



3rd International Seminar of CRB-Anim Infrastructure






Domestic Animals, Biobanks and Biodiversity

November 26th, 2019

Enjeux éthiques en conservation de la biodiversité

-François SARRAZIN, Sorbonne Université

Face à la crise actuelle de biodiversité, les valeurs que les humains accordent aux non humains, sauvages et domestiques, sont l'objet de nombreux débats en éthique environnementale. Valeurs instrumentales, intrinsèques et relationnelles ont été mobilisées à divers titres dans des approches anthropocentrées, biocentrées ou écocentrées au cours de l'histoire de la conservation de la biodiversité. Dans le cadre de la Convention sur la Diversité Biologique, des Objectifs du développement durable du PNUE, ou du cadre conceptuel de l'IPBES, les services écosystémiques et les contributions de la nature aux sociétés sont actuellement avancés comme possibles leviers d'action pour enrayer les pertes de biodiversité. Récemment, le « Life framework » a ouvert des perspectives de synthèse intéressantes pour réconcilier des approches souvent opposées. Néanmoins, on peut s'interroger sur la faible explicitation de la dimension évolutive de la biodiversité dans ces débats. Ceci conduit à limiter notre perception de l'ampleur des transitions impliquées dans le respect des trajectoires évolutives des non humains. Une telle approche, dite « évocentrée », qui respecterait de manière délibérée l'évolution des non humains au-delà de nos intérêts (cf. Figure), constitue en effet très probablement une nouveauté à l'échelle de l'histoire du vivant, constitutive de notre humanité.

SHOULD WE ...	Roots			Challenges		Consequences	
	INTRINSIC VALUE	CONSERVATION	WILDERNESS	ECOSYSTEM SERVICES (ES)		EVOLUTIONARY TRANSITIONS	IMPACTS
abandon attempts at biodiversity conservation?	None	None	None	Runaway consumption of biodiversity resources	 Blind Anthropocene	Minor	Major
conserve for the resilience of future human generations?	Human fitness	Anthropocentric	None	Long-term provisioning and regulating ES		Major	Major
conserve for the immediate well-being of human individuals?	Human well-being		Scenic wilderness	Short-term provisioning and cultural ES	 Deliberate Anthropocene		
conserve for the well-being of future human generations?	Human well-being and fitness		Scenic wilderness	Long-term provisioning, regulating, and cultural ES			
conserve for the well-being of future human generations and nature?	Human well-being and fitness Nonhuman fitness	Evocentric	Wildness beyond wilderness	Long-term evolutionary trajectories beyond ES	 Deliberate overcoming of the Anthropocene	Major	Minor

Sarrazin, F. & Lecomte, J. (2016). Evolution in the Anthropocene. *Science*, 351(6276), 922-923.





3rd International Seminar of CRB-Anim Infrastructure






Domestic Animals, Biobanks and Biodiversity

November 26th, 2019

Ethical issues raised by conservation of biodiversity

François SARRAZIN, Sorbonne University

In the context of the current biodiversity crisis, environmental ethics involve large debates on the values that humans place on non-humans, both wild and domestic. Anthropocentric, biocentric or ecocentric approaches have mobilized Instrumental, intrinsic and relational values throughout the history of biodiversity conservation. Within the framework of, the Convention on Biological Diversity the UNEP Sustainable Development Goals or the conceptual framework of IPBES, ecosystem services and nature contributions to people are currently advocated as possible levers for action to halt loss of biodiversity. Recently, the « Life Framework » has opened interesting perspectives of synthesis to reconcile previously opposite approaches. Nevertheless one can question the weak explanation of the evolutionary dimension of biodiversity in these debates. It limits our perception of the magnitude of the transitions involved in respecting the evolutionary trajectories of non-humans. Such an “evocentric” approach which would deliberately respect the evolution of non-humans beyond our interests (see Figure), is indeed a potential novelty at the scale of the history of life, defining our humanity.

SHOULD WE ...	Roots			Challenges		Consequences	
	INTRINSIC VALUE	CONSERVATION	WILDERNESS	ECOSYSTEM SERVICES (ES)		EVOLUTIONARY TRANSITIONS	IMPACTS
abandon attempts at biodiversity conservation?	None	None	None	Runaway consumption of biodiversity resources	 Blind Anthropocene	Minor	Major
conserve for the resilience of future human generations?	Human fitness		None	Long-term provisioning and regulating ES			
conserve for the immediate well-being of human individuals?	Human well-being	Anthropocentric	Scenic wilderness	Short-term provisioning and cultural ES	 Deliberate Anthropocene		
conserve for the well-being of future human generations?	Human well-being and fitness		Scenic wilderness	Long-term provisioning, regulating, and cultural ES			
conserve for the well-being of future human generations and nature?	Human well-being and fitness Nonhuman fitness	Evocentric	Wildness beyond wilderness	Long-term evolutionary trajectories beyond ES	 Deliberate overcoming of the Anthropocene	Major	Minor

Sarrazin, F. & Lecomte, J. (2016). *Evolution in the Anthropocene. Science, 351(6276), 922-923.*

