



Contents

Editorial	1
Aboriginal food security in the Arctic – a Utopia or a matter of attitude?	2
How to feed and not to eat our world	4
Securing water, energy and food – what’s wrong with that?	6
Book review: Paul B. Thompson. <i>From Field to Fork – Food Ethics for Everyone</i>	11
Update on the EurSafe Newsletter	12
EurSafe Executive Committee Update	12
Conferences and symposia	13
Contacts	15

Editorial



Dear EurSafe members,

Agriculture in the 21st century faces a whole host of challenges: it must produce more food and fiber to feed a burgeoning population while adopting more efficient and sustainable production practices in the wake of climate change, which is increasing the risk of severe food shocks across the globe. The current practices that we promote through our food system serve as a barometer of how well we are living up to our commitments to human dignity, social justice, and environmental stewardship. In their separate vignettes, Lena Nilsson, Ruben Boonen, and Simon Meisch invite us to consider our shared and diverse food stories. They highlight what is owed to people and the planet both practically and morally through food (and international, national and local food policies and initiatives). While food means and matters differently to different populations across our globe, there are also universal challenges to our shared humanity from climate change and the dominant way of thinking and producing food. Food for thought is certainly not in short supply between these pages, as the three authors serve up a buffet of stimulating hor’dvets that persuade revisiting the moral and philosophical bases of many of our current eating patterns and policies. Dr. Nilsson reminds us to pay heed to time honored practices and to dialogue with indigenous communities, many of whom have been hardest impacted by climate change and food insecurity, but who also have important lessons in resilience and respect that we cannot afford to ignore. Drs. Boonen raises questions about the importance of debating “sustainability” in sustainable agriculture, while challenging us to revisit the place of “need and desire” in our moral lives. He also acquaints us with the promising 6F-Framework developed to inculcate attentiveness to governance issues related to our food system. Dr. Meisch raises significant considerations regarding water resources management and stakeholder involvement in his edifying and thoughtprovoking discussion of the all important nexus of water-energy-food-security. He offers an insightful critique of the nexus view, which he warns could be more “about securing the free flow of goods in a neoliberal, though green economy” than protecting and promoting the interests of

those most vulnerable among us.

Lastly, check out Dr. Harfeld's review of Paul Thompson's (2015) *From Field to Fork – Food Ethics for Everyone*.

May their essays inspire us to eat well, mindful of our humanity.

Prof. Raymond Anthony, Issue Editor
Department of Philosophy
University of Alaska Anchorage
rxanthony@uaa.alaska.edu

Paper



Lena Maria Nilsson (PhD),
Research coordinator
Arctic Research Centre at
Umeå University (Arcum)
Umeå, Sweden
lena.nilsson@umu.se

Aboriginal food security in the Arctic – a Utopia or a matter of attitude?

Food security is significantly affected by industrial pollution and climate change. These transformations are particularly apparent in the Arctic's eight countries. In northern Canada, for example, melting perma-frost causes drainage of lakes and marshy areas of importance for food supply. In northern Sweden and Finland, the fish stock exceeds European maximum limits for dioxin and PCB to a large extent.

Despite this, no international monitoring of food security yet exists in the Arctic. The international food and agricultural organization, FAO's, food security monitoring program only covers high latitudes to a limited extent (Nilsson et al. 2015).

There may be many reasons for this, e.g. a lack of acute starvation and malnutrition in the Arctic combined with an extremely low population density from a global perspective. Further, as previously shown, many indicators suitable for low latitudes are not suitable for high latitudes (Nilsson et al. 2013). A third explanation for the difficulties in applying common food security indicators on the Arctic is the strong preference for traditional foods recognized among many indigenous groups (Canadian Academies 2014), which contribute to 10% of the Arctic population.

Thus, in the discussion on food security in the Arctic, food sovereignty is increasingly emphasized. While food security typically focuses on food access, availability and safety independent of distribution pathways, food sovereignty relates to the sustainability of the food supply on a local or regional level. In many cases, the vision of aboriginal food security equals the vision of a situation of unchanged access to subsistence species from time to time. Unfortunately, this is a very unlikely scenario in the Arctic.

It has been forecasted that 100 years from now the Taiga tree belt will have reached the Arctic coast, which no longer will be coated with ice. Thus, even if the cultural need of a practise of harvesting native plant and animal wild-life species is the same, an adaption to existing opportunities is vital.

Today, food dishes based on wild-caught fish and reindeer meat are of great importance for the food culture of the Sami people in the Barent's region (that is northernmost Scandinavia and the Kola peninsula of Russia). Sea mammals are important in Inuit food

culture as well as in the food culture of many indigenous groups of the Russian Arctic.

From a global perspective, high meat consumption will not be sustainable and from an Arctic perspective the unlimited extension of the old hunter and gatherer culture is not realistic. However, even if subsistence species may shift, there are elements of traditional food security strategies which may persist independently of industrial pollution and climate change. And we better start to discuss these aboriginal strategies soon, before it is too late!

Three main principles worth highlighting are the principles of 'collaborating, challenging and sharing'. These main principles of the old hunter and gatherer culture may be applied to any activities to promote future food sovereignty, that is the right of people to "define their own policies and strategies for sustainable production, distribution and consumption of food that guarantee the right to food for the entire population" (WFFS 2001).

The largest threat to a fruitful discussion on the essence of aboriginal food security is the attitude of unchangeability as a virtue among indigenous people. In my opinion this is a colonial perceived virtue, which does not really exist. Indigenous peoples have been resilient all this while because of their capacity for adaptation.

Our forefathers and mega-great grandmothers were never unchangeable. When meat was available they ate meat. When fish was available they ate fish. When wild plants were available, they ate wild plants. Some wild plants, for example Angelica (In Latin, *Angelica archangelica*), our grandmothers harvested in a careful way to promote a sustainable access and use. The essence of this traditional knowledge is knowledge about how to adapt as a part of resilience.

Applying this attitude into the discussion on future strategies for aboriginal food security in the Arctic may lead to locally accepted food transitions for a sustainable future, e.g. the greenhouse project in Nunavik, Quebec, Canada. Vegetables grown in these greenhouses are locally accepted because of the local community's involvement in the project.

But collaborating, challenging and sharing should not be seen as isolated on a local level. In the long run, food security on the local level will always be dependent on food security on a global level. Decreased meat consumption and a redistribution of the earth's resources, necessary for food security on a global level, will inevitably affect food security all over the world, including aboriginal food security in the Arctic.

Thus, we must be prepared for change, and some of us already have been. A Sami friend of mine recently visited an old reindeer herding uncle of his. To everyone's great surprise this old uncle declared that he had become a vegetarian. But his wife corrected him: What you really want to say is that you have begun to eat vegetables!

References

- Nilsson L M, Evengård B. Food Security or Food Sovereignty: What Is the Main Issue in the Arctic?. In: *The New Arctic*, eds Evengård B., Nymand Lars J., Paasche O, Springer; 2015. p. 213-223
- Nilsson LM, Berner J, Dudarev AA, Mulvad G, Odland JO, Parkinson A, et al. Indicators of food and water security in an Arctic Health context - results from an international workshop discussion. *Int J Circumpolar Health* 2013;72.
- Council of Canadian Academies. *Aboriginal Food Security in Northern Canada: An Assessment of the State of Knowledge*, Ottawa, ON. The

Paper



Drs. Ir. Ruben Boonen
Formerly at
Ethics@Arenberg, KU
Leuven
Ruben.boonen@gmail.com

Expert Panel on the State of Knowledge of Food Security in Northern Canada, Council of Canadian Academies. 2014.
WFFS (World Forum on Food Sovereignty). Final declaration of the World Forum on Food Sovereignty. Paper presented at Soberania Alimentaria, Havana, Cuba. 2001

How to feed and not to eat our world

**This entry is part of Dr. Boonen's dissertation research, which will be published later in 2015.*

Within the finite boundaries of planet Earth, agriculture plays an essential role in the production of renewable resources for the desires and needs of the growing human population. Since production means like soil, water and nutrients, are limited, choices have to be made, leading to moral discussions. To analyse the ethical debate, Aerts et al. (2009) developed the 6F-framework, assigning six different functions to agriculture: Food, Feed, Fuel, Fibre, Flower and Fun. In the framework of Aerts et al., Flower comprises both ornamental plant production and nature. Because ornamental plant production is also Fun and since humanity not only expects agriculture to take care of nature as such, but also to maintain other ecosystem services and keep agricultural land in good condition for future generations, this thesis suggests that it seems more adequate to adapt the framework by replacing Flower by Foster, stressing the caring role of agriculture for its environment and for the present and future generations.

During the last decades, agricultural production strongly increased. Nevertheless, more than 800 million people still suffer from hunger. With a global population that will increase up to 9 billion people by 2050, focussing on increasing food production alone will not solve the hunger problem. As discussed in Boonen et al. (2012a), animal production can play an essential role in producing food on 'useless' land or by converting 'useless' energy or proteins. Nevertheless, the role of nowadays' animal production can change, with, for example, an increasing interest in aquaculture production. Some new ethical discussions will probably occur during the next decades, e.g. the globally increasing population of carnivorous pets that demands for larger numbers of animals that are raised and killed to feed them. When rethinking the role of animal production within sustainable agricultural production, several traditional parameters are likely to change: the used species (e.g. replacement of mammals by insects), the use of new by-products (e.g. from algae production) and animal welfare norms.

Sustainable agriculture has been touted as an important ingredient in ensuring global good security. Several definitions are used and depending on one's worldview, priorities will alter between people, planet and profit (Boonen et al., 2012b). Furthermore, one has to question if the fulfilment of the desires of a rather small group justifies that the needs of many are compromised. In the consumer society, overconsumption and waste are ways that highlight the existential condition of the day (Baudrillard, 1998). Since consumption qua consumption focuses narrowly on 'having' within the framework of human needs (Max-Neef, 1992), it cannot lead to true happiness (human flourishing). Therefore, agricultural production should focus on needs in the first place, before fulfilling desires. Searching for these needs, one has to be aware of a possible inversion of goals and means. The production of a certain crop or animal product as such is not the goal, but only a means. If other means are more sustainable to reach the goal, a rethinking of the agricultural production system can

help to reach a sustainable equilibrium between the 6F-framework, with respect for the boundaries of the ecosystem Earth.

Animal production plays a pivotal role in the 6F-framework and in ensuring global food security. Nowadays' animal production uses a large area, often competing with other functions. Animal production is ethically discussed not only from an animal welfare point of view, but some consider it as competing with human food production. This discussion is not new: in 1975, van Es calculated the efficiency of several types of animal production by the amount of energy and proteins that humans get from the animal products compared with the amount of energy and proteins that could be available by direct human consumption of the feed ration. Due to improvements in animal production during the last forty years, the efficiency ratios were recalculated. An increase in protein efficiency can be found in almost all types of animal production, although this strongly depends in how 'edible' is defined. Barley, for example, is not eaten in Western diets, although it is suitable for human consumption. When it is considered 'inedible', cattle production by Belgian white-blue changes from 'inefficient' to more than a doubling of protein availability. Although progress in efficiency is made in animal production, one could question if one is looking for the desired or for the needed efficiency gain. The main focus is on increasing the efficiency of the most used species like pig, chicken and cow, while poikilothermic species are more efficient. A shift in the species we use therefore could lead to a large increase in protein efficiency, making it possible to produce more food with less resources expenditure. If yield gaps are closed and consumption focusses more on what is needed and less on what is desired, the Earth will be able to feed everyone [more sustainably] without compromising other functions.

References

- Aerts, S., De Tavernier, J., Decuyper, E., Lips, D. (2009). The 6 F's of agriculture. In: Ethical futures: bioscience and food horizons. Millar et al. (eds.). Wageningen Academic Publishers, Wageningen, 331-336.
- Baudrillard, J. (1998). Consumer society: myths and structures. Sage, London, 208 pp.
- Boonen, R., Aerts, S., Meganck, M., De Tavernier, J., Lips, D., Decuyper, E. (2012). Feed efficiencies in animal production: a non-numerical analysis. In: Climate Change and Sustainable Development. Potthast and Meisch (eds.). Wageningen Academic Publishers, Wageningen, 196-201.
- Boonen, R., Aerts, S., De Tavernier, J. (2012). Which sustainability suits you? In: Climate Change and Sustainable Development. Potthast and Meisch (eds.). Wageningen Academic Publishers, Wageningen, 43-48.
- Max-Neef, M. (1992). Development and human needs. In: Real-Life Economics: Understanding Wealth Creation. Ekins, P., Max-Neef, M. (eds.). Routledge, London, 197-213.
- van Es, A. J. H. (1975). Heterotrofe productie bij dieren. In: Productiviteit in biologische systemen. Beukema, J. J., de Wit, C. T., Golterman, H. L., Gulati, R. D., Korringa, P., Pieters, G. A., Stouthamer, A. H., van der Drift, J., van Es, A. J. H., Vervelde, G. J., Wassink, E. C., Woldendorp, J. W. (eds.) Verweij, Wageningen, Nederland, pp. 105-127.

Paper



Simon Meisch, PhD
Head of Junior Research
Group "Ethics of Science in
the Research for
Sustainable Development"
International Centre for
Ethics in the Sciences and
Humanities /
Internationales Zentrum für
Ethik in den Wissenschaften
(IZEW)
[simon.meisch@uni-
tuebingen.de](mailto:simon.meisch@uni-tuebingen.de)

Securing water, energy and food – what's wrong with that?

'Climate change, energy and food security, economic development – in the end, it all trickles down to water.' (Steduto and Kuynlenstierna, 2009) This statement of leaders of UN Water highlights the importance and cross-sectoral nature of water. Water connects many spheres of action that sustainable development is concerned with. In March 2015, the UN Deputy Secretary Jan Eliasson was quoted with the truism that "water is a precondition for human existence". Both statements illustrate the growing awareness of policy-makers that water problems might threaten humanity's base of life and the foundations of most of its activities. Against this background, in the last years, a new approach to challenges of sustainable development and climate change emerged: the water-energy-food-security nexus. Basically, there are two ideas related to it. First, as water, energy and food are inextricably linked, there are many synergies and trade-offs between water and energy use and food production (UNESCO 2014, 54). Second, all three nexus components are in many respects endangered by climate change and need to be secured.

Yet, what happens if one places the idea of sustainable development under the paradigm of security? Although sustainable development is essentially contested it nevertheless contains a shared core understanding, i.e. intra- and intergenerational justice and its relevance for the relationship between human development and environmental protection. Everyone today and in the future should be able live a good life and the necessary natural and social preconditions to live a good life are to be at least retained and in the best case enhanced. Meanwhile, it can be doubted that securitisation of sustainable development really contributes to that aim.

Nexus conceptions share general perceptions of present and future crises and offer solutions for more efficient resources management within a green economy, thereby specifically calling for integrated solutions with regard to water, energy and food. Images of crises comprise already depleted resources and destroyed ecosystems. The present critical state of environment and ecosystems is reflected in the Anthropocene imaginary and the concept of planetary boundaries. Meanwhile, about one billion people worldwide do not have access to clean drinking water, 1.3 billion people do not have access to electricity, and more than one billion people suffer from hunger. Moreover, projected population growth will put further stress on resources and ecosystems. Expectations are that in 2030 the world population will consume about 30% more water, 40% more energy, and 50% more food than today. Regions already suffering from water scarcity will see their populations grow from 700 million people to about 3 billion by then – with a predicted overall population of up to 8.8 billion. Maybe most importantly, changing lifestyles of urban middle classes in developing countries will result in potentially more meat-based diets that require both more water and land for production. Thus, urbanisation will put pressure on the water sector (supply, demand, waste water) and land for food.

Apart from these challenges, climate change has long been identified as probably the largest threat to the current status quo. On top of anthropogenic stress factors, global warming will adversely affect the water, energy and food sectors, respectively. Mitigation and adaption to climate change will then interact, and impinge on water, energy and

food. Water affects food production (e.g. agriculture, aquaculture, animal husbandry) as well as energy production (e.g. hydropower, cooling water). Energy affects not only food production (e.g. energy for chemical and mineral fertilisers, transportation, storage of food), but also water supply (e.g. water preparation, desalination, pumping). Hydraulic fracturing requires huge amounts of water and threatens to pollute groundwater. Food and energy production interfere with each other when power plants replace food plantations and lead to increased food prices. Thus, humanity is strongly called to change its lifestyle – and on a global scale. If no action is undertaken right now, according to the general notion, humanity will soon be facing all-encompassing geopolitical conflicts that will threaten national securities, the global economy, and peace in countries unable to adapt.

To sum up, the nexus approach aims to provide an integrated view on issues of water, energy and food while at the same time it claims to tackle global development problems such as hunger, energy deprivation or lacking access to water and sanitation. Thus, what can be possibly wrong with a water-energy-food-security nexus? I will argue that the nexus approach has a problematic bias: Though the nexus claims to help particularly the poorest of the poor worldwide, it is much more about securing the free flow of goods in a neoliberal, though green economy.

The idea of the water-energy-food-security nexus evolved in the late 2000s. Within a couple of years, research reports, policy papers, and political and academic events pushed the approach onto the political agenda as well as the research agenda. An initial impulse came from the '2030 Water Resources Group' consisting of global players from the food and beverage industry, different NGOs as well as research institutions. The group formed because its members regarded water scarcity as a global economic as well as a political threat. The 2030 WRG's main issue was the water security question of how to close the emerging gap between water supply and demand in a global economy. In 2009, the group published a report that made a case for water resource economics, different forms of water resources management, and stakeholder involvement – i.e. the private sector (agricultural producers and other agricultural value chain players, financial institutions, large industrial water users, technology providers, and the construction sector), and to a lesser degree (organised) civil society. It put forward the idea of a water-energy-food-security nexus.

From 2007 on, the World Economic Forum served as the platform to promote issues of water security "with the intent to change the political economy of the water agenda, from mostly an MDG-related 'access' issue to an issue of 'access in the context of wider resource security and economic growth'" (2030 WRG, 2012: 18-9). In its subsequent activities, the World Economic Forum built on the analytical approaches from the 2030 WRG. In 2011, the World Economic Forum Water Initiative published a widely recognised report that pushed the issue on political and academic agendas, and subsequently many political events and research projects referred to the water-energy-food-security nexus (2030 WRG, 2012: 18-9) – most prominently the Bonn2011 conference under the headline 'The Water, Energy and Food-Security Nexus – Solutions for the Green Economy'. In the context of the conference, the background paper 'Understanding the Nexus' (Hoff, 2011) was published and is now considered as a major reference point for the nexus debates. At the same time, also state and research bodies dealing with (national) security issues turned to the nexus and regarded nexus-related issues as threats to global economy and (social) security.

The nexus approach also contributed to the emergence of a specific research agenda. Since the 2011 Bonn conference, an increasing number of publications and conference refer to the concept. Nexus analyses need to bridge the knowledge gaps on interactions between water, energy and food, and contribute to resource efficiency and waste reduction. According to the academic and programmatic literature, apart from taking into account the relevance of resources for human systems, nexus research would also need to consider the relevance of these resources within ecosystems. Along with cross-sectoral interactions, nexus analyses then need to examine how systems interact across scales, and account for the role of factors such as political and social structures, governance, and trade. Moreover, interactions with other resource management concepts such as the integrated water resources management (IWRM) would need to be explored. In order to create an impact on policy and practice, nexus research would necessarily have to interact with different stakeholders (business, NGOs) head-to-head. While some nexus problems might be framed as positive-sum games, others might not. Yet, what is aimed for are 'triple-win'-effects in all three domains by means of anticipatory risk management and governance (Beisheim 2013).

So far, the nexus approach has been retraced with regard to the linkage and synergies of its constituent parts. Yet, what does it mean to address food, water and energy in terms of security? In the constructivist reading of security as put forward by Wæver (1995), security comes into being as something that emerges from threat. Where threat hitherto was conceived of primarily as military capacities of states, the constructivist turn in security studies introduced an understanding that threats as such need not necessarily take on a material form, but can emerge through discursive formations, i.e. threats are constructed and/or acknowledged as such through speech acts. Securitisation theory is not so much interested in the nature of the threat itself, but in its transformation on the political level. Such a perspective can particularly well account for the acknowledgement of resource scarcity as a threat to the security (i.e. survival) of humankind once planetary boundaries have been crossed. Academic literature on the nexus proposes to treat the current lack of sustainability (i.a. projected hunger crises, unavailable water for food production) as a threat, and subsequently to put the nexus on the security agenda, whereas earlier it was a matter of rather ordinary politics. The nexus approach highlights the need for a coordinated cross-sectoral response on all levels. The increasing scarcity of life-supporting resources (i.e. water, energy and food) produces a threat scenario that could possibly unhinge human existence at the very species level and as such has apparently moved water, energy and food politics from the realm of normalcy to a realm of emergency – thus enabling mechanisms that intend to swiftly counter, or at least mitigate, this increasing level of scarcity by means of a presumably 'green economy'. As Hoff (2011: 11) states, "while water, energy and food security have so far been mainly constrained by unequal access, humanity is now also approaching limits in global resource availability and sink strength, such as phosphorus supply or atmospheric CO₂ concentration". What was once framed as a matter of distributional justice and access, and as such within the scope of regular politics, has now become a matter of survival for all of humanity that calls for utmost immediacy.

Processes of securitisation related to the nexus can be better understood by adding the insights of Foucault who proposes an understanding of securitisation processes that extends beyond the

notions of urgency and political exceptionalism. While some authors have not completely dismissed the discursive construction of threat levels, most Foucauldian scholars start from the notion that not all involved rationalities are represented within the public arena. On the contrary, powerful agenda-setters such as police forces, security experts, and bureaucracies seldom make public contributions to the construction/acknowledgement of threats (Bigo, 1994, 2002). Such actors rather propose that issues be quietly and bureaucratically conceptualised as threats based on professional long-term expertise and accumulated knowledge, i.e. security professionals are seen as 'managers of unease' that contribute to the emergence of the security agenda through everyday routines and practices that almost never surface on the public level.

Thus, with regard to the nexus, while unsustainable development has been identified as the imminent threat that legitimises urgent action, the concrete measures appear to be determined by expert networks (e.g. from the energy or food industry) that pursue their specific and particular rationalities that now incorporate sustainability as the determining theme for a new and green though neoliberal economy. Such a reading of securitisation processes entails a slightly shifted scope when it comes to the concrete techniques that are used to govern security. Huysmans (2011) suggests that securitisation processes can indeed be performed by "little security nothings" – mundane processes that might not be perceived as a big deal, or might not even be related to security at all, "such as programming algorithms, routine collection of data and looking at CCTV footage" (Huysmans, 2011: 372). The proceedings of the nexus approach can be conceived as such a formation of mundane, day-to-day managerial practices that do not strive to create an exceptional realm but rather build on 'standard' economic means, arguing for instance that "constraints on a valuable resource should draw new investment and prompt policies to increase productivity of demand and augment supply" (2030 WRG, 2009: 4) – both in the name of security and for the sake of security. Or as Hoff (2011: 12) proposes, "there is a need for a coordinated and harmonized nexus knowledge-base and database indicators and metrics that cover all relevant spatial and temporal scales and planning horizons". This subtle turn produces in fact a crucial argument that could only be made once sustainability had been securitised. This argument, plain and simple, goes: now we have to produce security through the economy, and as such the survival of the economy must no longer be questioned (Leese/Meisch 2015).

So, after all, what is wrong with the water-energy-food-security nexus? Reading the nexus approach through the lenses of securitisation theory, a critical perspective emerged. What was once framed as a matter of justice and as such within the scope of normal politics, has now become a matter of survival for all of humanity that calls for immediate action. Although the nexus approach claims to tackle with the problems of the poorest of the poor worldwide, it seems to be in fact an attempt to produce security through the neoliberal economy and to guarantee enough water for an allegedly green global economy. With regard to the sciences involved, the nexus approach seems to be just another prolongation of what Pereira & Funtowicz (2015) call the 'Cartesian dream', i.e. quantitative research promoted as essential for the progress and well-being of humanity, and characterised by high capital investment, centralised control of funding and quality, exclusive expertise, and a philosophical as well as methodological reductionism.

So, better let the nexus alone? Basically, there is nothing wrong with

finding synergies between water, energy and food and avoiding detrimental interdependencies, i.e. looking for just and efficient solutions to water, energy and food problems and judgements of preferability for cases of conflict. However, means must not conflict with aims. After all: what we want is that everyone today and in the future can live a good life. From here, we can think about just social orders (instead of presupposing one – and in particular one that is seen as the cause of many problems in the first place). Sustainable development understood this way is a moral and political goal worth arguing and fighting for – and it (and not security) needs to be the framework of an approach looking for synergies between water, energy and food.

This contribution builds on Leese/Meisch 2015.

References

- 2030 WRG. 2009. Charting our water future: Economic frameworks to inform decision-making. www.mckinsey.com/App_Media/Reports/Water/Charting_Our_Water_Future_Full_Report_001.pdf (accessed on 21 August 2015)
- Beisheim, M. 2013. Der 'Nexus' Wasser-Energie-Nahrung: Wie mit vernetzten Versorgungsrisiken umgehen? Berlin: Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik/ Deutsches Institut für Internationale Politik und Sicherheit. www.swp-berlin.org/fileadmin/contents/products/studien/2013_S11_bsh.pdf (accessed on 21 August 2015)
- Bigo, D. 1994. The European internal security field: Stakes and rivalries in a newly developing area of police intervention. In: Anderson, M. and den Boer, M. (Eds), Policing across national boundaries, pp. 161-173. London/New York: Pinter.
- Bigo, D. 2002. Security and immigration: Toward a critique of the governmentality of unease. In *Alternatives: Global, local, political* 27(1): 63-92.
- Hoff, H. 2011. Understanding the nexus. Background paper for the Bonn2011 Conference: The water, energy and food security nexus. Stockholm: Stockholm Environment Institute.
- Huysmans, J. 2011. What's in an act? On security speech acts and little security nothings. In: *Security Dialogue* 42(4- 5): 371-383.
- Leese, M. and Meisch, S. 2015. Securitising Sustainability? Questioning the 'Water, Energy and Food-Security Nexus'. In: *Water Alternatives* 8(1): 695-709.
- Meisch, S.; Beck, R. and Potthast, T. 2012. Towards a value-reflexive governance of water. In: Potthast, T. and Meisch, S. (Eds.), *Climate change and Sustainable Development*, pp. 413-418. Wageningen: Wageningen Academic Publishers.
- Pereira, A. and Funtowicz, S. (Eds.). 2015. *Science, Philosophy and Sustainability: The End of the Cartesian Dream*. London: Routledge.
- Steduto, P. and Kuylenstierna, J. 2009. Climate change, energy and food security, economic development – in the end, it all trickles down to water. In: *Climate Change Policy and Practice*. Guest Article 8 (January 6th, 2009).
- UNESCO. 2014. *World Water Report 2014*. <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0022/002257/225741e.pdf> (accessed on 21 August 2015)
- Wæver, O. 1995. Securitization and desecuritization. In: Lipschutz, R.D. (Ed), *On security*, pp. 46-86. New York/Chichester: Columbia University Press.

Book review:



Jes Lynning Harfeld, PhD
Centre for Applied Ethics,
Aalborg University, Denmark
jlh@learning.aau.dk

Thinking about food and ethics

From Field to Fork – Food Ethics for Everyone
Paul B. Thompson
Oxford University Press, 2015, 329 pages

Should I feel bad about going to McDonalds? Should I feel good about going to Whole Foods? Is a vegetarian life style morally superior to an omnivorian one? Is it ethically problematic to purchase produce which is not local? Am I partaking in the oppression of low wage workers when I buy my morning coffee? These questions are but a few of many that will suddenly be much more present for the readers of *From Field to Fork – Food Ethics for Everyone* by Professor Paul B. Thompson. Although the book is not really for everyone, since both the topic and the level would dissuade a number of relevant members of the general public, it is certainly a book that is not only for the usual suspects within the ranks of philosophy. It is one of those books where the layman might actually truly learn something. And that is a hard sell. It is, however, a sell that Thompson does very well. With more than 35 years of experience working in the field of agricultural and food philosophy and currently holding the W. K. Kellog Chair in Agricultural Food and Community Ethics at Michigan State University in the US, Thompson is definitely qualified to write a book on food ethics. On the other hand, a great number of philosophers, highly qualified within their field, are entirely incapable of writing a book that can be appreciated by people outside philosophy. *From Field to Fork*, however, can be read, understood and appreciated by not only people outside philosophy but by anyone who would care to take the time and make the effort – from the academically interested farmer to the philosophically interested concerned consumer.

For the none-philosophers Thompson has included a short introduction with what he calls “a rough guide to ethics.” These first 20 pages work nicely as a setup for reading and understanding the rest of the book. For philosophers, however, these pages are mainly an introduction to the thinking of Paul B. Thompson and one could easily argue that in that view the introduction is not really an introduction to ethics as much as an introduction to Thompson’s very specific ethical approach.

One aspect of Thompson’s ethical approach is what might be called attentiveness to phronesis. It is clear throughout the book that Thompson is critical of the hard advocates of certain fix-it solutions to food ethics, whether they be utilitarian or rights based in nature. Instead his focus is on how we can become better at enabling ethical choosing both as individuals and in a societal context. He obviously hopes to help potential readers to at least know what the questions are – both empirically and concerning values – when they rush through the supermarket on a Wednesday afternoon. Similarly, Thompson’s aim is to situate this knowledge and the question of values in a public context. Thus he brings to our attention that the matters of food ethics are matters which to a great extent need to be addressed through public dialogue and food policy.

The book covers a wide variety of topics within food ethics. There are the classics of animal welfare and GMO and the environment, but also less common topics such as the ethics of obesity and the problems of food and social injustice.

I highly recommend the book. It could be a Christmas present for that academically inclined friend of yours who is finally starting to ask questions about the connection between ethics and what she eats. It could be a recommendation for an undergraduate student who is interested in the writings of Paul B. Thompson (tell him to skip the introduction). Or you could just buy it and read it yourself to get an overview of the topics in the field of food ethics and become inspired to read more of Paul B. Thompson.



Bernice Bovenkerk
Editor-in-chief
Bernice.bovenkerk@wur.nl

Update on the EurSafe Newsletter

For those of you who could unfortunately not attend the EurSafe conference in the beautiful city of Cluj, I hereby give you a brief update on the activities of the newsletter editorial board. You may have already noticed that we have a new feature in the newsletter, the book review, in which new book publications in the fields of agricultural and food ethics are discussed and recommended. If you are reading – or are planning to read – a recently published book in a relevant field and would like to comment on it in the newsletter, please contact me. I can order you a review copy. Book reviews are generally short (under 1,000 words) and could (but by no means have to) include the following questions: Who is the author? What is his or her ambition? What are the results or main arguments? What is most striking? Reasons not to read the book, and Reasons to read the book. Furthermore, we will aim to include in future newsletters short abstracts or overviews of work in progress by PhD students in the relevant fields. If you are currently supervising PhD projects, please tell your students we welcome their contributions. We aim to center each newsletter around one specific topic (although contributions outside of the topics are welcome too, of course). The next topics we are planning are: pollinators; methods (p.e. ethical frameworks, the empirical turn in bioethics); slaughter; fair trade. Please let us know if you are interested in writing a contribution, or know someone who could, on any of these topics. The newsletter aims to be a platform by all who are interested in agricultural and food ethics for all who are interested in these fields and therefore your contributions are pivotal to its success!



**Kate Millar on behalf of
the Executive Board**

EurSafe Executive Committee Update

We hope all of you had an enjoyable and relaxing summer. The summer months may soon be over but there are many EurSafe related activities to look forward to over the coming year, so welcome to the September 2015 issue of the EurSafe newsletter.

Before discussing on-going activities, the Board would like to thank the Organising Committee of the 12th Congress of the European Society for Agricultural and Food Ethics, “Know your food! – Food Ethics and Innovation”. The conference attendees appreciated a wide range of papers and good Transylvanian hospitality, including traditional dancing. Thank you to our hosts and all member of the Cluj-Napoca team for their hard work and warm welcome.

In terms of news, we are delighted to provide an update on (i) the new Board members; (ii) current EurSafe initiatives and (iii) the Congress for 2016.

We are delighted to announce that at the 2015 Congress, Anna Olsson was re-elected and two new members, Herwig Grimm

(University of Vienna) and Diana Dumitras (University of Agricultural Science and Veterinary Medicine Cluj-Napoca) joined the Board. We would also like to take this opportunity to thank Kristin Hagen for her work on the Board. Kristin stepped down as a Board member at the Annual Meeting in Cluj-Napoca. Thank you again Kristin for your positive approach, hard work and strong support for the Society over the last few years.

In terms of EurSafe initiatives, Bernice our Editor provides an update on the newsletter in this issue. The teaching workshop held at the Cluj-Napoca Conference was well attended and provides an excellent platform to establish the EurSafe Teaching network. Further information on this and a possible meeting in Spring 2016 will be circulated next month.

At the Annual General our President, Matthias Kaiser, provided an update on the new Springer 'Food Ethics' Journal. A number of prominent academics / commentators have been approached to provide articles for the first issue and Springer hopes to launch the Journal next Spring, 2016. Further direct updates will be circulated from the President regarding the association of the Journal with EurSafe and the details of the Journal launch.

Finally, we are delighted to confirm that the next EurSafe Congress will be held in Porto, Portugal in Autumn 2016. Our host is the EurSafe Board Member and longstanding contributor to the Society, Anna Olsson (Instituto de Biologia Molecular e Celular / Institute for Molecular and Cell Biology). The date of the Congress will be announced shortly.

We have a number of activities to look forward to in 2016 and we will be updating you on the various EurSafe initiatives before Christmas. We wish you a good start to the new academic year and a "Delicious autumn!"

"Is not this a true autumn day? Just the still melancholy that I love - that makes life and nature harmonise. The birds are consulting about their migrations, the trees are putting on the hectic or the pallid hues of decay, and begin to strew the ground, that one's very footsteps may not disturb the repose of earth and air, while they give us a scent that is a perfect anodyne to the restless spirit. Delicious autumn! My very soul is wedded to it, and if I were a bird I would fly about the earth seeking the successive autumns."

George Eliot, 1841



September 14-17

Conferences and Symposia

49th Congress of the International Society of Applied Ethology (ISAE)

Sapporo Hokkaido, Japan

<http://www.jsaab.org/isae2015/index.html>

September 17-19

Animals in the Anthropocene. Human–animal relations in a changing semiosphere
Stavanger, Norway

	<p>http://www.uis.no/research-and-phd-studies/research-areas/society-culture-and-religion/animals-in-changing-environments/2015-conference/</p>
September 17-19	<p>Vethics for vets - ethics for veterinary officers. Public Symposium Vienna, Austria http://www.vetmeduni.ac.at/de/messerli/forschung/forschung-ethik/projekte/vethics/</p>
October 1-2	<p>Science for the Environment 2015 Aarhus, Denmark http://dce-conference.au.dk/</p>
October 6-7	<p>Human and Nonhuman Animals: Liberation, History and Critical Animal Studies – Fourth European Conference of Critical Animal Studies Lisabon, Portugal http://animalsconferencelisbon.blogspot.pt/p/home.html</p>
October 6-10	<p>Asia for animals conference Borneo 2015 Kuching, Sarawak, Malaysia http://afaborneo2015.com/</p>
October 8-9	<p>4th International Conference on Social Responsibility, Ethics and Sustainable Business Athens, Greece</p>
October 10-12	<p>The Nineteenth Annual Meeting of the International Association for Environmental Philosophy Atlanta, USA http://environmentalphilosophy.org/2015-annual-meeting/</p>
October 11	<p>3rd International Conference on Sustainable Environment and Agriculture New York, United States of America http://www.icsea.org/</p>
October 13	<p>Beyond Animal Welfare 1 day conference, Wageningen University, the Nertherlands http://www.animalwise.nl/Conference-announcement.pdf</p>
October 28-29	<p>The Epistemic Role of Manufactured Dissent in Climate Science Karlsruhe, Germany https://mdcs2015.wordpress.com/</p>
November 3-8	<p>16th Asian Bioethics Conference Quezon City, Philippines http://16abcaba.simplesite.com/</p>
December 1-3	<p>The 2015 International Conference Sustainable Development Social Sciences & Humanities in Paris Paris, France http://www.icттconference.com/15199802/paris-social-sciences-conference</p>
	<h2>2016</h2>
February 23-25	<p>Contested Agronomy: Dynamics, Cases & Implications Brighton, UK http://contestedagronomy2016.com/</p>

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

Stefan Aerts

Odisee University College / KU Leuven,
stef.aerts@odisee.be

Herwig Grimm

University of Vienna, Austria
herwig.grimm@vetmeduni.ac.at

Diana Dumitras

University of Agricultural Science and Veterinary Medicine Cluj-
Napoca, Romania
ddumitras@usamvcluj.ro

Website

www.eursafe.org



News

Volume 17 - No. 3 – September 2015

Page 16 of 16

Chief-editor: Bernice Bovenkerk
Publications editor: Assya Pascalev

Wageningen University, bernice.bovenkerk@wur.nl

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.