

10-8-1999

Some Diversity on Biodiversity

IBPP Editor
bloomr@erau.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.erau.edu/ibpp>



Part of the [Biodiversity Commons](#), and the [Other Political Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Editor, IBPP (1999) "Some Diversity on Biodiversity," *International Bulletin of Political Psychology*. Vol. 7 :
Iss. 14 , Article 4.

Available at: <https://commons.erau.edu/ibpp/vol7/iss14/4>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in International Bulletin of Political Psychology by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact commons@erau.edu.

Title: Some Diversity on Biodiversity

Author: Editor

Volume: 7

Issue: 14

Date: 1999-10-08

Keywords: Global Biodiversity, Totalization, Utopia

Abstract. This article advocates for the need to qualify the political goal of maintaining and even increasing global biodiversity.

A large combination of governments, nongovernment organizations, groups, and individuals are engaged in political activities to maintain and even increase global biodiversity. However, in a political world--i.e., a world of infinite need and finite resources--these political actors may be committed to their goals without adequate consideration of both need and resources.

Biodiversity supporters typically argue that any reduction in biodiversity can bring with it the loss of flora and fauna potentially of great benefit to other flora and fauna. Another argument is that a belief in common evolutionary theories mandates a support for maintaining and even increasing biodiversity--otherwise evolutionary processes have less with which to work and adaptive possibilities suffer. (This second argument may be but a more complex ideological version of the first.)

One might well counter that a reduction in biodiversity can bring with it the loss of flora and fauna potentially of great harm to other flora and fauna. As well--if evolutionary processes have less with which to work--nonadaptive possibilities may suffer, the ratio of adaptive to nonadaptive possibilities may increase, and even the absolute number of adaptive possibilities may increase consequential to a decrease in nonadaptive possibilities. (To cite adaptive and/or nonadaptive possibilities--as if ripped out of ecological and historical contexts--may itself exemplify faulty thinking about evolutionary theories.)

What may be more integral to arguments supporting global biodiversity are conflated ideologies that any diversity of anyone or anything should be a goal of the True and Good and that any harm of anyone or anything is neither True nor Good. Yet even the Truest Believers of such ideologies, who also are supporters of global biodiversity, choose not to lead lives consonant with their beliefs--as can be seen by how they choose to dress, where and how they choose to seek shelter, and what they choose for sustenance and nutrition. Moreover, supporters of global biodiversity knowingly work against supporters of biodiversity reduction and even biodiversity irrelevance. In these cases, supporters of global biodiversity do not seem to be bothered with any real or potential loss.

In fact, the psychodynamics and cognitive systems and styles of supporters of global diversity seem to exemplify totalization--i.e., utopian perspectives that demand conformity, introjection, identification, and compliance on pain of the most noxious consequences. And twentieth-century history contains many examples of utopias begetting the most noxious consequences as atrocities. Save the whales, the rain forests, the birds. Can one do these things and also save the people? (See Hempel, L.C. (1997). Population in context: A typology of environmental driving forces. *Population and Environment: A Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 18, 439-461; Kidd, A.H., & Kidd, R.M. (1997). Aquarium visitors' perceptions and attitudes toward the importance of marine biodiversity. *Psychological Reports*, 81, 1083-1088; Petrinovich, L.F. (1999). *Darwinian dominion: Animal welfare and human interests*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press; van den Berg, A.E., Vlek, C.A., & Coeterier, J.F. (1998). Group differences

International Bulletin of Political Psychology

in the aesthetic evaluation of nature development plans: A multilevel approach. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 18, 141-157.) (Keywords: Global Biodiversity, Totalization, Utopia.)