



Contents

Editorial	1
Ethical dimensions of public food procurement	2
Report from the 9Th World Congress on Alternatives and animal use in the Life sciences, 24-28 August 2014, Prague	12
Book review: Adam Briggie & Carl Mitcham, <i>Ethics and Science, an introduction</i> , Cambridge Applied Ethics, 2012	13
EurSafe Executive Committee Update	14
List of upcoming conferences 2014 / 2015	15
Contacts	18

Editorial



Dear EurSafe members,

It is our pleasure to present to you the 2014 September issue of the EurSafe newsletter after a hopefully pleasant and relaxing summer. This issue presents a mixture of different topics of interest to EurSafe members. First of all, the ethics of the public procurement of food has increasingly become a topic for debate. As impetus for this debate, Mark Stein provides us with a useful overview of public procurement policies and moral, economic, and social issues regarding the public procurement of food in different countries. Someone who has to buy food for, for example, schools, is faced with countless considerations and dilemmas. Should this person always choose local food, or is it possible that food from further away is in fact more environmentally sustainable? Should this person enforce meat-free days or should he or she leave that choice up to individuals themselves? How can the procurement of specific foods contribute to education about healthy food habits? Should fair trade only be about fairer terms for farmers in the developing world or also for farmers in the developed world? These and many other dilemmas will keep the discussion about public procurement alive for a long time to come, we suspect. Secondly, Frans Stafleu reports about his visit to the World Congress on Alternatives and animal use in the Life sciences that was held in Prague recently. How should we evaluate the costs and benefits of animal experiments? Newly proposed methods for making such an evaluation may lead to the rejection of a lot more requests for licenses. At the same time Stafleu points out the danger of the almost sacred status of the 'alternatives to animal testing mantra' of the 3R's - replacement (no animals), refinement (less suffering) and reduction (less animals): too much focus on these avoids a meaningful discussion about the limits to the benefits of animal experiments. Mariëtte van den Hoven reviews an educational book that supports teaching to science students about ethics. Even though this book was already published two years ago, we thought it would be good to review it after some of us have had experience using it for our own students. We have found it to provide a helpful overview of issues to be discussed with students and a useful tool with which to structure one's own lectures. Finally, Kate Millar gives us an update about the organisation of the next EurSafe congress to be held in Cluj-Napoca,

Romania. Please note that the deadline for submission of abstracts has been extended until October 1. We hope to see many of you in Romania!

Mark Stein, special issue editor

Bernice Bovenkerk, editor-in-chief

Short paper



Mark Stein
Salford University Business
School, Manchester, UK
markstein2010@live.co.uk

Ethical dimensions of public food procurement

Introduction

This paper endeavours to give an overview of ethical issues relating to public procurement of food for the public sector – principally schools and hospitals, as well as care homes, prisons and office canteens.

Public procurement has multiple objectives. Procurers must seek to buy food at an affordable price and delivered in adequate quantities and at the required time. Food must meet government nutritional and food safety standards.

Ethical issues are also often discussed under the concept of *sustainable* procurement, with reference being made to environmental, economic and social sustainability.

The most important environmental considerations include protecting biodiversity – especially by introducing organic food - and reducing greenhouse gas emissions – by reducing food miles or perhaps by reducing meat consumption.

The most important economic and social considerations include:

- Promoting animal welfare
- Supporting local food producers
- Promoting better employment conditions among employees in the food chain
- Buying Fair Trade products
- Providing children with healthier school meals
- Teaching children about healthy food

Ethical Objectives encouraged by the New EU Public Procurement Directive

The new EU Public Procurement Directives became law in March 2014. All EU member states have two years to pass legislation to transpose them into national law.

Contracts must now be awarded not simply on the basis of lowest price but based on the “most economically advantageous tender” (MEAT). This will enable public authorities to put more emphasis in the award procedure on quality, animal welfare, environmental

considerations, social aspects or innovation while still taking into account the price and life-cycle-costs of what is procured.

The new regulations will benefit Small & Medium Enterprises (SMEs) by encouraging buyers to break large contracts into smaller lots. The new rules will see much simpler and more streamlined procurement processes, which could save SMEs up to 60% of bidding process costs.

The new regulations will also encourage procurers to buy Fair Trade products (see below).

Promoting farm animal welfare

A common way in which public procurement can aim to protect farm animal welfare is by requiring meat or dairy products to have been produced according to a system of farm assurance which guarantees certain minimum standards of welfare.

In the UK Red Tractor is the leading farm assurance scheme and public procurement tenders often specify that the meat or other produce must comply with Red Tractor standards even though it may have been certified by a different certifying body in another EU member state.

The UK's Sustainable Development Commission commissioned an analysis which gave a limited endorsement of Red Tractor, saying that its

standards do a good job of assuring food safety, animal welfare and to a lesser extent, environmental imperatives. They also generally cover safe working environments and appropriate training where these relate to food safety. However they do not cover... other key aspects of sustainable development – viable livelihoods, environmental improvements, rural cultures and economies, nutritious food and accurate information about food, and local foods..... The levels set for some of the ...standards are well below those that the UK Sustainable Development Commission would argue are necessary in sustainable food production (Sustainable Development Commission, 2005, p.5)

Public procurers in the UK have followed a wider change in public buying habits by switching to free range eggs.

The keeping of laying hens in battery cages has been banned throughout the EU from 1st January 2012. This decision reflected widespread public concern about the suffering of chickens in battery cages. Under the new rules caged birds will have twice the space they had previously although still less than free range chickens.

The Sustainable Development Commission reviewed the reasons for the massive growth in UK consumption of free range eggs – from 7% of total market in 1987 to 30% in 2005 and concluded that the shift occurred due to producer response to the salmonella health scare in 1988. It was reinforced by public concerns about animal welfare. There was strong media support for change, egg quality was the same or better and the price difference was small.

Supermarkets were quick to react to the salmonella health scare and offer customers a free-range choice of eggs. Retailers and some restaurants also use free-range egg products as part of public relations activity. For example retailer Marks and Spencer, and fast food retailer, McDonalds who have a free range only offer Egg producers have responded to the higher demand and higher margins offered by free-range and the mix of production methods have continued to shift towards free range year-on-year since 1988 (Sustainable Development Commission, 2006, p.14).

Support for local food producers - Farm to School in USA

In the USA “Farm to school” is a nationwide program which helps bring fresh, local produce to school cafeterias. The first USDA census has revealed that 43 per cent of US school districts – or about 38,600 schools – bought local produce for their students during the 2011/2012 school year. This reflects substantial growth of “Farm to School” food purchasing over previous years.

Many chefs have switched away from buying in pre-prepared packaged meals towards cooking with fresh ingredients. This is seen as providing healthier and higher quality food.

Farm to School tends to promote healthier eating habits. Visits to farms play an important role.

When students have the opportunity to spend time on farms, to get to know farmers and to see, taste, touch and smell food in its natural state, they are far more willing to try it raw or prepared at mealtime, ask for it at home, incorporate it into their own diet and be willing to try new and different foods when they are offered...fennel quickly replaced McDonald's as a student favourite as their learning deepened (Davis & Hudson, 2011, p.179).

Cookery classes and creation of school gardens are other ways in which Farm to School promotes children's better understanding of food and healthy eating.

Small producers may struggle to provide the volume, variety and regularity of products required for the school kitchens. They may also struggle with the logistical challenge of delivery of food to large numbers of schools. A widespread development within the

USA has been the creation of local food hubs to address the distribution problems faced by small suppliers :

A major obstacle to localization is the lack of economic, organizational and physical structures of the appropriate scale for local aggregation and distribution of food. Local food hubs are emerging as an important tool for overcoming that obstacle by pooling food products from a number of smaller farms and delivering them to grocery stores, schools, hospitals and restaurants. (Cleveland et al, 2014, p.26)

Distribution of food is thus separated from supply, making it easier for smaller food producers to compete in the marketplace.

There is growing demand for local meat and poultry but the supply is restricted by the limited processing infrastructure and existing small processors often lack the steady consistent business required for profitability

We conclude that business commitments between processors and farmers are critical to mutual success: farmers commit to providing consistent throughput of livestock to process, and processors commit to providing consistent, high-quality processing services. This commitment, supported by coordination and communication between processors and their customers as well as along the entire supply chain, is essential to the persistence and expansion of local meats. (Gwin & Thiboumery, 2013, p.3.)

In 2011, EcoTrust published the “Impact of Seven Cents,” which examined the economic impact of a pilot program: the Farm to School program with the Portland and Gervais school districts during the 2008-2009 school year. Those districts were given \$160,750.02, which amount to a seven-cent reimbursement from the state for each school meal that included locally sourced food.

The report found that the money used to reimburse schools

incentivized local food purchases totalling \$461,992.10. In successive rounds of economic activity, such as future purchasing and spending, the report found that every dollar spent on purchasing local food for school meals encourages an additional 86 cents of spending among suppliers, producers and households.

Support for small food producers - UK , Finland, Sweden

There are widespread initiatives in the UK promoting sourcing of local and organic food for school kitchens and these have been promoted by several initiatives over the years – particularly the Public Sector Food Procurement Initiative between 2003 and 2009 and the Food for Life Partnership – since 2007.

Finland has provided free school meals to all school children since 1943, and this has been an important dimension of the welfare state. The government's sustainable development and procurement strategies encourage procurement of local and organic food. A telephone survey of Finnish municipalities shows that procurement of local and organic food is a widespread practice, although there are opportunities to increase such procurement. The report concluded that :

If public sector kitchens really want to use local food, it requires a new kind of thinking. It would require readiness to genuinely cooperate with the producers for instance by developing their products into something that kitchens can use for their needs. Joint meetings between kitchen buyers and the producers require time initially but as the cooperation matures, there will be less need for meetings. (Muukka, et al 2008, p26)

Sweden resembles Finland in terms of strong government sustainable development policies and a system of universal free school meals. Special distribution arrangements to assist small food producers by lifting the logistic burden of distributing to large numbers of public sector kitchens are practiced by significant numbers of municipalities in Sweden and the UK. Division of contracts into lots is another practice which assists small producers and is quite widespread in Sweden and the UK.

Teaching children about healthy food

Under the discussion above of Farm to School in the USA, reference has been made to the links between local food procurement and teaching children about healthy and sustainable food through farm visits, school gardening and cookery activities.

Persson et al (2013) discuss the role of the "pedagogic meal" in Sweden, where school meals are intended to be a teaching occasion in which children learn about food and meals – health, nutrition and table manners. In Finland government policy also encourages nutritional education, learning of table manners, school gardening and cookery lessons. In the UK the Food for Life Partnership promotes farm visits, school gardens and cookery lessons.

Is local food supply the best way to save the planet?

The notion has become widespread that local food is better for the environment – specifically because long distance food transport (food

miles) leads to greater Greenhouse Gas Emissions. The “food miles” concept was coined and developed by Professor Tim Lang in the early 1990s. He said in 2009 that “food miles” is woven into the language now, a shorthand for a debate, a perspective. In the early 1990s, it was very helpful to get people to realise that food wasn’t local anymore but had become globalized and industrialised, trucked about endlessly—and often needlessly—before reaching the plate. And it’s truer than ever today. About a quarter of freight traffic in the UK is food-related, and half of that is lorries travelling empty, sort of non-Food Miles. To some extent the Food Miles metric isn’t accurate; carbon or greenhouse gas emissions are better measured using Life-Cycle Analysis. But, to return to my concern about shifting food culture, food miles has been really helpful in engaging everyday language and beginning that process of improved understanding (Harper, 2009, p.21).

Some researchers have however argued that the view that food’s environmental impact depends on distance travelled is an enormous over-simplification. Edward-Jones (2010) spells out with clarity that there is no simple relationship between local foods and lower GHG emissions. Think of tomatoes grown in heated greenhouses in Britain compared to those grown without artificial heating in Spain. The British produce will have incurred fewer food miles but transportation may be quite a low percentage of the total carbon footprint.

However the belief that purchasing local food is always more environmentally friendly is still held among influential decision makers at both national and local level.

The local trap

Born & Purcell (2006, p.195) have coined the phrase “the local trap”, referring to

the tendency of food activists and researchers to assume something inherent about the local scale. The local is assumed to be desirable; it is preferred a priori to larger scales. What is desired varies and can include ecological sustainability, social justice, democracy, better nutrition, and food security, freshness, and quality..... [T]he local trap is misguided and poses significant intellectual and political dangers to foodsystems research.

Winter (2003, p.30) points out that in his study of food purchasing patterns in five rural localities of England and Wales that

the patterns of food purchasing revealed, with local food figuring more highly than organic, illustrate a defensive politics of localism rather than a strong turn to quality based around organic and ecological production

He gives the example of a dairy farm in Devon with widespread local sales

The farm is not organic, nor are environmental and food safety considerations used to market the product. Indeed the farm is intensively managed with high inputs of nitrate fertilizer and in common with many west country dairy farms a recent shift to forage maize with attendant problems of soil compaction and/or erosion

It must not be assumed that localization of food systems necessarily equates to promotion of environmental sustainability and social justice. The opposite may be the case.

The challenge is to combine food localization with environmentally and socially desirable food production methods, such as better pay

and working conditions for farm workers and minimizing of environmentally destructive farming methods.

Fair trade – for the Global South

Fair Trade refers to the movement to secure better prices, decent working conditions, local sustainability and fair terms of trade for farmers and workers in the developing world. Consumer sales of Fair Trade products from the Global South have grown rapidly in the Global North.

The main Fairtrade food products are tea, coffee, sugar, fruit juice, bananas, chocolate, wine, cereal bars and biscuits. The limited purchasing of Fair Trade products by public authorities can be explained by two factors:

- government guidance on EU procurement rules which until very recently discouraged public authorities from giving any form of preference to Fair Trade products in public procurement;
- The limited range of Fair Trade products available and limited demand for less healthy foods like chocolate and sugar.

Fisher & Corbalan (2013) predict that the forthcoming change to the Public Procurement Directives will facilitate the uptake of fair trade products by public authorities.

Agricultural working conditions What about Fair Trade for the Global North?

The suggestion has been made that farmers and workers in the Global North should also be able to benefit from Fair Trade – given that pay and working conditions are often very poor. There have been academic studies in the USA and Europe which have shown that some consumers are willing to pay extra for food products if they have been grown under fair labour conditions and the term “domestic fair trade” has been coined (Howard & Allen, 2008;). There have been attempts to develop domestic fair trade in the USA – particularly California. No widely accepted “domestic fair trade” label has yet emerged in Europe.

Up till now public procurement in Europe appears to have made hardly any attempt to address the problem of poor labour conditions in farming and other food production. One exception is the Manchester Veg People cooperative, established in 2009. MVP is a co-operative of organic growers and buyers – restaurants and caterers – created to increase access to sustainable food in Greater Manchester and create a more stable market for small local food producers. The model is based on fairness, with prices based on costs of production and the risks involved in food production shared by the members, through creating relationships of trust and understanding between growers and buyers. At present MVP operates on a very small scale. Its most important customer is from the public sector – the University of Manchester.

Reducing meat consumption

Several academic studies emphasize that of all food products, red meat has the highest carbon footprint and the greatest environmental

impacts, as well as having negative impacts on human health when consumed in large quantities.

In historical perspective meat consumption in the developed world has risen dramatically over the last two hundred years. Ruminant animals – cattle and sheep – emit methane, which is a particularly potent greenhouse gas. A recently published study of 2,253 Dutch consumers reports that

Empirical studies of the meat-consumption frequency of Dutch consumers show that, apart from meat-avoiders and meat-eaters, many people are meat-reducers that eat no meat at least one day per week. Given the enormous environmental impact of animal-protein consumption and the apparent sympathy of consumers for meat reduction, it is surprising that politicians and policy makers demonstrate little, if any, interest in strategies to reduce meat consumption and to encourage more sustainable eating practices. (Dagevos and Voordouw, 2013, p.1).

A “Meatless Mondays” movement began in 2003, and this is now promoted by many groups in Europe, Japan, the United States, Britain, Canada, Israel and Australia.

For example, the Belgian Municipality of Ghent won support of local people for its Veggie Day campaign. Vegetarian days have also been tried quite extensively in Finland and with some success.

Cords, Nitzko & Spiller (2014) describe a survey of 690 German consumers which shows that animal welfare and human health arguments are most effective in reducing meat consumption.

There is strong support for vegetarian days in public catering in certain German and Swedish cities. However, the German Green Party’s 2013 General Election Manifesto included a policy of introducing vegetarian days in all public catering, which aroused intense opposition among carnivores which is thought to be one of the main reasons for the German Greens’ poor election result.

Until now support in the UK for Meat Free Mondays has also been limited. It has been adopted by a small number of individual schools in London, Buckinghamshire and particularly Liverpool. Two local authority catering services appear to have adopted Meat Free Mondays – with very little publicity, as if the managers are concerned that this could be unpopular with parents.

The House of Commons International Development Committee recommended in June 2013 that UK consumers eat less meat :

The rate of increase in global meat consumption is unsustainable: the consequence is a growth in the production of grain-fed livestock, with crops used to feed livestock instead of humans. Clearly this does not mean that the world should stop consuming meat: this would be disproportionate and unrealistic. However, in the longer-term it may be appropriate to focus on sustainable systems such as pasture-fed cattle rather than on grain-fed livestock, with meat promoted as a occasional product rather than an everyday staple (House of Commons , 2013, p.16).

In June 2014 the Department of Education published a sixteen page booklet providing guidance on the revised school food standards. The standards – which schools will be required to follow - will oblige them to provide meat or poultry at least three days a week. Following the Standards there are “top tips” which include the first ever official

suggestion that schools can “encourage all children to have a meat-free day each week, using alternatives such as pulses, soya mince, tofu and Quorn” (School Food Plan, 2014, p.6).

Organic food – environmental benefits and animal welfare

Organic food sales have risen worldwide and in Europe. Global turnover rose 200 per cent from \$17.9 billion in 2000, to \$54.9 billion in 2009. The growth of organic markets between 2000 and 2009 was also impressive in European countries: 183% in Germany, 129% in the UK and 90% in Switzerland. However, market shares for European markets were still small: the share of organic in all food sales in 2010 were about 6.0% in Austria, 5.7% in Switzerland and 3.5% in Germany.

There is considerable academic debate about whether organic food is more nutritious than conventional food – with emphatic views expressed on both sides.

Proponents of organic agriculture also argue that it promotes greater bio-diversity, soil fertility and animal welfare and uses less energy than conventional agriculture. Countries with strong government policies supporting organic food in public catering include Italy, Norway, Denmark and Finland.

Organic conversion: the role of street level bureaucrats

Since 1995 the Danish government has been encouraging increased usage of organic food in public catering. Mikkelsen & Sylvest (2012) describe organizational changes in public catering linked to implementation of this policy, focussing on 43 projects which received government grant assistance in different municipalities, eight of which involved over a hundred food service units. Three quarters of the projects succeeded in reaching their goals of significantly increasing organic food. The study looked at the roles of the people who actually implement policy - “street-level bureaucrats”:

- Organic food is significantly more expensive and catering managers have had to convert to organic without an increase in their food budget by making savings elsewhere.
- The shock of organic conversion has stimulated catering managers to rethink kitchen organization and procedures which might otherwise have gone unquestioned and to find savings.
- Cost-cutting menu planning has in many cases resulted in more expensive meat cuts being replaced by cheaper vegetable products.
- The food being served in the kitchens is more nutritious and less is wasted.
- Kitchen personnel acquired new skills and experienced increased pride and engagement in their work.

The article concludes that the personal preferences and attitudes of the street-level bureaucrats seem to play an important role.

Similarly, Post & Mikkola (2012) carried out 46 structured telephone interviews with members of a Nordic network for healthy and sustainable catering, endeavouring to increase usage of organic food. Their article emphasises the need for dedicated individuals, who are personally motivated to promote the sustainability agenda.

Conclusions

The most widely practiced ethical/sustainability theme in public procurement is supporting local food producers.

Other themes which are widely practiced are:

- Promoting farm animal welfare
- Teaching children about healthy food
- Introducing organic food into public catering

Promoting Fair Trade for the Global South is a minor priority for most public procurers because of the very limited range of foods which is available under the Fair Trade label.

The pressure to buy food as cheaply as possible runs counter to any aspirations to promote better agricultural working conditions.

Major ethical dilemmas relate to support for local producers and for meat consumption.

Support for local producers may well imply purchasing of local produce (eg red meat), which has a very high carbon footprint and its production may have major negative environmental impacts.

Procurers may be aware of the environmental and health benefits of reducing meat consumption but feel unable to act on this knowledge. They may be worried that local farmers would protest. A further concern is that the consumers of the public food service may well resist any reduction in meat provision, for example by refusing to buy the meals, thereby threatening the viability of the public food service.

References

Born, B., & Purcell, M. (2006). Avoiding the local trap scale and food systems in planning research. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 26(2), 195-207.

Cordts, A., Nitzko, S., & Spiller, A. (2014). Consumer Response to Negative Information on Meat Consumption in Germany. *International Food and Agribusiness Management Review Volume 17 Special Issue: Food demand, diet, pp. 83-106.*

Dagevos H. & Voordouw J. (2013). Sustainability and meat consumption: is reduction realistic?. *Sustainability: Science, Practice, & Policy* 9(2)

Edwards-Jones, G. (2010). Does eating local food reduce the environmental impact of food production and enhance consumer health?. *Proceedings of the Nutrition Society*, 69(4), 582.

Fisher, E., & Corbalán, S. (2013). Fair trade and European public procurement: legal principles and governance dynamics. *Social Enterprise Journal*, 9(1), 11-27.

Gwin, L & , Thiboumery, A , (2013) From Convenience to Commitment: Securing the Long-Term Viability of Local Meat and Poultry Processing, Oregon State University

Harper, P. (2009). Values for money: rethinking the food system (Interview with Tim Lang) *Clean Slate The Practical Journal of*

Sustainable Living No 71 Spring 2009.

Howard, P. H., & Allen, P. (2008). Consumer willingness to pay for domestic 'fair trade': Evidence from the United States. *Renewable Agriculture and Food Systems*, 23(03), 235-242.

House of Commons. (2012). *Environmental Audit Committee Sustainable Food Eleventh Report of Session 2010–12*, 30 April 2012.

Mikkelsen, B. E., & Sylvest, J. (2012). Organic Foods on the Public Plate: Technical Challenge or Organizational Change?. *Journal of Foodservice Business Research*, 15(1), 64-83.

Muukka, E., Kuosmanen, L., Ylinampa, M., Blomquist, U., Kärkkäinen, I., Malaska, K., ... & Soininen, J. (2008). *Local food in municipal catering-a survey of local food purchasing in Finnish municipalities*.

Persson Osowski, C., Göransson, H., & Fjellström, C. (2013). Teachers' Interaction With Children in the School Meal Situation: The Example of Pedagogic Meals in Sweden. *Journal of nutrition education and behaviour*, 45(5), 420-427.

Post, A. & Mikkola, M., (2012) Nordic stakeholders in catering for sustainability: Chasm between ideology and practice? *British Food Journal*, 114, pp 743-761

School Food Plan. (2014). *SchoolFood Standards. A practical guide for schools their cooks and caterers*.

Sobell, SA & Tasman, N. 2011. The Impact of Seven Cents: Examining the Effects of a \$.07 per Meal Investment on Local Economic Development, Lunch Participation Rates, and Student Preferences for Fruits and Vegetables in Two Oregon School Districts. www.ecotrust.org/

Sustainable Development Commission. (2005). *Sustainability Implications of the Little Red Tractor Scheme Report by Levett-Therivel Sustainability Consultants, January 2005*

Sustainable Development Commission. (2006). *Looking back, looking forward Lessons in choice editing for sustainability: 19 case studies into drivers and barriers to mainstreaming more sustainable products, May 2006*.

Winter, M. (2003). Embeddedness, the new food economy and defensive localism. *Journal of rural studies*, 19(1), 23-32.

This is a selective list of references. For further details contact me at markstein2010@live.co.uk. With reference to Farm to School in the USA I must acknowledge valuable assistance from Ms Emily Ritchie who has been working as Oregon FoodCorps Fellow with the Oregon Department of Agriculture

Report from the 9Th World Congress on Alternatives and animal use in the Life sciences, 24-28 August 2014, Prague.

Frans Stafleu
Ethics Institute Utrecht
University
f.r.stafleu@uu.nl

Since the nineteen nineties every three years this congress has taken place at different places in the world. This year it was in the beautiful city of Prague. As the title suggests, the topic of the congress is the use of laboratory animals with special emphasis on alternatives. These alternatives are described by the mantra of the 3R's: replacement (no animals), refinement (less suffering) and reduction (less animals). The program included 10 themes, including "Predictive toxicology", "Communication, differentiation and data sharing", and "New technologies". One of the themes was "ethics". This theme was subdivided in different areas which give a nice insight of the current topics in this special branch of applied ethics: "ethics of using animals", "ethical evaluation", "distress evaluation" and "benefit evaluation". It turned out to be a mixture of well known standpoints and analyses and new steps forward. The ethical evaluation was a hot topic on this conference because the new European Directive asks for a "cost benefit evaluation". An example of a step forward in this respect was the "Austrian catalogue of criteria to objectify the harm-benefit analysis within the evaluation of projects using living animals". The authors presented a detailed systematic method to perform the harm benefit analysis. An interesting point was that they applied their method to old cases and that a substantial amount of those projects would have been rejected! The method is developed by order of the Austrian government to be used in the legal and scientific practice and so the question came up whether such a drastic method would be accepted. During the networking between the ethicists who were present at the conference, plans were made for the next conference (September 2017, Seattle, Washington USA). Two topics are expected to be very relevant by then: the negative sides of the 3R's, and the (lack of) benefits produced by animal experiments. The mantra of the 3R's has reached an almost holy level. The big danger in this is that the scientific community could be led to believe that as long as the 3r's are implemented optimally in the experiment, this experiment is ethically sound. This is of course not the case, as the harm-benefits analysis must be done as well. Hence the idea to use the one liner: "the 3 R's: necessary but never sufficient" as a theme for the ethics part of the next conference. An upcoming theme is the evaluation of the benefits of animal experiments. There is a growing amount of publications which show that these benefits are very limited. This raises interesting ethical questions, such as whether animal experiments are still ethically acceptable when the benefits are so limited, whether we should try to enhance animal models or should focus on working with human material, etc. These questions give rise to the expectation that the 10th world congress will be a very interesting one, not in the least from an ethical point of view.

Book Review

Mariëtte van den Hoven
Ethics Institute Utrecht
University
m.a.vandenhoven@uu.nl

Adam Briggle & Carl Mitcham, *Ethics and Science, an introduction, Cambridge Applied Ethics*, 2012, from \$26,99

The authors

Carl Mitcham works as philosopher of science at the department of Liberal Arts and Sciences in Colorado. He is well known for his publications on ethics and technology, science and society and is editor of the 'Encyclopaedia of Science, Technology and Ethics' (2005). Adam Briggle works at the university of North Texas and has mainly published on biotechnology and policy. Both authors seem well known in the field, both as teachers and researchers.

Their ambition

Few authors claim their ambitions at the beginning of their books, especially not in educational books. The statement of their learning aims makes clear that we are reading an educational book. They aim for a) students to get an informative 'snap shot' of information on the relation between ethics and science; b) to offer critical reflection on the relation between society, ethics and science and c) to improve the understanding and critical reflection of scientific developments in an open dialogue between scientists and lay-persons. (preface XV). The book contains few references and footnotes, has suggestions for discussion and further reading after each chapter. In short, it looks like a very readable introduction in the field.

The results

In the twelve chapter long book the authors do as promised. Although the start is a bit 'traditional', their discussion of the classic 'atom bomb' case is enlightening. They describe the letter that was sent in 1939 by scientists, amongst whom Albert Einstein, who fear the nuclear technology is being used by Hitler in Nazi Germany to develop a horrible weapon. President Roosevelt urges a large number of people to be employed in the Manhattan Project to develop the bomb themselves, which has ultimately been used in 1945 to destroy Hiroshima and Nagasaki and lead to the death of many Japanese people. The authors regularly turn to a historical description to show how certain debates came into existence. Aspects of philosophy of science are combined with debates on regulation, integrity codes and the responsibility of researchers. They indicate that throughout history, many scientists have been sceptically reviewed: Galileo was even forced to reject his own theory and recent climate debate shows huge scepticism of the general public on the data. A particular strong point is that the authors show how science develops in different times and cultures and that the focal point of scientific values can change (from finding the truth, or revealing mother nature towards models that are susceptible to uncertainty). They also show that research integrity does not only affect science, but also society itself, namely in its status and authority that knowledge is given. The authors end with a debate on science: is it still a profession or calling to be a scientist, or does it make a living, like any other employment?

Most striking

What I like about the book is the fresh approach they take. A chapter on ethical theory (chapter two) does not start with a description of consequentialism, as is traditionally done, but with virtue ethics and Aristotle. Even more refreshing is that the authors first describe what theoretical models are and only then introduce what ethical theoretical models are. In this way, science students are much better equipped to understand normative theories.

Reasons not to read the book

After chapter seven, the book becomes a bit less interesting for students. The authors start to present their views on professional ethics education. This is interesting for teachers, but has no fit with the rest of the book. The chapters on policy are a bit boring even; arguments on politics, policies and public debate could have been made more interesting to read.

Reasons to read the book

It is a comprehensive book, in which authors do not simply copy other authors. They have a clear view on their goals and explain their choices and strategies clearly to the reader. This is all very interesting and refreshing. My own experiences (n=1) with students who know nothing about ethics and mainly are interested in science resemble the way they approach the debates. Moreover, the authors take an attitude of 'equals amongst equals': they explain students why they present the chapters in this manner and argue with their audience as 'sparring partner' instead of an unequal hierarchy of teacher and pupil. I really like the idea, and would like to try it with my own students.



Kate Millar

EurSafe Executive Committee Update

Welcome to the September 2014 issue of the EurSafe newsletter. We hope all of you have had an enjoyable, relaxing and of course productive summer. With the funding calls for the EC Horizon 2020 programme in full swing and the further announcements on funding programmes emerging from European Commission, this coming year (2015) presents some interesting opportunities for professionals working with food and agricultural ethics issues.

The next **EurSafe Congress 2015** is being held in late Spring 2015, 27-29 May 2015, in **Cluj-Napoca, Romania** and we are delighted to report that further details are available on the website.

Please note the abstract deadline has been extended to **01 October 2014**. Further details, again, can be found on the website.

The theme for the 12th Congress of the European Society for Agricultural and Food Ethics, Cluj-Napoca, is "Know your food! – Food Ethics and Innovation". Further details of the call for abstracts and the full details of the Congress theme can be found at: <http://eursafe2015.usamvcluj.ro/>. If you have any questions please contact the EurSafe 2015 Secretariat at: Department of Economic Sciences (Office: +40 (264) 596384 ext. 380; Fax: +40 (264) 593792 or by e-mail: eursafe2015@usamvcluj.ro).

We wish you a very productive start to the autumn months.

Kate Millar on behalf of the Executive Board
September 2014

List of upcoming conferences

2014

September 15–17	3rd Global Conference: Food Oxford, UK http://www.inter-disciplinary.net/probing-the-boundaries/making-sense-of/food/call-for-presentations/
September 18–19	The Ethics of In-Vitro Flesh and Enhanced Animals Rothbury, Northumberland, UK http://www.ncl.ac.uk/sustainability/news/item/conference-on-the-ethics-of-in-vitro-flesh-and-enhanced-animals-sponsored-by-the-wellcome-trust
September 20–21	Minding Animals Germany Seminar Nuernberg, Germany http://www.mindinganimals.de/News.html
September 24	Agriculture, Food Security and Climate Change Vienna, Austria http://franz.sinabell.wifo.ac.at/workshop.html
September 24-26	Ecoprocura: Sustainability, innovation and cost efficiency: taking procurement forward. Ghent, Belgium http://www.ecoprocura.eu/ghent2014/
September 25–27	Human-Animal Relationships in Religious Traditions Bonn, Germany http://www.igw.uni-bonn.de/institut-fuer-orient-und-asienwissenschaften/abteilungen/religionswissenschaft/abteilung/tagungen-1/tagungen
October 8–9	6th International Conference on Corporate Sustainability and Responsibility Berlin, Germany http://www.csr-hu-berlin.org/theme
October 13–14	Sustainability Summit 2014 Freiburg, Germany http://www.sustainability-summit.org/cms/welcome.html
October 19-20, and November 16-17	Third Annual 'Animals and Society Lecture Series – Wild and Endangered Los Angeles, USA http://www.museumofanimals.org/#/lectures-2014/4550748
October 20–21	Fourth International Conference on Food Studies Prato, Italy http://food-studies.com/the-conference



October 23-24	<p>Sustainable Procurement in Public Kitchens Helsinki, Finland http://www.ekocentria.fi/resources/public/teaser_Nordic%20seminar_ENG.pdf</p>
October 23-27	<p>Salon Gusto and Terra Madre Turin, Italy http://www.salonedelgusto.com/events/conferences/</p>
October 25	<p>Animals: Ethics, Sustainability, Sentience Ormskirk, UK http://www.edgehill.ac.uk/cfhas/conferences/</p>
October 25	<p>Animals: ethics, sustainability, sentience Host Institution: UK Centre for Human Animal Studies Conference Keynote speakers: Elisa Aaltola, Jonathan Balcombe and Richard Twine Ormskirk, Edge Hill University, UK http://www.edgehill.ac.uk/cfhas/conferences/</p>
October 25–27	<p>The International Association for Environmental Philosophy New Orleans, USA https://environmentalphilosophy.files.wordpress.com/2014/06/iaep2014program.pdf</p>
October 28	<p>Foundations for Family Farming: Building Inclusive Partnerships Brussels, Belgium http://www.efc.be/news_events/Pages/events_foundations_and_family_farming.aspx</p>
November 5	<p>Seminar on Animal Play, Behaviour, Cognition and Ethics Keynote speaker: Gordon Burghardt Wageningen, Netherlands http://animalconcepts.eu/calendar/2014/animalbehaviourplaynetherlands/</p>
November 5-7	<p>International AESOP- SustainableFood Planning conference Leeuwaarden, Netherlands http://www.findingspaces.nl/aesop6/</p>
November 15-17	<p>All Things Great and Small: Interdisciplinary Interspecies Community Host: Nonhumans UC Davis Interdisciplinary Animal Studies Research Group Keynote speakers: Frans de Waal Venue: UC Davis campus, Sacramento, USA http://nonhumans.org/november-2014-conference/</p>
November 18-20	<p>Food Matters London, UK http://www.foodmatterslive.com/</p>
December 1–2	<p>Food Security: Mapping Risks, Building Resilience London, UK http://www.chathamhouse.org/foodsecurity2014</p>
December 3-4	<p>6th International Forum on Food & Nutrition: Milan, Italy http://www.barillacfn.com/en/forum/forum-2014/</p>
December 4–5	<p>Between Apes and Angels: Human and Animal in the Early Modern World Edinburgh, UK http://apesandangels.wordpress.com/</p>



December 8–10	World Congress on Sustainable Technologies London, UK http://www.wcst.org/
December 15	Food Symposium- City University, London, UK http://foodresearch.org.uk/food-symposium-at-city-university-london/
2015	
January 6–7	Oxford Real Farming Conference Oxford UK http://www.oxfordrealfarmingconference.org/
January 13–20	Minding Animals Conference 3 New Delhi, India http://mindinganimals.com/
February 11-14	BioFach Congress - World's leading Trade Fair for Organic Food Nuremburg, Germany http://www.biofach.de/en/congress/
May 1–October 31	EXPO Milano 2015 Feeding the Planet, Energy for Life Milan, Italy http://www.expo2015.org/en
May 27–29	12th Congress of the European Society for Agricultural and Food Ethics Cluj-Napoca, Romania http://eursafe2015.usamvcluj.ro/
June 30–July 3	European Society of Ecological Economics – 11th biennial conference Leeds, UK http://lubswww.leeds.ac.uk/aire/events/article/esee-2015-transformations-the-11th-biennial-conference-of-the-european-society-for-ecological-eco/
July 12-15	Australian Animals Study Group (AASG) conference: Animal Publics: Emotions, Empathy, Activism Conference http://humananimal.arts.unimelb.edu.au/event/animal-publics-emotions-empathy-activism-conference Melbourne, Australia
July 23–25	Environmental Ethics between Action and Reflection Kiel, Germany http://environmentalphilosophy.files.wordpress.com/2014/07/call_for_sessions_isee_2015.pdf
August 18-21	XXVI European Society for Rural Sociology Places of Possibility: Rural Societies in a Neo-Liberal World Aberdeen, UK http://www.esrs2015.eu/
September 7-10	The 5th International Symposium for Farming Systems Design : “Multi-functional farming systems in a changing world” Montpellier, France http://fsd5.european-agronomy.org/

Contacts

**EurSafe Membership
Administration**
Verenigingenbeheer
Nederland

Spinozalaan 33, NL-2273 XC, Voorburg, The Netherlands
tel. (+31) (0)70 4162940, fax (+3 1) (0)70 4162959,
info@eursafe ledenadmin.nl

President
Matthias Kaiser

Centre for the Study of the Sciences and the Humanities, University
of Bergen, Norway, matthias.kaiser@svt.uib.no

Secretary
Franck L.B. Meijboom

Utrecht University, the Netherlands
F.L.B.Meijboom@uu.nl

Treasurer
Anne-Marie Neeteson

Aviagen, The Netherlands
aneeteson@aviagen.com

Vice-president
Kate Millar

Centre for Applied Bioethics, University of Nottingham, United
Kingdom, kate.millar@nottingham.ac.uk

Members

Thomas Potthast

University of Tuebingen, Germany,
potthast@uni-tuebingen.de

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

Stefan Aerts

KAHO Sint-Lieven/K.U.Leuven, Belgium,
stef.aerts@kahosl.be

Website

www.eursafe.org



EurSafe News

Chief-editor: Bernice Bovenkerk

Wageningen University, bernice.bovenkerk@wur.nl

Publications editor: Assya Pascalev

Howard University, United States, director@bioethics.net

Editorial Board

Mark Stein

Salford University, Manchester, UK, markstein2010@live.co.uk

Samuel Camenzind

Messerli Research Institute Vienna, Austria,
Samuel.Camenzind@vetmeduni.ac.at

Jes Harfeld

Aalborg University, Denmark, jlh@learning.aau.dk

Raymond Anthony

University of Alaska Anchorage, US, ranthon1@uaa.alaska.edu

Kate Millar

University of Nottingham, United Kingdom,
kate.millar@nottingham.ac.uk

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