

The politics of good food : why food engineers and citizen-consumers are talking at cross-purposes

Citation for published version (APA):

Haen, D. F. (2015). *The politics of good food : why food engineers and citizen-consumers are talking at cross-purposes*. Maastricht University.

Document status and date:

Published: 01/01/2015

Document Version:

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Please check the document version of this publication:

- A submitted manuscript is the version of the article upon submission and before peer-review. There can be important differences between the submitted version and the official published version of record. People interested in the research are advised to contact the author for the final version of the publication, or visit the DOI to the publisher's website.
- The final author version and the galley proof are versions of the publication after peer review.
- The final published version features the final layout of the paper including the volume, issue and page numbers.

[Link to publication](#)

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

If the publication is distributed under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license above, please follow below link for the End User Agreement:

www.umlib.nl/taverne-license

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at:

repository@maastrichtuniversity.nl

providing details and we will investigate your claim.

Valorisation addendum

Relevance

In this dissertation, I have presented an analysis of current public discussions on food technology and innovation in the Netherlands, as well as a number of recommendations to technology developers, citizen-consumers and dialogue facilitators for how to improve the quality of such discussions. The general thrust of my argument is that better discussions are those in which people are more responsive to concerns generally regarded as ‘soft’; which, in turn, may help the (re-)building of trust between those who make our food, and those who eat it. A deeper understanding and recognition of whatever citizen-consumers hold dear is a vital step towards the ideal of responsible innovation, and consequently, the development of better food production, food processing and food products. As long as this understanding is lacking, technology actors and societal actors will be talking at cross-purposes.

My recommendations do not present a recipe for public trust. The importance of trust emerges where absolute certainties are missing. Relations of trust cannot be enforced but need to grow; and one can only cultivate a seedbed from which the growth of trust is at least not impossible. Nor do my recommendations offer a recipe for better food products. It takes a food engineer to know what creative and innovative possibilities are given within the limits of food technology. At least I have suggested why and how food engineers need to explore these possibilities, and what direction this exploration may take: towards the more ‘experiential’ aspects of food (i.e. generally regarded as soft) – those aspects that seem immeasurable, private and causally unrelated to technologies as such; and for which food engineers may not consider themselves responsible at face value.

Stakeholders

My research results are of interest, therefore, first and foremost, to

technology (en)actors in the field of food innovation – and, given the kind of ‘soft’ concerns I have identified – those who are specifically involved with food *processing*. Although I have addressed food engineers in particular, my analysis should be instructive for many more actors in academic and industrial fields of food technology who are faced with public distrust; and from my critical analysis of the instrumentalist conception of technology it should become clear that responsibilities for ‘soft’ impacts may reach beyond the distinction between technology ‘as such’ vs. its application. Attention for ‘soft’ concerns, in other words, should not be left to marketing departments alone.

But if the quality of public dialogue is at stake, the imperative of responsiveness cannot apply to only one side of the table. I have presented several recommendations to societal actors who (try to) raise concerns that are generally regarded as soft. These include a broad variety of citizen-consumers who actively (and sometimes frequently) express their concerns on discussion forums, online and offline, some in the role of food professional, some speaking on behalf of NGO’s, some as concerned parents, and some simply as sceptical consumers. Their interest is to be heard and adequately responded to. The key message for them is two-fold. If they have specifically ethical, cultural or aesthetic concerns, they better not conceal it; and they should articulate the ways in which their concerns are entangled with ‘harder’ food issues already recognized as legitimate by those they seek to address. Especially those who aspire to have a structural and substantial influence on the public food innovation agenda – the Slow Food movement, for example – thus need to master both techno-scientific *and* ethical-esthetical repertoires. My analysis and recommendations show why and how to connect both.

A third group to whom my findings are of interest consists of those who are interested in facilitating public deliberation and dialogues on the innovation of food (and) technology, and bring the aforementioned stakeholder groups together (e.g. consultancy firms, communication advisors, governmental policy analysts, technology assessors and ‘science cafe’ organizers). The dialogue setting as well as the techno-ethical scenario design (criteria) suggested in this dissertation should provide them with guidance, if and when they have the ambition to set

up a dialogue (series) that is more responsive than is currently the case with public discussions on food technology.

A fourth group, whom I did not explicitly address in my dissertation but to whom my analysis may well be instructive, are those who report public controversies and potential issues in food innovation and technology. Those include journalists and reporters on science, technology or food-related issues, and policy advisors who seek to draw a representative image of current positions, views and concerns in any of those fields. If they are interested in making a fair representation of current issues in food and technology, my dissertation urges them to take 'soft concerns' into serious consideration. Serious consideration here means to take them seriously on their own terms rather than instantly framing them as mere expressions of fear and romanticism.

Activities

I have shared the results of my research – and more importantly, the perspective I have developed in achieving those results – with some of these people in several ways.

I have participated in *De Nationale DenkTank*, a Dutch Think Tank of young academics. We conducted a field analysis of the sustainability of the food supply chain in The Netherlands, and presented our recommendations to key stakeholders – such as CBL (Dutch food retailers' trade organization) and FNLI (Federation of Dutch food industries). In the working group Consumers we have promoted the importance of food culture for developing a more sustainable food supply chain (Nationale DenkTank 2012).

In order to share our main findings and provoke further discussion, I have organized a stakeholder conference together with the research project team I am part of, and in collaboration with Schuttelaar & Partners consultancy. We asked leading experts in the philosophy and sociology of food to moderate several discussion sessions, each addressing specific 'soft' concerns. The conference was attended by a number of food engineers, policy advisors, communication professionals and marketers. In preparation of this conference, we

have launched a project website (Fasos-research 2013) and set up an open LinkedIn discussion group. Also, we published a YouTube animation video, produced by Daan Dirk de Jonge and Didier Jansen, in which our main findings are explained in lay terms (De Jonge 2013).

Furthermore, I appeared in a science radio show, in an episode dedicated to gluttony and food studies (Hoezo Radio 2013) and posted an article on Foodlog, a news blog on virtually all aspects of food production and consumption (Haen 2013). I have presented key findings of my analysis of the food additives controversy in Voeding Nu, a magazine for professionals in the food sector (Haen 2014), and at VMT Food Event 2014, an annual conference for food professionals, the theme of which was food trust.

Contribution

Over the past five years, the issue of trust has become a growing priority on public as well as institutional food (technology) agendas in the Netherlands – although one could reasonably argue that food trust has been an issue of all times. In the public sphere, but also in the food sector in particular, this issue has given rise to an often-heard call for more transparency about food products, their origins, how they are processed and what health and safety warrants are in place. My main contribution to the discussion of food trust is distinctive in the sense that I challenge this call: more transparency will not do. In order to (re-)establish a mutual relation of trust with consumer-citizens, food innovators and other technology (en)actors in the food supply chain will have to engage in public dialogue and respond to substantial consumer concerns about good food – even if they do not consider themselves primarily responsible for those concerns. If they don't, they may miss out on early warning signals and creative business opportunities. The persistent controversy of E-numbers suggests that public trust in technologically produced and processed food is too fragile to leave it up to information campaigns and the mechanism of the free market.

References

- Jonge, D.D. de, [DaanDirk] (2013, October 17) *Met elkaar in gesprek over voedseltechnologie*. YouTube video at <http://youtu.be/GqNSqlvJ7xg>
- Fasos-research (2013) Maatschappelijk verantwoord innoveren in voedseltechnologie, project website, retrieved 26 August 2014 from <http://fasos-research.nl/responsiblefoodtech/>
- Hoezo Radio (2013, August 15), *Vraatzucht*, NTR Science programme, retrieved 26 August 2014 from <http://www.npowetenschap.nl/programmas/hoezo-radio/Uitzendingen/2013/augustus/15-08-2013-vraatzucht.html>
- Haen, D. (2013) 'De tragiek van het E-nummer'. Blogpost on *Foodlog*, 3 September, retrieved 26 August 2014 from <http://www.foodlog.nl/artikel/tragiek-van-het-e-nummer/>
- Haen, D. (2014) 'E-nummers: geen omkijken meer naar je eten', in: *Voeding Nu* 16 (5/6), 27.
- Nationale DenkTank (2012) *Verduurzaming van de Voedselketen*. Final report, retrieved 31 July 2014 from <http://www.nationale-denktank.nl/wat-doen-wij/denktank/resultaten/denktank-2012/>