

Political actions are required to address biodiversity loss, not additional scientific knowledge

September 12 2018



The population of green turtles (*Chelonia mydas*) illustrates an impressive successful conservation measure. After concrete protection and banning their trade that had decimated their population, the average number of green turtle clutches deposited annually at Ascension Island has increased sixfold between 1977 and 2013. (Photograph taken on Mooréa) Credit: Thomas Vignaud/Te Mana O Te Moana/Centre for Island Research and Environmental Observatory (Perpignan)/CNRS Photo Library

Over 15 years, almost 13,000 scientific papers have been published in leading conservation science journals. Yet biodiversity remains threatened at a global scale. Two CNRS researchers have focused on this worrisome paradox by taking a deeper look at this large volume of literature. One of the major problems is that decisions are usually more favorable to human activities than to nature protection. Their study appears in *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*.

The sixth mass extinction is accelerating, but [conservation](#) scientists, critics claim, offer no solutions. Some argue that conservation findings are so pessimistic that their warnings are actually counterproductive. But is this really the case? Two CNRS researchers have addressed this question. They examined the 12,971 research articles published during the last 15 years in the main scientific journals dedicated to conservation.

Excluding articles dealing with discussions in the discipline, they proposed the first extensive empirical assessment of the scientific background and output of conservation science in describing the current status of biodiversity, the threats, and the solutions accumulated by scientists.

Their initial conclusion is indisputable: the remaining threats to biodiversity today were already identified nearly 40 years ago, when they were quoted the "evil quartet." They are (i) habitat destruction (ii) overexploitation of resources, i.e., overhunting or overfishing for example; (iii) introduction of invasive species; and (iv) co-extinctions that may be triggered by these factors. To these four well-established threats, researchers add the concern of climate change, which further destabilizes natural environments. And it is not "exotic" [biodiversity](#) alone that is endangered—most research has focused on European

ecosystems, showing that populations of common species and habitats are also suffering. This is, for example, the case for birds in the French countryside.

But fortunately, conservation research also reports good news like the comeback of the wolf in Europe and clear improvements resulting from the application of conservation measures. Hence, they conclude that [conservation science](#) is neither pessimistic nor optimistic—just realistic. According to the researchers, a lot of sustainable and human-friendly solutions are already available. The major obstacle is the demand for concessions even more favorable to resource exploitation rather than to nature protection, despite timid scientific recommendations.

More information: Laurent Godet et al. What Conservation Does, *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* (2018). [DOI: 10.1016/j.tree.2018.07.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2018.07.004)

Provided by CNRS

Citation: Political actions are required to address biodiversity loss, not additional scientific knowledge (2018, September 12) retrieved 4 May 2024 from <https://phys.org/news/2018-09-political-actions-required-biodiversity-loss.html>

<p>This document is subject to copyright. Apart from any fair dealing for the purpose of private study or research, no part may be reproduced without the written permission. The content is provided for information purposes only.</p>
--