Editorial

Richard P. Haynes

Accepted: 11 May 2012 / Published online: 23 May 2012
© Springer Science+Business Media B.V. 2012

The current issue contains eleven articles and two book reviews. This issue is the first issue to reflect a significant increase in the size of each number.

The author of the first article is Vincent Pompe. In “Moral entrepreneurship: Resource based ethics,” Pompe reports on his studies of business ethics to demonstrate what actual moral entrepreneurship can do in bringing about moral change by combining effectively social, policy, norm, and economic related values. He uses a moral business practice formed out of the relationship between the veal calf industry of the VanDrie Group and the Dutch Society for the Protection of Animals (DSPA) in their development and implementation of a Welfare Hallmark for calves to show a remodeling of capabilities of both organizations in the light of co-creation of values. He sketches out a resource-based ethics with Deweyan concepts as end-in-view and transactionality of means and ends. The organizations studied “show in their entrepreneurship the ability to create, what is called ‘Room for Maneuver’ by exploring, socializing, individualizing, and growing. By maneuvering they set off a form of co-evolution between business and ethics.”

The second article, “Antibiotic Resistance Due to Modern Agricultural Practices: An Ethical Perspective,” is by Joan Duckenfield. In this article, the author discusses the regulatory hurdles and ethical dilemmas of banning the practice of using subtherapeutic doses of antibiotics in food-producing animals, which has been linked to antibiotic resistant infections in humans, within the context of the risk analysis model (risk assessment, risk management, and risk communication). While the practice was banned in Europe, US regulatory agency have been slow to act. Specific issues include unethical use of scientific uncertainty during the risk assessment phase, the rejection of the precautionary principle leading to ineffective risk management, and the criticality of risk communication to build consensus and force action. The underlying root cause is a conflict of values (Type I ethical

R. P. Haynes (✉)
University of Florida, Gainesville, FL, USA
e-mail: rphaynes@ufl.edu

problem) among key stakeholders, which the authors examines in depth along with an ethical analysis using public health ethical values.

In the third article, “Ethical Consumption, Values Convergence/Divergence and Community Development,” authors Michael A. Long and Douglas L. Murraey explore convergence and divergence of ethical consumption values through a study of organic, fair trade, and local food consumers in Colorado. As evidence, they use survey and focus group results to examine demographic and attitudinal correlates of ethical consumption. The evidence shows that while many organic, fair trade, and local food consumers converge around similar values, some Colorado consumers support only local food, while opposing the consumption of organic and fair trade products. They then look at how ethical consumers who converge and diverge frame their commitment to consuming ethically. They then conclude that to enjoy long-term sustained success, community development planners of projects that focus on ethical consumption will need to successfully traverse issues stemming from convergence and divergence.

The fourth article is by Bernward Gesang. In “What Climate Policy Can Be Morally Justified?” The author sketches out what a utilitarian should support when considering global warming along with what measures can be recommended to political leaders for utilitarian reasons, and concludes by recommending three strategies: (1) global emissions trading in comparison with a global CO₂ tax; (2) and investments in renewable energies should be increased; (3) and a policy aimed at slowing down population growth.

The fifth article, “Rights and Nature. Approaching Environmental Issues by way of Human Rights,” is by Andrew T. Brei. In this article, the author claims that ethical, aesthetic, religious, and economic arguments for the conservation and protection of the natural environment have made relatively little headway, so he recommends a rights approach. Although there have been three rights based approaches, the author argues that the best approach grounds duties toward nature on the human right to health. This approach has the benefits of being straightforward, uncontroversial, and simple.

The sixth article is by Joost Leuven and Tatjana Višak. In “Ryder’s painism and his criticism of utilitarianism,” the authors defend utilitarianism against Richard Ryder’s “painism” and his critique of both Singer’s utilitarianism and the deontological theory of Tom Regan. To start with, the authors examine the kernel and historical sources of Ryder’s painist theory, linking it to the work of John Rawls and Jean-Jacques Rousseau. Then they examine Ryder’s critique of utilitarianism and his use of the word “sentience.” Finally, they examine the counterintuitive implications of Ryder’s theory and argue that “utilitarianism might have more resources for dealing with its own alleged counterintuitive implications than Ryder acknowledges.”

In the seventh article, “Is Eating Locally a Moral Obligation?” Gregory R. Peterson looks at the various arguments to support the claim that we should eat locally, he concludes that “eating locally can play a role in reducing environmental impacts, this is not necessarily so, and once removed from instrumental considerations, eating locally is more likely at best an imperfect duty.”

In the eighth article, “The organic food philosophy. A qualitative exploration of the practices, values, and beliefs of Dutch organic consumers within a cultural-historical frame,” the authors, Hanna Schösler, Dr. Joop de Boer, and Prof. Jan J. Boersema investigate the choice for organic from a cultural-historical perspective and aim to reveal the food philosophy of current organic consumers in the Netherlands. First they give a concise history of the organic food movement. The authors use a number of in-depth interviews to determine that the wish to return to a more natural lifestyle by a much larger part of Dutch society than those currently shopping for organic food distancing from materialistic lifestyles, and reverting to a more meaningful moral life are still current among consumers as well as the sense of a connectedness to nature, awareness, and purity. These values, they argue, are shared by a much larger part of Dutch society than those currently shopping for organic food. They conclude that, “Strengthening these cultural values in the context of more sustainable food choices may help to expand the amount of organic consumers and hereby aid a transition towards more sustainable consumption.”

The ninth article is by Obidimma C. Ezezika, Jennifer Deadman, and Abdallah S. Daar. In “She came, she saw, she sowed: Re-negotiating gender-responsive priorities for successful development of agricultural biotechnology in sub-Saharan Africa,” the authors argue for the importance of incorporating a gendered perspective for the successful development of sustainable agricultural biotechnology systems in sub-Saharan Africa for successfully addressing food security and poverty reduction in this region. They use interviews with key stakeholders and a review of current literature and field observations. Finally, they explain the consequences “of failing to include such gender-responsive considerations into priority setting for agricultural biotechnology development in the region and provide recommendations for how policy makers and project partners can avoid such oversights.”

The last two articles look at attitudes toward sustainability issues in two geographical regions: Southern Spain and the central Himalaya.

In the first of these, “Agricultural sustainability from a Societal View: An Analysis of Southern Spanish Citizens,” Melania Salazar-Ordóñez, Macario Rodríguez-Entrena, and Samir Sayadi examine European agriculture’s potential sustainability with regard to citizens’ preferences, focusing on southern Spanish citizens. Generally, the authors claim, European citizens are not satisfied with the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) due to misinterpretation of their preferences. A comparison is made between citizens’ preferences and the CAP aims and the main results indicate that agricultural economic, environmental, and social functions are equally important to the respondents in their study, even though the CAP prioritizes the economic ones. Nevertheless, some citizen groups agree with the agricultural model designed by the CAP.

The authors of the last paper, “Socio-Ecological and Religious Perspective of Agrobiodiversity Conservation: Issues, Concern and Priority for Sustainable Agriculture, Central Himalaya,” are Vikram S. Negi and R.K. Maikhuri. They describe the present scenario of agriculture, traditional and socio-cultural practices of retaining soil fertility and agrodiversity, policy dimensions, and strategies for management of the Himalayan agroecosystems. The authors claim that these traditional systems have been ignored by recent agriculture policy, but are now being recognized and training centers have been set up.