

Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services: Similar but Different

Author: Daniel P. Faith

Source: BioScience, 62(9) : 785

Published By: American Institute of Biological Sciences

URL: <https://doi.org/10.1525/bio.2012.62.9.17>

BioOne Complete (complete.BioOne.org) is a full-text database of 200 subscribed and open-access titles in the biological, ecological, and environmental sciences published by nonprofit societies, associations, museums, institutions, and presses.

Your use of this PDF, the BioOne Complete website, and all posted and associated content indicates your acceptance of BioOne's Terms of Use, available at www.bioone.org/terms-o-use.

Usage of BioOne Complete content is strictly limited to personal, educational, and non - commercial use. Commercial inquiries or rights and permissions requests should be directed to the individual publisher as copyright holder.

BioOne sees sustainable scholarly publishing as an inherently collaborative enterprise connecting authors, nonprofit publishers, academic institutions, research libraries, and research funders in the common goal of maximizing access to critical research.

Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services: Similar but Different

In their May Forum piece, Reyers and colleagues (2012) argued that narrow interpretations of *biodiversity* and *ecosystem services* have obscured common ground between the two. I am concerned that their narrow interpretation of *biodiversity values* as largely intrinsic has done the same thing. Although Reyers and colleagues acknowledged that biodiversity conservation occurs for lots of reasons, they claimed that it is often associated with a biocentric, intrinsic-value perspective and that “the concept of *biodiversity* emerges from an intrinsic context” (p. 503). However, the case for biodiversity conservation equally has its roots in anthropogenic values. For example, the *World Conservation Strategy* (IUCN 1980), written back when *biodiversity* was still *diversity*, strongly promoted conservation to ensure benefits for future generations. It called for conservation of diversity for present and future use. Similarly, McNeely (1988) highlighted the need for a “safety net of diversity.” McNeely (1988) linked such anthropocentric values to option values, reflecting the value of biodiversity in providing uses, often unanticipated, for future generations (for a review, see Faith 2007).

This broader perspective, based on anthropogenic use values, sheds light on Reyers and colleagues’ examples. These examples seem to have focused narrowly on intrinsic, nonanthropogenic, biodiversity values. In their win–neutral example, biodiversity conservation action supposedly has “no apparent human benefit” (p. 506), because no ecosystem services gains are apparent. In their win–lose example, fencing off protected areas, excluding hunting and other current human uses, supposedly makes biodiversity conservation hard to justify because it “will run counter to... human well-being” (p. 506). A narrow intrinsic-values perspective might justify these conclusions, but the broader perspective properly recognizes biodiversity conservation as also offering human-use benefits; it’s

just that these values may be more about option values and future generations than about the current benefits from those recognized ecosystem services.

Biodiversity and ecosystem services share common ground based on anthropogenic use values but may differ in how well they capture current and future uses. They are similar but different. Sustainability depends on finding synergies or efficient trade-offs among the many different needs of society, and a major challenge will be ensuring human well-being for both current and future generations.

DANIEL P. FAITH

Daniel P. Faith (danfaith8@yahoo.com.au) is a research scientist at the Australian Museum, Sydney, Australia.

References cited

- Faith DP. 2007. Biodiversity. The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, Fall 2008 ed. Stanford University. (29 June 2012; <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2008/entries/biodiversity>)
- [IUCN] International Union for Conservation of Nature. 1980. *World Conservation Strategy: Living Resource Conservation for Sustainable Development*. IUCN.
- McNeely JA. 1988. *Economics and Biological Diversity: Developing and Using Economic Incentives to Conserve Biological Resources*. International Union for Conservation of Nature.
- Reyers B, Polasky S, Tallis H, Mooney HA, Larigauderie A. 2012. Finding common ground for biodiversity and ecosystem services. *BioScience* 62: 503–507.

doi:10.1525/bio.2012.62.9.17

The Common Ground of Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services Demonstrated: A Response to Faith

There is a curious parallel between our article (Reyers et al. 2012) exploring the alleged differences between *biodiversity conservation* and *ecosystem services* and the alleged differences between Faith’s views and our own. In fact, Faith’s concern with our paper reiterates and demonstrates one of our main points: Narrow interpretations of values make the common ground between biodiversity and ecosystem services seem smaller than it is.

Faith accuses us of narrowing this common ground by focusing on the “biocentric, intrinsic-value perspective” of biodiversity, when in fact, we do not. Faith quotes us as saying “the concept of *biodiversity* emerges from an intrinsic context” and then argues that “biodiversity conservation equally has its roots in anthropogenic values.” We make this very point within the same sentence: “[A]lthough the concept of *biodiversity* emerges from an intrinsic context, the conservation of biodiversity is usually motivated by a wide variety of human values and choices.” Similarly, he quotes us as saying that some biodiversity conservation may have “no apparent human benefit,” but our next sentence states that “Such cases may prove hard to find in the real world, since there are few places where protected areas provide absolutely no benefits to people.”

It would appear that our views and those of Faith are not different on this point: Instrumental values hold much potential for finding common ground. Instrumental values are more than direct current use values (a point we make in the paper) and include current and future use and nonuse values, a sentiment that Faith apparently does not share when he states that biodiversity and ecosystem services “differ in how well they capture current and future uses. They are similar but different.” We propose, rather, that improved understanding and quantification of the impacts of environmental change on future provision of services will highlight even more common ground between biodiversity conservation and ecosystem services.

Some scientists focus on differences while others focus on similarity and common ground. We think in this case that differences have been exaggerated and common ground is, in fact, common.

BELINDA REYERS

STEPHEN POLASKY

HEATHER TALLIS

HAROLD A. MOONEY

ANNE LARIGAUDERIE

Belinda Reyers (breyers@csir.co.za) is affiliated with the Natural Resources and