

EurSafe News

European Society for Agricultural and Food Ethics



EurSafe News
Volume 9, No. 2
June 2007

Contents

Editorial / 1
Thematic Section “ <i>Agri-food ethics in German-speaking Europe</i> ” / 2
EurSafe Update
<i>EurSafe General Assembly</i> / 11
<i>Information EurSafe Congress</i> / 13
Conferences & Symposia / 14
Publications / 16
Funding / 17
Contact / 19

Editorial

Dear EurSafe members,

On behalf of the newsletter board, I welcome you to September’s EurSafe News. As the issue editor, I am happy to introduce the third of the recently initiated thematic series. It was launched to invite to debate on current issues in the field of agri-food ethics, express interest for collaborations, and present published or forthcoming work.

The subject of the current issue is “Agri-food ethics in German speaking Europe”. I am thankful to the experts who kindly contributed their perspective on the situation in Switzerland, Austria, and Germany. Since the 7th EurSafe Conference will take place in Vienna, we hope that this issue will lead to discussions and strategies for further development of agri-food ethics in the

German speaking countries. Although all of the three countries have seen positive developments, the ethical issues in the field of the agri-food sector are far from being solved. Unsurprisingly, there is still work to do. I am looking forward to the conference in Vienna which brings EurSafe to Austria. This will certainly contribute to the public debate on agricultural ethics and promote the idea of EurSafe to bring ethics closer to agriculture and vice versa.

Besides, I would like to draw attention to the special issue on 'organic values' which was published on the occasion of Henk Verhoog's retirement. On behalf of EurSafe I wish all the best for his

retirement and hope for further inspiring publications.

The next EurSafe News September 2007 will be edited by Matias Pasquali. Its subject will be "Food safety and security". All contributions, thematic or other, should be sent to pasqu016@umn.edu by August 15.

Kind regards on behalf of the newsletter board, see you in Vienna,

Herwig Grimm, *issue editor*

Institute TTN/Agroethik
Munich, Germany

Thematic Section – 'Agri-food ethics in German-speaking Europe'

Survey of the current discussion, its specialties and the perspectives of agricultural ethics in the national context of Switzerland

Klaus Peter Rippe & Ariane Willemsen

Current discussion

Agriculture has to serve multiple goals. Farmers should produce sufficient, safe, healthy and nutritional food. Changes in food production and nutrition habits cause additional demands. Agricultural products are expected to be durable but also tasty. In addition, farmers must treat their farm animals according to the animals' needs and according to ethical standards (or at least according to legal standards that are supposed to cover minimal ethical standards). They should also take care of biodiversity, including agro-biodiversity. Not to forget, in Switzerland the mountain farmers are also "gardeners". Without the extensive

but labour intensive cattle farming in the Alps the Swiss mountains would be covered in forests up to the height of 1800m. Not only the characteristic scenery of Switzerland would vanish but also agriculturally used land lost.

Farmers are supposed to fulfil all these demands with harming the environment as little as possible: no degrading of fertile soil, no excessive use of water, no pollution of water and air, reducing use of non-renewable energy sources etc. And considering the spatial demands of an increasing population, agricultural production has to manage with decreasing agricultural land.

Some of these goals are contradictory, and some of them are controversial. To fulfil all these demands at once is a challenge if not impossible. One idea to meet this challenge is the use of new technologies. One such technology brought forward in this context is gene technology. Gene technology still causes (not only in Switzerland) controversial discussions in public and media, especially the use of gene technology in agriculture.

No commercial cultivation of genetically modified (GM) crop has taken place in Switzerland until today. Only three field experiments with genetically modified crop were carried out. In 1991 and 1992 a federal research institute cultivated genetically modified potatoes. At that time no specialized legal norms yet existed. It was therefore not necessary to go through an application procedure. In 1998 two applications for an experimental release of GM-potatoes and GM-maize were declined by the authority. A third field experiment with GM-wheat was carried out in 2004.

In November 2005 the majority of the Swiss people and the cantons voted in favour of a referendum “for food derived from an agricultural practice free of gene technology”. The referendum introduced a moratorium of 5 years for import and marketing of genetically modified plants, parts of plants that are still capable to reproduce, as well as seed designed for the release into the environment in agriculture, horticulture and forestry. The moratorium lasts until November 2010.

Import of genetically modified food and feed as well as research is not touched by the moratorium. There are only very

few food products on the market, however. The main retailers do not sell the products because the consumers won't buy them, as they argue. Similarly, the sale of GM-feed has declined because of rising opposition by farmers. Since May 2007 three applications for experimental release of GM-wheat with increased fungus resistance are in the application procedure.

One Swiss specialty to be considered regarding the ethical discussion around genetically modified animals and plants is the concept of dignity of living beings. The Swiss constitution was amended in 1992 to the effect that animals, plants and other organisms must be handled with due consideration to the dignity of living beings. The current constitutional discussion connects the concept of dignity of living beings with a worth of individual living beings for their own sake. Since 1998 the Swiss Ethics Committee on Non-human Biotechnology (ECNH), an advisory committee implemented by the Federal Council, is expected to put this concept into concrete terms not only with regard to animals but also with regard to plants.

The ECNH has published some considerations with regard to animals in 2001 in its brochure “the dignity of animals” (www.ekah.ch). The main ethical question with regard to plants is, if and why plants must be protected. That plants are partially to be protected for others' sake is undisputed. The crucial question with regard to the concept of dignity however is, if plants are to be protected for their own sake. For some the question alone contradicts common sense. To morally consider plants for their own sake seems to be

nonsense. For them to deal with plants is morally neutral. Some exclude plants from the moral world because they fear that human life became morally too demanding and therefore too complicated. They also fear that a moral consideration of plants for their own sake might undermine moral duties towards humans (and animals) that are considered to be of higher rank. The discussions within the ECNH showed that there exist hardly any moral intuitions or some kind of moral common sense with regard to plants. Therefore, the ECNH discussed ethical positions with regard to plants and examined the conditions under which moral duties towards plants for their own sake could be derived. The ECNH is now in the process of finishing its statement towards the government.

Perspectives of agricultural ethics in the national context

In the context of the moratorium the discussion focuses primarily on consequential questions regarding implications of already existing or to be expected agricultural practices. Until the end of the moratorium, but also over and above, the main issues to be decided are considered to be the following:

- Do we have enough data to assess and evaluate the risks?
- How are the remaining risks that are considered to be acceptable to be managed?
- Is the release of genetically modified organisms (GMOs) in a small-scaled farming environment within the topography of Switzerland under the aspects of coexistence with non-GMO farming methods possible?

Even if the risks of GM crops have been extensively assessed during the past ten years of commercial cultivation of GM crops worldwide, there are still many unsolved questions. We do not know if we have enough data and the adequate instruments to assess and evaluate the risks.

However, the ongoing debate takes place not only and not primarily due to a lack of scientific data but also due to a lack of clear definitions on how to evaluate the effects of GM crops on biodiversity in the context of today's agriculture. E.g. from an ecological perspective not every environmental effect may be of ecological significance. From an ethical point of view it remains an open question, whether an ecologically relevant impact on biodiversity is morally wrong. Thus, it is one ethical and legal question to decide which risks are acceptable. It is another question of how to manage the risks which are considered acceptable compared to the possible benefits of GMOs.

If the question of coexistence is answered in favour of the use of gene technology, evaluations of the so called second and third generation of GMO-crop are to be made. These next generations of plants are supposed to be closer to the consumers' needs and demands, which might increase, so at least is the hope of the producers, public acceptance of such products. In case the issues of safety and coexistence are considered to be dealt with, increased acceptance would influence the weighing of interests.

One should not be deceived by the ongoing ethical discussion of consequential questions to think that the

fundamental ethical questions are solved. Many moral decisions in agricultural practice and research are taken implicitly, without examining their moral justification. E.g. the question of coexistence is based on the assumption that other agricultural methods such as traditional or organic agriculture must be protected against gene technology. This depends not only on the evaluation of the consequences of a specific agricultural practice but also on the moral status of plants and animals.

Contacts

PD Dr. Klaus Peter Rippe & Ariane Willemsen LL.M., M.A. (Philosophy)
Swiss Ethics Committee on Non-human Biotechnology ECNH c/o Federal Office for the Environment, Bern, Switzerland
CH-3003 Bern
Tel +41 31 323 83 83
Fax +41 31 324 79 78
ariane.willemsen@bafu.admin.ch
www.ekah.ch

Animal Welfare Activities in Austria

Erik Schmid

Introduction

The conditions in animal husbandry, especially of farm animals, improved significantly during the last 10 years. The small scale structure of Austrian agriculture, concentrating on milk production in mountainous areas and the high percentage of organic farming were certainly helpful. Production focuses on high quality standards including animal welfare and regional origin.

New Austrian animal welfare law

In 2005 the new Austrian Animal Welfare Law replaced the different regional regulations of the Counties. For the first time there is a uniform legal standard for the whole country. Also new institutions, such as the Animals Advocate as a member of the Animal Welfare Council, an advising committee for the competent ministry of health, were founded. Mandatory registration

for sanctuaries, pet shops, trading of animals, keeping of wild animals and housing equipment manufactured in series is also new. So is the duty for reports to the parliament and special requirements for controls by the competent authority.

On-farm self evaluation in animal welfare

To implement all the new regulations the competent authorities introduced new methods. In 2006 the on-farm self evaluation in animal welfare was presented. The principle of this self judgement is as simple as convincing. The text of law and regulation is translated into an easily understandable checklist of 'yes' or 'no' questions. The questionnaire has additional information to every question. So every farmer knows what he has to comply with. It is a perfect method to inform about and communicate legal aspects. For advisory

and controlling bodies a separate manual and specification was made to ensure that everybody interprets the facts similarly. Finally you can make an assessment of relevance and an estimate of costs of improvement. Not to forget information about transitional periods. All together you get a hit-list of the 'to do's', ranking the problem with the highest relevance for animal welfare but lowest costs of improvement at the very top. All checklists and manuals (for cattle, small ruminants, swine and poultry) are available by the homepage of the ministry of health.

<http://www.bmgfj.gv.at/cms/site/detail.htm?thema=CH0307&doc=CMS1157545064200>

Risk based control plan

The self evaluation is a voluntary system within the Anima Health Service (AHS). But the farmer gets an advantage when making his self evaluation properly, especially when additionally checked for plausibility by his advising vet. Risk based controls by the competent authority will concentrate on farms without membership of AHS and without self evaluation, which is interpreted as lack of quality assurance (TQM animal welfare within food safety) and therefore high risk potential.

Housing systems for animals in organic farming

Corresponding to the self evaluation of animal welfare on legal minimum standard the Austrian Council for Farming Technique published a series of advisory booklets for animal welfare in organic farming supported by all organic

institutions and organisations. Notably, the difference in standards of animal welfare between conventional and organic farming is decreasing to marginal especially in cattle. As in the case of "On-farm self evaluation", these booklets are a perfect guide to inform about and communicate the new legal requirements. Perhaps both could be a basis for information to the public (consumers). Also these booklets are made available via the internet:

[http://www.oekl.at/stories/storyReader\\$567](http://www.oekl.at/stories/storyReader$567)

Teaching animal welfare

Probably the biggest effort in public awareness of animal welfare was made by initiating a project called "Animal Welfare Goes to School". The new legislation urges all the official bodies to support animal welfare in all fields, such as science public awareness and understanding especially of young people. This could easily be interpreted as an obligation for animal welfare as a major subject of public education. As animal welfare is a very emotional topic, people concerned have to be very careful, not to overtax sensibility. Neutral and objective information is important, referring and adjusted to the target group (age of pupils). The newly founded Society "Teaching Animal Welfare" follows a step by step concept, starting early in kindergarten with an activity known as "Prevent a Bite" teaching the children to understand communication with dogs. Next step is teaching elderly children the needs of pet animals, like dogs, cats, mice, rabbits etc. Using role plays, information cards and interaction the pupils should learn what pets need, and if they can fulfil

these requirements at home. From the age of 10 to 14 it is planned to use the video and teachers pack “Farm Animals & Us” from CIWF (Compassion in World Farming). The translation of all educational papers enables the use in bilingual classes in biology, religion and political education and ethics. A special edition is created for agricultural and housekeeping schools.

Stakeholders go for ethics

The Institute for Theology, Technology and Nature Science from the University of Munich was asked by the chamber of agriculture of Austria to help them arguing for ethical aspects in farming. They created a pathway for ethical decision making for good agricultural practice, considering economical and ecological and animal welfare aspects. As a second group of stakeholders, veterinarians are confronted with a split ethic, treating dogs and pigs very differently despite of their equal needs or level of intelligence. Making money with pet animal surgery and meat inspection is considered to become a conflict of interest if their profession wants to be the advocate of (all) animals. Therefore, workshops on veterinarian’s moral responsibilities were carried out. The Ethical Matrix of the University of Nottingham (www.ethicalmatrix.net) asks for wellbeing, choice and fairness for farmers, consumers, animals and environment. The principle of fair trade could also be used for regional and seasonal products. Retail industry shows

rising awareness of this additional value of products, creating labels for “moral food” (“back to the roots” by Hofer, “common sense” by Billa). This development on the market makes it reasonable that the animal welfare label proposed in the action plan of the European Commission could work successfully.

Conclusion

The positive development of animal welfare of farm animals in Austria is a result of building up a trustworthy relationship between farmers, authorities and the public. This process took years and permanent adaptation of requirements respecting the needs of daily work. The new animal welfare law and the unique system of on-farm self evaluation of animal welfare are convincing examples of this respectful cooperation. The successful strategic concept tries to combine options of free market with quality production using corresponding evaluating criteria for “ethical” labelling and official support.

Contact

Dr. Erik Schmid
Veterinary official County Vorarlberg,
Austria
Specialist in Animal Husbandry and
Animal Welfare
Diplomat ECVPH
Erik.Schmid@vorarlberg.at

Agricultural Ethics – Issues and Problems (not only?) in the German Speaking Parts of Europe and the Need for Enhanced Dialogue

Roger J. Busch

Problems of public communication about agriculture

The public increasingly has an eye on agriculture. This has not been the case until the near past. Today, the public seems to take it for granted that producers, integrators and retailers are able to prove their production practices and policies to be in accordance with societal preferences and values. However, this goes far beyond the traditional requirement of food safety and raises questions which can not be answered with technical and / or scientific knowledge alone; information concerning hygiene, residues and food quality is indeed needed, but has to be dealt with respect to morals and societal values. Producers (farmers), integrators and retailers face the challenge to widen their perspectives: the new task is to prove not only that production is economic and technically efficient, but societal values, personal intuitions and moral judgements are taken into account. This has to be considered in agricultural research also. Therefore, we are in need of interdisciplinary cooperation and approaches promising to develop appropriate solutions.

A survey carried out by the European Opinion Research Group EEIG and published in 2004 as “Special Eurobarometer: European Union citizens and agriculture from 1995 to 2003” shows that European citizens “seem poorly informed” of the common agricultural policy, but stick to some top

priorities of the farmer’s responsibility, such as “ensuring that farm animals are well treated and that the environment is protected”. Only about one half of the citizens would agree that the EU CAP plays its role rather well to foster these priorities. Television and newspapers are their main sources of information about what is happening in the field of common agricultural policy. It is not personal involvement or dialogue with people concerned with agriculture. Thus, the Special Eurobarometer states: “There is a need for more communication about the common agricultural policy among the general public.”

Having a look on the public debate on agriculture in the German speaking parts of Europe, it can generally be said that the discussion is lead by representatives of the players in the field of agriculture on the one hand and advocates of the public on the other hand.

Important issues in these discussions are:

- farm animal welfare (sometimes called “high quality animal production” – a term that might cause irritation because of combining a living organism with economic and technical aims),
- the use of biotechnology – such as GM-food and crops – and related legal requirements to guarantee co-existence,
- agro-chemicals in crop production (perceived by NGOs like Greenpeace as threat of risk by residues in food),

- the remarkable shift from traditional crop and food production to biomass production for renewable energy, triggered and fostered by subsidies and thus stepping into competition with former traditional agricultural production.

Issues likely to emerge:

- the impact of climate change on agricultural production, e.g. shortage of water, desertification, biodiversity etc.
- which have not yet received necessary public attention,
- pharmaceuticals in animal husbandry (as a means to adapt animals to probably inadequate housing systems or therapy)
- and, in a wider sense, the issue of agricultural production logic as such.

Different tendencies in German speaking countries

There are different tendencies in Austria, Germany and Switzerland concerning legal and / or political requirements for arable farming and animal husbandry:

- Austria is highly engaged in animal welfare (at least starting with 2006 and the first animal welfare conference on the European level in Brussels) and opposes the use of genetically modified plants.
- In Switzerland regulators as well as consumers seem to have specific Swiss interests in mind when judging e.g. plant biotechnology: e.g. although scientific research in containments is fostered, field trials are restricted and agricultural use is under suspicion. On the other hand, organic farming and / or small scale

farming allegedly is largely supported by Swiss consumers.

- In Germany, politics tries to develop legal requirements and thereby focuses on cross compliance requirements dealing with the necessity to enhance the scientific perception of ecologic interdependencies. This implies that experts are of utmost importance and predominantly involved according to the maxim “experts talk and public listens”. The public has to cope with the fixed results while parts of the interested public are at the same time sensitized for the basics of the precautionary principle and doubt whether this is really taken into account.

But how producers and integrators who traditionally focus on production efficiency, and retailers who have to deal with consumer acceptance, explicitly deal with those issues? Producers and integrators try to inform and to teach consumers but thereby step into competition with NGOs, sometimes with the churches and other interested parties who focus on societal dimensions and the underlying moral values mentioned above. Retailers usually try not to mention problems that might irritate consumers and in order to prevent public irritation sometimes pro-actively fulfil the demands of critical NGOs. In fact, according to the Special Eurobarometer many (most?) consumers take food *safety* as given or at least acknowledge that legal EU requirements foster healthy food production (Germany 55%, Austria 49%). However, consumers increasingly want to know *how* their food was produced e.g. farm animal welfare conditions. Consequently, such questions are caused

by moral reasons and not by the aim to overcome a lack of technical understanding.

Adequate procedures to enhance public dialogue involving a wider scope of citizens in this respect seem difficult to establish due to the different structures of public participation in the German speaking countries of Europe. In Germany and Austria, public “participates” mainly through “stakeholder dialogues”, meaning that representatives and experts are involved and the public is informed afterwards. In Switzerland, political opinions can be expressed by referendum with direct influence on regulations. However, consumers in Switzerland can only choose from defined alternatives in a binary structure.

Moral values and participation

Important moral values with respect to agricultural production are known to all stakeholders involved. From the perspective of researchers and people in the production chain the moral values are represented in sustainability frameworks referring to economic, ecological and social dimensions of the technologies in question. They are estimated with the focus on foreseeable interferences in terms of cross compliance requirements. The latter implies that *scientific* inquiry dominates reflection, evaluation and decision making.

As seen before, agriculture has to cope with consumer *attitudes* and not with the consumer’s lack of *knowledge*. Classical consumer communication regularly starts with information. The ones who know teach those who do not. According to this approach, description and

evaluation of and strategies to minimize foreseeable technological risks for consumers (such as residues of pharmaceuticals in meat) and environment respectively (such as prevention of dissemination of GMO) are communicated. This approach can be identified as technology- or product-driven, since it focuses on the reduction of unwanted / unintended effects, but does not question whether the product as such is reasonable. The public, in contrast, starts from its cultural context into which the technology and / or product is to be implemented, and therefore raises questions about the general (and technical and social) necessity of innovations.

In this respect, underlying personal attitudes, intuitions and values of consumers, recognisable in their context oriented approach, are obviously not taken into account by agricultural players easily. However, *producers* have to prove that their practice does not conflict with the consumers’ values, attitudes and intuitions which, according to moral judgements, go beyond considerations of individual benefits. In order to do this, these attitudes, intuitions and moral values have to be identified which is not easy, due to the fact that they are mainly implicit or hidden. People are normally not obliged to explain their values; they just act accordingly. In case of social every-day-life conflicts, they might feel obliged to defend or at least to explain their values. But do people who are not engaged in agricultural production feel obliged to defend their resistance or scepticism against products and / or producers?

From the public’s perspective, acceptability of technical procedures and practice requires to meet societal values

in a wider sense. Consequently, generic issues gain attention:

- the tendency of industrialization of agriculture,
- international and intergenerational justice now and for the future generations,
- protection of culturally and traditionally socially embedded agricultural production,
- extension of intellectual property rights,
- safeguards for the reversibility of results,
- dealing with uncertainties and the realm of the not-known etc.

People want to be accepted as citizens with influence on policy decisions. They expect to be given the opportunity to substantially participate in decision making – far beyond repetitive elections and polls. In this respect, Jerome Ravetz pointed out in his 2002 contribution to the Journal of agricultural and environmental ethics: “Ordinary people have vivid experiences of benefit and harm; and they are outraged when regulators and scientists [to be added: agricultural producers; RJB] dismiss their reports as ‚merely anecdotal’ ”.

Conclusion

The extended task to enhance the dialogue between agriculture and consumers is to enable consumers to reflect and to express their attitudes. Dialogue needs time, definitely more time than it has been given in the past. To prevent consumers from manipulation it is necessary that ethics intensify reflections on participatory decision-making-processes which can widen and / or overcome the narrow approaches of stakeholder-dialogues and technology-driven communication. Sociological, psychological and philosophical analysis is available. It has to be made ready to use in new forms of fair dialogues.

Contact

Dr. Roger J. Busch
Director TTN Institute for applied ethics
and dialogue, LMU Munich, Germany

Marsstraße 19, D-80335 Munich
Germany
Ph. +49 89 5595 600
Fax. +49 89 5595 608
Busch@elkb.de

EurSafe update

EurSafe General Assembly

Dear Members,

The EurSafe General Assembly (GA) will be held on Saturday, 15 September 2007 as part of the Vienna Conference. The agenda for the GA will include a report from the Treasurer and the Cash

Audit Committee and the election of new members of the Executive Committee. At the Oslo conference (June 2006) the Society elected a new Executive Committee (EC). Although EC Members are elected for a period of three years, we believe that it would be

best for the Society to rotate a number of positions on the Executive Committee at every conference (i.e. every year and a half). The Vienna GA would be a good starting point for this new procedure.

Peter Sandøe and Frans Brom have been members of the EC since the foundation of the Society in 1999. At the Oslo conference Peter and Frans announced that they would be stepping down in Vienna. In line with Article 8 of the Statutes, the current Executive Committee will nominate candidates for the election. This nomination will be presented before the start of the conference. Other candidates may be nominated, if proposed by at least ten ordinary members. Nomination may be presented to the President (Peter Sandøe) by the deadline of Friday 14 September at 19.00 hours.

In order to facilitate this process of change, the Executive Committee has installed a Preparation Committee to prepare the nominations. The Preparation Committee invites the Members of EurSafe to draw to their attention possible candidates for President, Secretary or EC member. We strongly urge individuals who are willing to devote their time and energy to our Society to inform the selection

committee and to contact the secretary of the Preparation Committee dr. Kate Millar at: kate.millar@nottingham.ac.uk

We look forward to seeing you all in Vienna in September and we wish you a productive summer.

On behalf of the Executive Committee,

Frans W.A. Brom
Secretary

For your information: Art. 8 of the Statutes:

1. The Executive Committee shall consist of at least four (4) persons.

Appointments shall be made by the General Meeting from among the members. The number of Executive Committee members shall be determined by the General Meeting. In the event of a vacancy, the Executive Committee may make a nomination, without prejudice to the authority of the General Meeting to appoint someone else.

2. Candidates for the Executive Committee may be nominated by the Executive Committee, as well as on the proposal of at least ten ordinary members.

7th EurSafe Congress on Sustainable Food Production and Ethics Vienna, Austria on 13-15 September 2007

Conference Update

The preparations for the 7th EurSafe Congress on Sustainable Food Production and Ethics (Vienna, Austria) to be held on 13-15 September 2007 are progressing very well.

The Conference organisers, Dr Christoph Winckler, (University of Natural Resources and Applied Life Sciences Vienna - BOKU), and colleagues from the University of Veterinary Medicine Vienna, University of Vienna (Faculty for Life Sciences) and the Austrian Scientists for Environmental Protection Society, have received over 100 abstracts. The quality of the papers is again high and the Scientific Committee is therefore looking forward to presenting a very stimulating programme in September.

Invited Keynote Speakers will give presentations on:

- Roots of sustainability, organic farming and ethics (Ben Minter, USA; Susanne Padel, UK)
- Global sustainability, resilience and markets (Polly Ericksen, UK; Mahendra Shah, A)
- Animal production and animal welfare (David Fraser, CAN; Vonne Lund, NOR)
- Food trends and consumer concerns (Unni Kjaernes, NOR)

A panel discussion on 'Coexistence with GMOs' will be organised with contributions from Louise Luttikholt (IFOAM), Matthias Kaiser (NOR), Adinda de Schrijver (B).

Further details of the Programme, including information on the Keynote Speakers and parallel sessions will be available from the 1st of July 2007 on the Conference website:
<http://www.nas.boku.ac.at/eursafe2007.html>

The Organising Committee would like to remind all presenters and attendees to register at:
<http://www.nas.boku.ac.at/9086.html>

The Executive Committee hopes that you are all able to join us in lovely Vienna. We wish you an enjoyable summer and are looking forward to seeing you in September.

Dr Christoph Winckler
(on behalf of the Conference Organising Committee)

Dr Kate Millar
(on behalf of the EurSafe Board)

May 2007

Conferences & Symposia

Spring 2007

Jun 11-12

Searching for the Animal of Animal Ethics,
IX Annual Swedish Symposium on
Biomedicine, Ethics and Society
(Stockholm, Sweden)

<http://www.bioethics.uu.se/symposium/2007/>

Jun 11-14

FELASA-ICLAS Joint Meeting 2007
(Cernobbio (CO) Italy)

Hosted by Federation of European
Laboratory Animal Science Associations
(FELASA) and International Council for
Laboratory Animal Science (ICLAS)

<http://www.felasa-iclas2007.com/>

Jun 12-13

3rd Annual Obesity Europe Conference
(Brussels, Belgium)

Organised by Epsilon Events Ltd

http://www.epsilonevents.com/eps_current_event.asp?id=30&type=current

Jun 16-19

ESHG 2007. European Human Genetics
Conference (Nice, France)
Organised by European Society of Human
Genetics

<http://www.eshg.org/eshg2007/index1.htm>

Jun 20-21

EFSA Scientific Colloquium 8 -
Environmental Risk Assessment of
Genetically Modified Plants – Challenges
and Approaches (Tabiano, Italy)
Organised by the European Food Safety
Authority

http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/science/colloquium_series/Colloquium_8_gmo.html

Jun 25

Emerging Technologies: Opportunities and
Challenges for the Replacement, Refinement
and Reduction of Animals in Research and
Testing (London, UK)

Seminar organised by the Royal Society of
Chemistry, London

<http://www.rsc.org/ScienceAndTechnology/Events/EmergingTechnologies.asp>

Jun 26-27

Research towards Future Challenges of
European Agriculture (Brussels, Belgium)
Organised by the Standing Committee on
Agricultural Research (SCAR) aimed at
assessing the outlook of European
agriculture by 2020

http://teamwork.intbase.com/0705_01/

Jun 27-29

IAMO Forum 2007. Sustainable Rural
Development: What is the Role of the Agri-
food Sector? (Halle (Saale), Germany)
Organised by Leibniz Institute of
Agricultural Development in Central and
Eastern Europe (IAMO)

<http://www.iamo.de/index.php?id=forum2007>

Summer 2007

Jul 3-6

Animals and Society II. Considering
Animals (Tasmania, Australia)
Hosted by the Animals and Society Study
Group (Australia) and the University of
Tasmania

<http://www.cdesign.com.au/AS2007/>

Jul 8-12

American Society of Animal Science
(ASAS) Joint Annual Meeting 2007 (Texas,
USA)

Organized by ASAS, ADSA, PSA, AMPA

<http://adsa.psa.ampa.asas.org/meetings/2007/call.asp>

Jul 9-11

The British Society for Ethical Theory 2007
Conference (Bristol, UK)

Organised by British Society for Ethical
Theory

<http://www.bset.org.uk/conference.html>

Jul 10-13

10th European Nutrition Conference (Paris, France)

Organised by the Federation of the European Nutrition Societies (FENS) and the Union Française pour la Nutrition et l'Alimentation (UFNA)

<http://www.fens2007.org/04-preliminary/preliminary.asp>

Jul 20-21

CIT-BIOTECH 2007. Biotechnology for Human Welfare (Tamil Nadu, India)

Organised by Coimbatore Institute of Technology and Tamil Nadu Agricultural University

Themes include: Agricultural Biotechnology; Food Biotechnology; Environmental Biotechnology and Nano Biotechnology

<http://www.citbiotech2007.info/theme-confre.html>

Jul 23-27 and Sep 10-14

Interdisciplinary Aspects of Nanobiotechnology (Munich, Germany)
Organised by Interdisciplinary Institute TTN (technology, theology, natural sciences)

<http://www.ttn-institut.de/call.pdf>

Jul 26-29

11th International Conference on Agricultural Biotechnologies: New Frontiers and Products – Economics, Policies and Science (Ravello, Scala, Italy)

Organised by International Consortium on Agricultural Biotechnology Research (ICABR) and the Catholic University of Leuven

http://www.economia.uniroma2.it/conferenze/icabr2007/call_for_paper.asp

Jul 30-Aug 3

Applying Ethology to Animal and Ecosystem Management (Yucatan, Mexico)
41st Congress of the International Society for Applied Ethology (ISAE)

<http://www.isae2007.com/>

Aug 12-16

Transgenic Animal Research Conference V1 (Tahoe City, California)

Hosted by the UC Davis Department of Animal Science and the UC Davis Biotechnology Program

<http://www.cevs.ucdavis.edu/Cofred/Public/Aca/WebSec.cfm?confid=282&webid=1413>

Aug 20-24

Mobilities, Vulnerabilities and Sustainabilities: New Questions and Challenges for Rural Europe. (Wageningen, The Netherlands)

22nd Congress of the European Society for Rural Sociology (ESRS)

<http://www.esrs2007.nl/>

Aug 21-25

6th World Congress on Alternatives and Animal Use in the Life Sciences (Tokyo, Japan)

Organised by Japanese Society for Alternatives to Animal Experiments (JSAAE); Alternative Congress Trust (ACT) and Science Council of Japan (SCJ)

<http://www.ech.co.jp/wc6/>

Aug 26-29

58th Annual Meeting of the European Association of Animal Production (EAAP) (Dublin, Ireland)

http://www.eaap2007.ie/reg_interest.htm

Sep 1-7

The First International Technical Conference on Animal Genetic Resources (Interlaken, Switzerland)

Organised by the Animal Production and Health Division of the FAO

<http://www.fao.org/ag/againfo/programmes/en/genetics/anrvent2007.html>

Sep 10-14

Interdisciplinary Aspects of Nanobiotechnology (Munich, Germany)

Organised by Interdisciplinary Institute TTN (technology, theology, natural sciences)

<http://www.ttn-institut.de/call.pdf>

Sep 13-15

EurSafe 2007. Sustainable Food Production and Ethics (Vienna, Austria)
7th Congress of the European Society for Agriculture and Food Ethics
<http://www.nas.boku.ac.at/eursafe2007.html>

Sep 13-15

EACME 2007 - Bioethics in the Real World (Zurich, Switzerland)
21st Annual Conference of the European Association of Centres of Medical Ethics
<http://www.ethik.uzh.ch/ibme/eacme/index.html>

Sep 16-19

World Conference on Research Integrity (Lisbon, Portugal)
Organised by European Science Foundation (ESF) and the US Department of Health and Human Services Office of Research Integrity (ORI)
<http://www.esf.org/activities/esf-conferences/details/confdetail242/conference-information.html>

Sep 17-19

13th European Congress on Biotechnology. Symbiosis: Science, Industry and Society (Barcelona, Spain)
Organised by the European Federation of Biotechnology (EFB)
<http://www.ecb13.eu/index.php/>

Sep 20-21

NTAF 2007. 3rd meeting of the Norwegian Transgenic Animal Forum (NTAF) (Oslo, Norway)
<http://ntaf.info/>

Sep 23-26

Harnessing Science for the Evolving Consumer: the Fit of Agricultural Biotechnology. ABIC 2007 (Alberta, Canada).
The Annual Agricultural Biotechnology International Conference (ABIC)
<http://www.abic.ca/abic2007/>

Sep 23-27

15th International Conference on Aquatic Invasive Species (Nijmegen, The Netherlands)
Hosted by the Institute for Inland Water Management and Wastewater Treatment (RIZA)
<http://www.icaais.org/>

Sep 24-28

Biosafety of GM Crops and the Evolution of Regulatory Frameworks: Issues and Challenges (Minas Gerais, Brazil)
Organised by the International Centre for Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology (ICGEB)
<http://www.icgeb.org/MEETINGS/CRS07/BRASept07.pdf>

Sep 27-28

Expressions of Traditional Wisdom International Symposium (Brussels, Belgium)
Organised by Royal Academy for Overseas Sciences together with Royal Museum for Central-Africa and Royal Museums of Art and History of Belgium
<http://www.kaowarsom.be/en/conferences.html>

Sep 28-30

Linz 2007 - 14th Congress on Alternatives to Animal Testing (Linz, Austria) Organised by zet – Organised by the Centre for Alternative and Complementary Methods to Animal Testing and MEGAT - Middle European Society for Alternative Methods to Animal Testing
<http://www.zet.or.at/kongress/Linz2007/index.html>

Autumn 2007**Oct 5-7**

IAHAIO 2007: 11th International Conference on Human-Animal Interactions (Tokyo, Japan)
Organised by Japanese members of International Association of Human-Animal Interaction Organisations (IAHAIO)
<http://www2.convention.co.jp/iahaio.tokyo/>

Oct 18-19

The Promises and Challenges of the Life Sciences Industry in Central and Eastern Europe (Prague, Czech Republic)
Organised by INNOGEN and OSI in conjunction with PASOS
Contacts: Farah Huzair (f.huzair@open.ac.uk); workshop organizer Peter Robbins (Innogen, the Open University, (p.t.robbins@open.ac.uk); and Adrian Ionescu, OSI, Hungary (aionescu@osi.hu).

Oct 23-25

International symposium on Animal Genomics for Animal Health (Paris, France)
Organised by OIE, World Organisation for Animal Health
<http://www.ars.usda.gov/meetings/AGAH2007/>

Oct 24-27

Aquaculture Europe 2007: Competing Claims (Istanbul, Turkey)

Organized by the European Aquaculture Society

<http://home.scarlet.be/marevent/AQUA2007.htm>

Nov 8-10

3rd International Scientific Conference Rural Development (Lithuania)
Organised by the Lithuanian University of Agriculture
http://www.lzuu.lt/rural_development/index.html

Nov 19-21

Food in a Future Climate – Conference on Sustainable Food Systems (Norrköping, Sweden)
Organised by the Centre for Sustainable Agriculture, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences
<http://www.cul.slu.se/english/conference/index.html>

Publications

Values in Organic Agriculture – Special issue of the NJAS Wageningen Journal of Life Sciences

The focus of this special issue is on values and organic agriculture. Being a protest movement against developments in industrialized conventional agriculture, the organic movement has been value-based from the very beginning. However, organic agriculture is undergoing rapid changes. In some agricultural sectors it is becoming similar to conventional agriculture: growing intensification, specialization and transport over long distances. This 'conventionalization' of organic agriculture is worrying many people in the organic movement. They believe that it is incompatible with the organic values and may have a negative impact on the public image of organic farming. It is not surprising therefore that recently interest in organic value issues is increasing. In this special

issue, values in organic agriculture are described from different points of view. It is published on the occasion of the retirement of Henk Verhoog (68), as bio-ethicist. The last seven years he was involved in research with other members of the Louis Bolk Institute in the Netherlands on the (ethical) values of organic agriculture.

Scope

This special issue of NJAS deals not only with the topic of the conventionalization of organic agriculture as such, but also with a broad range of issues including the 'naturalness' of organic agriculture and the IFOAM ethical principles, the concept of integrity of plants and of animals with special emphasis on animal welfare and natural behaviour, the values of landscapes,

the health of the farm organism, and gene-technology in relation to organic principles. On the backside of this leaflet you will find the titles of the papers.

Readership

The special issue is of great interest for anyone who is working in the field of agriculture or nutrition such as consultants, researchers and policy makers. Conventional agriculture is also changing into a more sustainable direction. Ethical values are always future-directed, inspiring people towards a certain course of action. The discussion in the organic movement may therefore be of interest to all concerned about the future of agriculture in general.

Prize and ordering

The special issue on Values in Organic Agriculture is available from 2 April, 2007, and can be ordered for the special prize of 20 euro (including postage costs) from the Louis Bolk Institute. Please send an email with your name and address to publicaties@louisbolk.nl to order the special issue.

Contents of the special issue

1. The value of 'naturalness' in organic agriculture, H. Verhoog, E.T. Lammerts van Bueren, M. Matze & T. Baars.

2. Principles of Organic Agriculture as formulated by the International Federation of Organic Agriculture Movements (IFOAM), L.W.M. Luttikholt.
3. The tension between common sense and scientific perception of animals: recent developments in research on animal integrity, H. Verhoog.
4. Practical implications of increasing 'natural living' through suckling systems in organic dairy calf rearing, J.P.T.M. Wagenaar & J. Langhout.
5. Organic agriculture versus genetic engineering, H. Verhoog.
6. Organic agriculture requires process rather than product evaluation of novel breeding techniques, E.T. Lammerts van Bueren, H. Verhoog, M. Tiemens-Hulscher, P.C. Struik & M.A. Haring.
7. Coaching the process of designing a farm: using the healthy human as a metaphor for farm health, J.R. Bloksma & P.C. Struik.
8. Values of rural landscapes in Europe: inspiration or by-product?, B.G.M. Pedroli, Th. van Elsen & J.D. van Mansvelt.
9. Organic values and the conventionalization of organic agriculture, J. de Wit & H. Verhoog.
10. Towards a philosophical underpinning of the holistic concept of integrity of organisms within organic agriculture, E. Baars & T. Baars.

Funding

ERA-NET / ERA-NET Plus Call 2007

Identifier: FP7-ERANET-2007-RTD

Publication date: 22 December 2006

Budget: € 28 900 000

Deadline: 31 July 2007 at 17:00 (Brussels local time)

OJ Reference: [OJ C316 of 22 December 2006](#)

Specific Programme: [Cooperation]

Theme(s): [Energy] [Environment (including Climate Change)] [Coordination of Research Activities] [Health] [Food, Agriculture and Fisheries, and

Biotechnology] [Nanosciences, Nanotechnologies, Materials and new Production Technologies] [Socio-economic sciences and Humanities] [Transport (including Aeronautics)]

http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/dc/index.cfm?fuseaction=UserSite.CooperationDetailsCallPage&call_id=7

Intra-European Fellowships for Career Development

Identifier: FP7-PEOPLE-2007-2-1-IEF

Publication date: 28 February 2007

Budget: € 72 000 000
Deadline: 14 August 2007 at 17:00 (Brussels local time)
OJ Reference: [OJ C045 of 28 February 2007](#)
Specific Programme: [People]
Theme: [PEOPLE]
http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/dc/index.cfm?fuseaction=UserSite.PeopleDetailsCallPage&call_id=44

International Outgoing Fellowships for Career Development

Identifier: FP7-PEOPLE-2007-4-1-IOF
Publication date: 28 February 2007
Budget: € 24 000 000
Deadline: 14 August 2007 at 17:00 (Brussels local time)
OJ Reference: [OJ C045 of 28 February 2007](#)
Specific Programme: [People]
Theme: [PEOPLE]
http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/dc/index.cfm?fuseaction=UserSite.PeopleDetailsCallPage&call_id=45

International Incoming Fellowships

Identifier: FP7-PEOPLE-2007-4-2-IIF
Publication date: 28 February 2007
Budget: € 24 000 000
Deadline: 14 August 2007 at 17:00 (Brussels local time)
OJ Reference: [OJ C045 of 28 February 2007](#)
Specific Programme: [People]
Theme: [PEOPLE]
http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/dc/index.cfm?fuseaction=UserSite.PeopleDetailsCallPage&call_id=46

Socio-economic sciences and Humanities

Identifier: FP7-SSH-2007-1

Publication date: 22 December 2006
Budget: € 58 500 000
Deadline(s): 29 November 2007 at 17:00:00 (Brussels local time)
10 May 2007 at 17:00:00 (Brussels local time) - for specific topics of the call
29 November 2007 at 17:00:00 (Brussels local time) - for other topics (see call fiche)
OJ Reference: OJ C316 of 22 December 2006
Specific Programme: [Cooperation]
Theme: [Socio-economic sciences and Humanities]
http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/dc/index.cfm?fuseaction=UserSite.CooperationDetailsCallPage&call_id=39#prereg

Science in Society

Identifier: FP7-SCIENCE-IN-SOCIETY-2007-2
Publication date: 13 April 2007
Budget: € 1 675 000
Deadline: 17 July 2007 at 17:00:00 (Brussels local time)
OJ Reference: OJ C080 of 13 April 2007
Specific Programme: [Capacities]
Theme: [Science in Society]
http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/dc/index.cfm?fuseaction=UserSite.CapacitiesDetailsCallPage&call_id=48

Call for proposals for the development of integrated Master Degree courses in consumer issues.

(SANCO/2007/007)
Deadline: 5 November 2007
http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/tenders/information/index_en.htm

Contact

Executive secretariat

Paul den Besten, Royal Netherlands Society of Agricultural Sciences, P.O. Box 79, NL-6700 AB Wageningen, The Netherlands, paul.denbesten@wur.nl

EurSafe Membership Administration

Bureau De Beek, Parkweg 27, NL-2585 JH The Hague, The Netherlands, tel. (+31) (0)70 4162943, fax (+31) (0)70 4162959, info@eursafe ledenadmin.nl

Executive committee

President: Peter Sandoe, Royal Agricultural and Veterinary University, Denmark, pes@kvl.dk

Secretary: Frans Brom, Utrecht University, The Netherlands, f.brom@rathenau.nl

Treasurer: Jos Metz, Wageningen University, The Netherlands, jos.metz@wur.nl

Members

Andrea Cattaneo, Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, France,

andrea.cattaneo@oecd.org

Johan De Tavernier, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium,

johan.detavernier@biw.kuleuven.be

Matthias Kaiser, National Committee for Research Ethics in Science and Technology, Norway,

matthias.kaiser@etikkom.no

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

Helena Röcklinsberg, Lund University, Sweden, helena.rocklinsberg@teol.lu.se

Mariachiara Tallacchini, Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Italy,

mariachiara.tallacchini@unimi.it

Website

www.eursafe.org

EurSafe News

Chief-editor: Stefan Aerts, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium,

stefan.aerts@biw.kuleuven.be

Issue-editor March 2007: Tassos Michalopoulos, Wageningen University, The Netherlands,

tassos.michalopoulos@wur.nl

Issue-editor June 2007: Herwig Grimm, Institute TTN, Germany, herwig.grimm@elkb.de

Issue-editor September 2007: Matias Pasquali, University of Torino, Italy, pasqu016@umn.edu

Conference & courses editor: Sandy Tomkins, Nottingham University, United Kingdom,

sandy.tomkins@nottingham.ac.uk

Publications editor: Assya Pascalev, Howard University, United States, director@bio-ethics.net

Funding calls editor: Tassos Michalopoulos, Wageningen University, The Netherlands,

tassos.michalopoulos@wur.nl

Nordic editor: Vonne Lund, National Veterinary Institute, Norway, vonne.lund@vetinst.no

Deadline for the next issue: August 15, 2007