



News

EurSafe

VOLUME 19 NO. 2 JUNE 2017

SPECIAL ISSUE ON WINNERS VONNE LUND PRIZE



Editorial

Dear EurSafe members,

It is my pleasure to present to you the second issue of the 2017 EurSafe News, which is dedicated to former Vonne Lund Prize winners. The Vonne Lund Prize has been introduced in memory of Vonne Lund, who sadly passed away on June 3rd 2009. For those of you who have not had the fortune of becoming acquainted with Vonne Lund: Vonne was a Swedish agronomist in animal husbandry who worked ceaselessly to promote organic agriculture and animal welfare and who played an important role within the EurSafe community. Since the 2012 EurSafe congress, the Vonne Lund Prize has been awarded four times to the best paper presentation of a young PhD student or master student. During the 2016 EurSafe congress in Porto, the idea came to our mind to ask these winners to write a paper for EurSafe news. In this issue you can read the contribution of two former prize winners, Teea Kortetmäki and Tatjana Višak.

Tatjana was the first winner of the Vonne Lund Prize at the 10th EurSafe Congress in 2012 in Tübingen, Germany, with her paper: *Daniel Haybron's theory of welfare and its implications for animal welfare assessment*. Her current

CONTENTS

Editorial by Mariska van Asselt | **1**

Conflicting intuitions concerning cross-species comparisons of welfare Paper by Tatjana Višak | **3**

From Romania to Finland: All roads lead to sustainability Paper by Teea Kortetmäki | **5**

Call for Papers - 14th EurSafe Congress | **7**

Scholarships for South-Eastern European Countries | **8**

EurSafe Executive Committee Update by Franck Meijboom | **10**

Conferences, symposia, and workshops | **11**

Contact | **16**

paper, *Conflicting intuitions concerning cross-species comparisons of welfare*, covers again interesting viewpoints on the assessment of animal welfare, and specifically on cross-species comparisons of welfare. Tatjana questions which account of animal welfare, a relativized or an absolute one, is the best. You can read in her paper a nice integration of her intuitions regarding animal welfare assessment with ethical theories on animal welfare, which will provide you food for thought.

Tea's paper *Food security and ethics: the first world hunger* won the Vonne Lund Prize on the 12th EurSafe Congress 2015 in Cluj-Napoca, Romania. Her contribution to this newsletter is entitled *From Romania to Finland: All roads lead to sustainability*. In this paper, Teaa reflects on the academic journey she has made since Cluj-Napoca. She discusses different subjects and trends in food ethics, such as moral problems of charity-based food aid, sustainability of food security and sustainable protein consumption. All of the journey subjects turn out to contribute to sustainable food production.

Furthermore, we are happy to present to you the latest information on the 14th EurSafe congress from 13th to 16th June 2018 in Vienna, Austria from the organizing committee. Please have a look at the Call for Papers, Congress Topics, Important dates, and Scholarships for South-Eastern European Countries. I am looking forward to this event with inspiring presentations, meetings with colleagues, and interesting discussions, all within a friendly atmosphere. I have started, as Franck Meijboom suggests in his message from the executive board, thinking about a subject to present in Vienna. And you? Do you already have a subject in mind?

Of course, this newsletter also includes a list of events, conferences, and symposia that may be interesting for EurSafe members. If you would like to contribute to EurSafe News in the future, either by providing an article, a book review, or a list of conferences, books, and symposia, please feel free to contact any member of the editorial board.



Mariska van Asselt, Issue Editor
DVM, PhD candidate
Department of Applied Research
Aeres University of Applied Sciences Dronten, the
Netherlands
m.van.asselt@aeres.nl



Paper

Dr. Tatjana Višak

Wissenschaftliche

Mitarbeiterin (Postdoc)

Department of Philosophy
and Business Ethics

Mannheim University,

Germany

tatjana.visak@gmail.com

Conflicting intuitions concerning cross-species comparisons of welfare

Dr. Tatjana Višak



I would like to take this opportunity to share some thoughts with you that puzzle me about animal welfare, in particular cross-species comparisons of welfare. I am looking forward to your comments.

Let me start with two opposing intuitions that I have when I am trying to measure an animal's welfare. The first intuition is to assess to what extent the animal's needs are fulfilled. If the animal's needs are completely fulfilled, the animal is very well off and has, therefore, a high welfare score. In ideal circumstances, the welfare score would probably be 100 out of 100. In order to do that kind of assessment, I need to know what the animal's needs are and to what extent they are fulfilled. This knowledge is at least in principle available to me. Perhaps instead of needs, I should rather focus on the animal's preferences, or self-fulfillment, or nature-fulfillment. No matter which of these I will assess, a perfectly well off rabbit will score 100 out of 100, and the same score applies to a perfectly well off human, dog or frog. My second intuition concerning how to compare welfare across species is different. This intuition tells me that a maximally well off human is better off than a maximally well off mouse or turtle. According to this second intuition, it does not sound correct that both have the same welfare score, namely 100 out of 100. The maximally well off human, according to my second intuition, must score higher than the maximally well off dog or frog.

What to make of these opposing intuitions? They cannot both be true and I would like to know which of these two different ways of comparing welfare across species is correct, if any. When welfare scientists assess the welfare of different species in different husbandry systems – say hens in battery cages and cows on pasture – they tend to proceed in accordance with my first intuition, so do laypeople. But the very same people would perhaps prefer to be a maximally well off chimpanzee rather than a maximally well off fish, at least assuming that their length of life would be the same. If this judgment is based purely on egoistic considerations, as we can stipulate here, this is a judgment about welfare. So, is the chimpanzee's life better for the chimp than the fish's life is for the fish, after all?

Consulting philosophical theories of welfare does not help me decide between my conflicting intuitions. Some theories – such as preferentialism, nature-fulfillment or self-fulfillment accounts and those that are based on the fulfillment of needs – tend to imply that a maximally well off rabbit scores the same as a maximally well off human. Other theories, such as objective list accounts and hedonism tend to imply that the maximally well off human is better off than the rabbit, because of the higher absolute level of prudential goodness in the human's life: humans in favorable circumstances simply have more or more intense pleasant experiences or they can realize more of the objective goods in their lives. If I knew what the correct account of welfare was, I could simply apply this account. There are, however, no knockdown arguments in the debate about what the correct account of welfare is, and a theory's implications with regard to cross-species comparisons of welfare are part of the overall assessment of its plausibility. So, turning to accounts of welfare does not solve the problem for me.

Perhaps I need to start at a more fundamental level and first ask myself what the notion of welfare is supposed to capture. An answer to this question may allow me to judge whether a relativized notion or an absolute notion is a better fit. A relativized notion relativizes some absolute amount of good in one way or the other to the individual in question. For example, preferentialism assesses the individual's amount of fulfilled desires in relation to the number and intensity of her desires. It doesn't matter what the individual's absolute amount of desire-satisfaction is. It matters only to what extent the desires that she has are satisfied. Is such a relativized account of welfare more in line with what the notion of welfare is supposed to capture, or is an absolute account of welfare a better fit?

Unfortunately, taking a look at conceptualizations of welfare does not tell me which of my intuitions concerning cross-species comparisons of welfare is correct. Each of the competing conceptualizations is compatible with both of my intuitions about how to compare welfare across species, or so it seems. Some of these conceptualizations say, for example, that positive welfare for some individual *S* refers to (1) whatever makes *S*'s life good for *S*, or to (2) whatever makes it more appealing to have *S*'s life, or to (3) whatever we have reason to want for *S*, provided that *S* is worthy of care, or to (4) the extent to which *S*'s life is appropriately related to things that are good for *S*, or to (5) the extent to which *S*'s life is suitable for *S*. Since these are conceptualizations of welfare, they should be compatible with all major accounts of welfare, unless their proponents are willing to claim that a major part of the discussion about welfare was really about a different topic. Some people actually make that latter suggestion, but I am skeptical.

Are there really two different notions that go under the heading of 'welfare': one that captures a relativized and a second one that captures an absolute prudential value? If this was the case, it might explain my two different intuitions about cross-species comparisons of welfare. In this case, people are not disagreeing about how to do cross-species comparisons; they are merely talking past each other, aiming at comparing what turn out to be two different things. Perhaps, this is true, but I am not convinced.

The conflict between relativized and absolute notions of welfare is not only relevant when we compare the welfare of different individuals at a particular point in time; it also matters with regard to comparisons of lifetime welfare. When we are comparing lifetime welfare (i.e. diachronic welfare) rather than welfare at a particular point in time (i.e. synchronic welfare), it becomes more complicated. For each individual, we need to aggregate synchronic welfare in some way in order to arrive at a score for diachronic welfare. Here again, it seems that two intuitions conflict. On the one hand, a longer life with a very positive score of welfare at each time seems clearly better for an individual than a shorter such life. This suggests that the absolute amount of welfare matters: the more well off years we make possible, the more good we do. For example, when it comes to saving lives, it seems correct to save a chimp rather than a mouse, if one cannot save both and this seems to hold even if their remaining lifetime would be the same. On the other hand, is a flourishing cat really better off than a flourishing dog, overall, merely because of her longer lifespan? If not, this counts in favor of relativizing: we do not tend to think that we do more good by bringing into existence a well off cat rather than a well off dog, merely because of the cat's longer lifespan.

In conclusion: I don't know. In some moods, I am attracted to a relativized notion of welfare, in others I favor an absolute one. I have no idea how to settle this issue and any suggestions are very welcome.



Paper

Dr. Teea Kortetmäki

Researcher Department of
Social Sciences and
Philosophy
University of Jyväskylä
Finland
teea.kortetmaki@jyu.fi

From Romania to Finland: All roads lead to sustainability

Dr. Teea Kortetmäki



In 2015, I felt honoured to receive the *Vonne Lund prize* at the EurSafe conference in Cluj-Napoca, Romania. My presentation discussed first world food security as an issue of human dignity, a topic that had received only very little attention in academic realms. Since that, a lot has happened in two years, in academic food ethics generally and in my own exercises within that field as well. This small retrospection can be read as a story about my personal research path or as a commentary on the topics that I have found to be of increasing importance in food ethics.

The paper I wrote about first world hunger for EurSafe was my first piece on food ethics, and it started an academic journey that has steered me towards new questions. I have continued to address the notion of food security from other angles. One nice consequence of the EurSafe paper was that I got the chance to co-author (with professor Tiina Silvasti) a chapter titled 'Charitable food aid in a Nordic welfare state: A case for environmental and social injustice' in the book on eco-social transition and social work. In this piece, we discuss in more detail the moral problems of charity-based food aid. Although reducing food waste by turning it into charity food appears to be a win-win-solution at first sight, it can be criticised on multiple basis. Essentially, it legitimises the charity food aid system, which provides only gifts instead of entitlements to food. The present system also legitimises wasteful practices and surplus production that have become a normal part of food system functioning, which is unsustainable.

I also integrated food security into a broader concern about sustainability. Promoting food security in a stable manner is not possible without the sustainability of food systems, and the two cannot do without each other. In the 2016 EurSafe paper, I discussed how the criteria of food security and sustainability together determine what kinds of food must be available for future generations to come. Many European traditional and artisanal food products and native cultivars may be threatened due to the increasing competition and pressure from globalising and more effective food markets. Therefore, it is an important question to ask whether we should, for example, aim to secure the availability of culturally important food products for future generations through protective food or agricultural policy measures.

Sometimes a particular topic seems to choose the researcher rather than vice versa. I feel this happened to me after I began to pay attention to the sustainability of food systems, for interesting things began to happen in Finland at the same time. In 2016, an innovative Finnish company introduced a new plant-based protein product *Nyhtökaura* ('pulled oats'). At the same time, broad public discussion emerged on the need to decrease the consumption of meat for environmental and health reasons. (The issues of animal welfare were also brought to table, but it was remarkable that they did not play as significant a role as the environmental and health points in this discussion.) This was followed by what became known as the 'vegetarian/vegan food boom': our small Finnish nation witnessed the emergence of vegan fast food products and meatless meals into the market shelves, the introduction of new plant-based proteins such as fava bean based *Härkis* ('favvy'), and a change in food culture where

vegetarian days became trendy and even restaurants began to compete in offering high-profile meatless options. At the same time, the major Finnish science funding institution decided to support a research project on novel protein sources, like plant-based proteins and insects, which would meet the sustainability and self-sufficiency challenges of the future. I am happy to be part of that project as a social science researcher.

It seems that the 'protein question' chose me. From the viewpoints of environmental sustainability, public health, and animal welfare, the research has already shown that the current Western levels of meat consumption and the industrial meat production systems are both unsustainable and unjust. The big impact of food systems on climate change cannot be reduced significantly by a transition in production methods or waste reduction: dietary transition is required as well. Finland is not the only European country where the discussion and public interest in dietary change has gained footing. It remains yet to be seen whether this trend becomes truly a more permanent transition that roots itself into mainstream food culture.

Calls for the dietary transition evoke many questions that have been but scratched at the moment. While there is a rich literature on the ethics of meat production and consumption, the ethics of novel protein products and the dietary transition towards more plant-based diets is in its infancy. This provides new opportunities and areas of inquiry for the researchers in food studies and food ethics. I am excited to be part of the research community that can witness and study these potentially remarkable times of change.

CALL FOR PAPERS

14TH EURSAFE CONGRESS

Professionals in Food Chains: Ethics, Roles and Responsibilities

13th -16th June 2018, Vienna, Austria



Background

The EurSafe 2018 Congress in Vienna will focus on the role of professionals and professions in the food chain. Within the public debate surrounding food it is often argued that the key to meeting current challenges is changing consumer behaviour. Professionals and practitioners like farmers, retailers, veterinarians, or researchers are only in the limelight when the media report on so called 'food scandals'. To better understand and get to grips with current and future problems in the food chain, it is essential that we pay greater attention to the role and position of professionals. Different expectations and interests lead to challenging and complex situations for all parties trying to understand the nature of the problems. Additionally, participating players act in different areas of responsibility and are subject to professional values and constructions of virtues, as well as expectations about their expertise. Therefore, the prominent questions are: What are the main ethical challenges for the professionals in the food chain? Who within this complex field holds responsibility for emerging issues? What does it mean for the food-related professions to work in a field of immense social tension? Which virtues are necessary to do a proper job?

Congress Topics

The EurSafe Congress 2018 welcomes submissions from a broad range of disciplines, including philosophy, agricultural science, law, economics, and sociology. The topics of the Congress will range from fundamental issues in ethics to veterinary medicine, from transparency in the food chain to animal welfare. We welcome papers that use case studies to expose problem areas and suggest guidelines on how to deal with them.

Congress topics include:

- Professional Roles and Responsibility: General Issues
- Sustainable Food Chains
- Novel Approaches in Food Production Systems
- Food Politics: Policy and Legislation
- Media, Transparency, and Trust
- Ethics of Consumption
- Veterinary Ethics
- Teaching and Research Ethics
- Aquaculture and agriculture ethics
- Food, plant and animal ethics

You are welcome to submit abstracts for oral or poster presentations via the conference web-site until 11th September 2017: www.vetmeduni.ac.at/eursafe2018. We welcome contributions on the topics above as well as general topics on food ethics, aquaculture ethics, agriculture ethics and animal ethics. All accepted contributions will be published as a short academic paper in a peer reviewed book published by Wageningen Academic Publishers.

We are also open to make room for workshops upon request during the conference. Furthermore we explicitly welcome practitioners' contribution with non-scientific background. If you want to organize a workshop or submit a contribution as a practitioner (non-scientific background), please get in touch with the scientific organizers not later than 11th October 2017 via the following e-mail: eursafe2018@vetmeduni.ac.at.

Important dates

May 2017	Call for abstracts
11 Sept 2017	Deadline for submission of abstracts
11 Oct 2017	Notification of decision on abstracts to authors
8 Jan 2018	Deadline for submissions of full papers
8 Feb 2018	Notification of acceptance of full papers to authors
1 March 2018	Final submission of full papers
15 March 2018	Deadline for early bird registration

Please refer to the congress website for updated information and further details.
www.vetmeduni.ac.at/eursafe2018

Venue and organization

EurSafe 2018 will be held at the Messerli Research Institute – Unit of Ethics and Human-Animal Studies – at the University of Veterinary Medicine.
Veterinaerplatz 1, 1210 Vienna, Austria

Contact event management

For questions concerning registration, hotel booking and social program please contact the event management team of the University of Vienna.

E-mail: congress@univie.ac.at

Telephone: +43 1 42 771-17677

Contact scientific programme

For questions concerning scientific programme, scheduling and any other conference-related matter: E-Mail: eursafe2018@vetmeduni.ac.at

14TH EURSAFE CONGRESS

SCHOLARSHIPS for South-Eastern European Countries

The EurSafe Organizing Team is pleased about the opportunity to provide scholarships for researchers from South-Eastern European countries. PhD-students and scholars from South-Eastern European countries should be given the opportunity to apply for scholarships in order to participate at the congress.

General requirements for application

- Association with institution dealing with education at tertiary level and/or research
- Proven Interest in Veterinary Ethics and/or Food Ethics
- Submission for oral/poster presentation or contribution to pre-congress workshops
- Lack of alternative funding sources
- Letter of Motivation
- Professional CV (Europass format)

Please refer to the website for further details: www.vetmeduni.ac.at/de/eursafe2018/scholarships-for-south-eastern-european-countries

The EurSafe 2018 Organizing Committee

Heads of the Organizing Team: Herwig Grimm, Svenja Springer

Organizing Team: Andreas Aigner, Judith Benz-Schwarzburg, Samuel Camenzind, Christian Dürnberger, Martin Huth, Susana Monsó, Eva Schwarzinger, Elena Thurner, Kerstin Weich

Unit of Ethics and Human-Animal Studies, Messerli Research Institute University of Veterinary Medicine, Medical University of Vienna and University of Vienna

Co-organizer: Angela Kallhoff

Department of Philosophy, University of Vienna



Looking forward to seeing you in Vienna!

EurSafe Executive Committee Update

Franck Meijboom on behalf of the Executive Board

Time flies: when this Newsletter is published it is almost summer. However, this period just before the holidays always comes with a lot of teaching, exams, meetings, workshops, etc. Next year this period is also the moment for the 14th EurSafe conference! Herwig Grimm and his team of organizers of the EurSafe 2018 conference in Vienna already have set important steps towards a successful meeting in Vienna on 13-16 June 2018. The call for papers has been published a few weeks ago and is available at www.vetmeduni.ac.at/eursafe2018. We cordially invite you to submit abstracts in the coming months and using the summer period to reflect on possible ideas and results that you want to share with the EurSafe community. The aim of the conference is to set a spotlight on the role and responsibility of the professional, but – as always – abstracts submission with a broader scope are also welcomed.

Before the Summer break the Executive Committee will have a meeting. In this meeting we will follow up on the ideas for a EurSafe strategy focusing on the added value of the Society for its members and the role of communication. If you have any input for this meeting or more general questions, please let us know.



Best regards,

Franck Meijboom
On behalf of the Executive Board, June 2017



Conferences, symposia and workshops

JUNE 12-16

Vethics – ethical challenges for veterinarians in One World PhD-course

The course offers a week of ethical challenges, ideas, thoughts and values regarding the role and responsibility of veterinarians, as well as further issues on human-animal interaction in a dynamic world. The course is led by European researchers in animal ethics, animal welfare and animal science. PhD students in ethics, philosophy, history, sociology, economics as well as veterinary medicine and animal science are welcome.

More information at www.slu.se/vethics

Registration before May 15th to Anne.Larsen@slu.se

Course leaders: Helena Röcklinsberg, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, helena.rocklinsberg@slu.se and Mickey Gjerris, University of Copenhagen, mgj@ifro.ku.dk

Location: Sunnersta Herrgård, Uppsala, Sweden www.sunnerstaherrgard.se

Travels: Train to Uppsala Central, flights to Arlanda airport (north of Stockholm)

JUNE 20

Workshop: Empathy, Animals, Film

Basel, Switzerland

www.empathies2017.com

JUNE 22-25

Human-Animal Interconnection, ISAZ Conference 2017

Davis CA, USA

www.isaz.net/isaz/conferences

JUNE 29-30

Animals and Social Change, Centre for Human Animal Studies 2017 Conference

Liverpool, England

www.edgehill.ac.uk/cfhas/conferences

JULY 1-2

Minding Animals Germany Conference 4

Bielefeld, Germany

www.mindinganimals.de/news.html

JULY 3-5

Animal Intersections – Australasian Animals Studies Conference

Adelaide, Australia

www.animalstudies.org.au/conferences

JULY 23-26

The Ethics of Fur, Fourth Annual Oxford Animal Ethics Summer School

Oxford, UK

www.oxfordanimaethics.com/what-we-do/summer-school-2017

SEPTEMBER 5-8

7th International Conference on the Assessment of Animal Welfare at Farm and Group Level

Wageningen, Netherlands

www.wafl2017.com

OCTOBER 2-6

International Summer School: BEYOND THE PRECAUTIONARY PRINCIPLE? Ethical, legal and societal aspects of genome editing in agriculture

Subject: Beyond Precautionary Principle?

Recent advances in Genome Editing for agricultural purposes pose general questions in a new light: How should we regulate new breeding technologies for plants and livestock in a scientific way? What are the legal, societal and ethical backgrounds of the current food labelling practice in different countries, especially in Germany and the United Kingdom? Is food labelling an appropriate strategy to cope with uncertainty in risk discussions? Which alternatives could be suitable to respond to the specific protection needs of people, animals and the environment? Do we have to re-interpret the way the precautionary principle is understood in current risk assessments?

The international summer school will analyse and discuss corresponding scientific, legal and ethical questions not least by comparing the ongoing debates in Germany and the United Kingdom. This comparison is of particular interest since the political discussions, ethical evaluations and the juridical frameworks in the two states can be considered as counterparts. In addition, contrasting the situation in Europe and in the USA will reveal the arguments offered in favour of and against the need for labelling.

The summer school will discuss current debates about the use of Genome Editing in agriculture through an international and multi-disciplinary dialogue. The aim is to develop recommendations for more consistent ethical evaluation and legal framing. For these purposes, the summer school invites young scientists from the fields of molecular biology and agricultural sciences as well as politics, law, sociology and philosophy/ethics.

Gut Schönwag (Munich), Germany

www.ttn-institut.de/summerschool

NOVEMBER 8-10

Are Animal Studies 'Good to think?' (Re)inventing Science, (Re)Thinking the man/animal relationship

Strasbourg, France

animots.hypotheses.org/5981

NOVEMBER 21-23

4th Conference on Animal-Computer Interaction

Milton Keynes, England

www.aci2017.org

2018

JANUARY 17-24

Minding Animals International Conference 4

Mexico City, Mexico

Deadline call for abstracts: July 15, 2017

www.mindinganimals.com

JUNE 13-16

14th EurSafe Congress

Vienna, Austria

www.vetmeduni.ac.at/eursafe2018

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

Kate Millar

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

Secretary

Bernice Bovenkerk

Philosophy Group, Wageningen University, the
Netherlands
bernice.bovenkerk@wur.nl

Treasurer

Dirk de Hen

the Netherlands
dgdehen@gmail.com

Vice-president

Franck L.B. Meijboom

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

Members

Stefan Aerts

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

Diana Dumitras

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

Leire Escajedo

University of the Basque Country, Spain
leire.escajedo@ehu.es

Herwig Grimm

Messerli Research Institute
University of Veterinary Medicine Vienna
herwig.grimm@vetmeduni.ac.at

Anna Olsson

Institute for Molecular and Cell Biology
(BMC), Portugal
olsson@ibmc.up.pt

Thomas Potthast

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

Helena Röcklinsberg

Swedish University of Agricultural Science,
Sweden

helena.rocklinsberg@hnh.sl.se

Website

www.eursafe.org

EurSafe News

Chief-editor

Bernice Bovenkerk

Wageningen University
bernice.bovenkerk@wur.nl

Publications editor

Howard University, United States
director@bioethics.net

Editorial Board

Raymond Anthony

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

Mariska van Asselt

Aeres University of Applied Sciences
Dronten, the Netherlands
m.van.asselt@aeres.nl

Samuel Camenzind

Messerli Research Institute Vienna, Austria
samuel.camenzind@vetmeduni.ac.at

Jes Harfeld

Aalborg University, Denmark
jlh@learning.aau.dk

Simon Meisch

University of Tuebingen
simon.meisch@uni-teubingen.de

Kate Millar

University of Nottingham, UK
kate.millar@nottingham.ac.uk

Helene Nilsen

University of Bergen
helene.nilsen@uib.no

Mark Stein

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

Layout

Luc Dinnissen

studio ds, Nijmegen, the Netherlands
www.studiods.nl

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