

Review of: "Biodiversity, Anthropogenic"

Stefan Ortiz Przychodzka¹

¹ Universidad Nacional de Colombia

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This manuscript brings a relevant discussion on the role of the human species in conserving and recreating biodiversity through domestication. The author criticizes the dominant idea that humans are merely destroyers of biodiversity, by giving several examples of diversification through domestication of animal and plant species.

The first paragraph states the main argument of the manuscript, turning around humans as destroyer vs. humans as promoters of biodiversity. This two-sided version of the debate on humans-biodiversity relationship is a bit simplistic and biased – and this is a problem throughout the text. The manuscript would gain much with a more precise and nuanced framing of this debate. For example, the author never really addressed to which extend the diversification of species through domestication can compensate the loss of “wild” biodiversity. There can be diversification on one side (e.g. traditional agriculture), but a bigger biodiversity loss on the other side (e.g. deforestation). This is not considered by the author in his argumentation.

Moreover, the manuscript could improve its theoretical and political positioning by including some reflection on the human/nature divide, and a problematization of the modern/pre-modern dualism. I suggest including the perspectives brought by Latour (“We have never been truly modern”), Donna Haraway, Anna Tsing and Jason Moore. These authors criticize notions such as “Anthropocene”, for keeping an epistemological and ontological human/nature divide. In particular, J. Moore’s notion of “Capitalocene” could provide this manuscript a stronger conceptual base for its argumentation. It supports the idea that the destruction of biodiversity has been driven, not by a human species in abstract, but by an economic system, capitalism that needs the appropriation of nature’s work together with the exploitation of human’s work to keep expanding. Additionally, the author could be more explicit and reflective about the values he is assigning to the non-human nature (I suggest consulting the IPBES framework on values, in particular the categories of instrumental, intrinsic and relational values of nature). There is a strong anthropocentrism in the argumentation, when considering domesticated biodiversity at the same level of importance as non-domesticated (wild) biodiversity. There is nothing wrong with this, but the authors’ own values should be more explicit in order to strengthen his arguments.

While the manuscript uses many referenced examples in support to the main argument, it also contains many broad and vague affirmations that need more precision and references. One example, is in the second paragraph in page 2: it is affirmed that “most of the human societies (...) used to conserve their resource base (...) and enhanced species and genetic diversity...”. This affirmation, which appears across the document in different versions, is very polemic and thus requires a more rigorous argumentation. Personal opinions are valid but require stronger argumentation and, if possible,

supporting references to maintain academic rigor. Finally, I suggest rethinking the title. As it is, it reads too short and vague - and does not completely reflect the content of the manuscript.

Thank you for this interesting contribution, I look forward to reading the improved versions.