 2011-03-16

MARIE CURIE INTERNATIONAL INCOMING FELLOWSHIPS (IIF)

Call Identifier FP7-PEOPLE-2011-IIF

Foreseen Date of Publication: 2011-03-16

Contacts

Executive secretariat
Saskia de Boer

Royal Netherlands Society of Agricultural Sciences, P.O. Box 79,
NL-6700 AB Wageningen, The Netherlands

saskia.deboer@wur.nl

EurSafe Membership
Administration
Bureau De Beek

Parkweg 27 NL-2585 JH The Hague, The Netherlands

tel. (+31) (0)70 4162943, fax (+3 1) (0)70 4162959,

info@eursafe ledenadmin.nl

President
Matthias Kaiser
Secretary
Franck L.B. Meijboom

National Committee for Research Ethics in Science and
Technology, Norway, matthias.kaiser@etikkom.no

Utrecht University, the Netherlands

F.L.B.Meijboom@uu.nl

Treasurer
Anne-Marie Neeteson

European Forum of Farm Animal Breeders, The Netherlands

anne-marie.neeteson@effab.info

Vice-president
Kate Millar

University of Nottingham, United Kingdom,

kate.millar@nottingham.ac.uk

Members
Johan De Tavernier

Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium,

johan.detavernier@theo.kuleuven.be

Helena Röcklinsberg

Swedish University of Agricultural Science, Sweden,

helena.rocklinsberg@hnh.slu.se



| | |
|-----------------------|--|
| Leire Escajedo | University of the Basque Country, Spain, leire.escajedo@ehu.es |
| Anna Olsson | Institute for Molecular and Cell Biology - IBMC, Portugal olsson@ibmc.up.pt |
| Kristin Hagen | Europäische Akademie zur Erforschung von Folgen wissenschaftlich-technischer Entwicklungen, Germany kristin.hagen@ea-aw.de |

| | |
|----------------|--|
| Website | www.eursafe.org |
|----------------|--|

| | |
|---|---|
| EurSafe News | |
| Chief-editor: Stefan Aerts | Katholieke Hogeschool Sint-Niklaas, Belgium, stef.aerts@kahosl.be |
| Publications editor: Assya Pascalev | Howard University, United States, director@bioethics.net |
| Funding calls editor: Tassos Michalopoulos | ta_michal@yahoo.com |

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Editorial Board | |
| Herwig Grimm | Institute TTN, Germany, herwig.grimm@elkb.de |
| Matias Pasquali | Matias.pasquali@gmail.com |
| Bernice Bovenkerk | Universiteit Utrecht, b.bovenkerk@uu.nl |
| Raymond Anthony | University of Alaska Anchorage, ranthon1@uaa.alaska.edu |
| Kate Millar | University of Nottingham, United Kingdom, kate.millar@nottingham.ac.uk |

Editors and themes next issues

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| June 2011 | Assya Pacalev, "Nanny Nation": Should the Government Regulate Our Diet? |
| September 2011 | Raymond Anthony: "Social justice and hunger/food security" |
| December 2011 | Tassos Michalopoulos: "Food Market & Consumption Ethics" |
| March 2012 | Kate Millar: "Ethical decision-making tools" |

Deadline for the next issue: May 15, 2011

You are kindly invited to send any relevant contributions, conference calls, publication reviews, etc. to the editors.