No Return from Biodiversity Loss

IN THEIR LETTER “BRAZILIAN LAW: FULL SPEED IN REVERSE?” (16 JULY, P. 276), J. P. METZGER and coauthors highlight the precarious plight of the Brazilian Forest Act (Código Florestal), embattled by new legislative reform that will effectively condemn old-growth remnants and forest regrowth in private landholdings throughout the largest tropical country on Earth. We would like to emphasize that the reforms could lead to irreversible loss of tropical biodiversity.

Rural private properties account for 39% of Brazil’s ~8.5M-km² territory and represent an essential component of forest biodiversity conservation that is separate from formally protected areas. Sadly, the short-term interests of powerful economic groups, influential landowners, and politicians ignore the conservation value of private-sector forests by diluting the Brazilian Forest Act.

The detrimental environmental and social impacts of brushing aside scientific evidence are exemplified by the proposed reductions in protected forest area requirements for riparian forest (buffer strips) located adjacent to rivers and streams. Current proposals ignore pervasive edge effects, whereby the influences of neighboring habitats such as cattle pasture permeate into forest areas, gradually decimating the canopy tree population (1). The reduction in buffer strips means that these landscape features will have decreased ability to both retain and connect forest species (2) and maintain water quality and flows (3). Landowners who comply with the new legislation would increase landscape fragmentation and reduce the value of their properties as a result of property-scale soil erosion and poor water catchment regulation within watersheds (4).

There is a glimmer of hope: The scientific community, environmental nongovernmental organizations, and the Ministry of Environment can still reconcile with the staunch proponents of Brazilian Forest Act reform. We need better communication among all segments of society and poor water catchment regulation within watersheds (4). Landowners who comply with the new legislation would increase landscape fragmentation and reduce the value of their properties as a result of property-scale soil erosion and poor water catchment regulation within watersheds (4).

There is a glimmer of hope: The scientific community, environmental nongovernmental organizations, and the Ministry of Environment can still reconcile with the staunch proponents of Brazilian Forest Act reform. We need better communication among all segments of society and poor water catchment regulation within watersheds (4). Landowners who comply with the new legislation would increase landscape fragmentation and reduce the value of their properties as a result of property-scale soil erosion and poor water catchment regulation within watersheds (4).
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that an additional 10 to 13 million people will reside in these regions by 2030 (3). To add another layer of complexity, the possibility of basing an integrated industrial ecology on biofuels (such as algae and lignocellulose) has received increased attention in southwestern United States (4). However, the water footprint represents a major sustainability challenge for future biofuel production (5–7).

In the future, increased demand for water for civic, agricultural, and even energy needs coupled with a decreasing supply could result in conflicts between states regarding water sharing, management, and use.

To address these issues and facilitate sustainable production of clean energy, state and federal governments should implement strict guidelines and a regulatory framework for water-use permits and water recycling. Commercial biofuel production permits should be given to companies and units that have implemented modern technologies for water recycling and conservation. New policies and regulations for water management and use should be a high priority for the sustainable development of a biofuel sector in order to meet liquid fuel needs in the United States without hampering the regional hydrologic pattern in the southwestern region of the country.
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the CTBT does not slow those who join the nuclear club for reasons of their own. Tactical weapon reliability is the hardest to judge without tests, and may well be the most likely to be used. Ignoring this is folly.

It is also folly to imagine that total nuclear disarmament is stable—it is far too easy to cheat, even with no testing.
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Response
I DID NOT CLAIM THAT THE COMPREHENSIVE Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) will “bring nuclear peace,” as Benford suggests. The CTBT is one step toward a nuclear weapon-free world. Others will be required, and each must promote stability and be verifiable. The process depends on a benefit-risk calculus of how best to ensure security.

Of the three states that have tested most recently, India and Pakistan did so in 1998, and only North Korea (in 2006 and 2009) did so after the Senate voted against the CTBT. In each case, it is arguable that prior U.S. ratification would have influenced the decision to test, particularly if U.S. ratification had led to ratification by China and others.

Benford claims that a direct (nuclear) test is necessary to ensure weapon reliability. This is not the case. Since 1996, the Stockpile Stewardship Program has been the basis for an annual certification of confidence in the reliability of nuclear weapons, both strategic and tactical (there are no technical differences between them that would affect confidence), without testing. The April 2010 Nuclear Posture Review foresees no future need for nuclear testing for maintaining such confidence, a position that the directors of the three nuclear weapons laboratories have endorsed (1). The Stockpile Stewardship Program has no direct correlation to constraining testing by potential adversaries, whereas the CTBT does. Such testing, and its damage to global stability, is not in the U.S. interest.
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