THE IN A HURRY SERIES

Ecology

in a Hurry

Food webs, feedbacks, and ecosystems

Max Brocklesby

BOOKSINAHURRY.COM

Contents

The Whole Thing in One Page

Ecology is often drawn as a pyramid. Plants at the bottom, herbivores above them, predators on top, each species in its proper place. The picture is useful for one lesson about energy and misleading about almost everything else. Real ecosystems are networks in motion. Organisms change one another's abundance, alter the physical world, move energy and matter, and leave effects that can return later as feedback.

Start with scale. The same organism can be explained as an individual coping with heat, a population limited by births and deaths, a member of a community competing and being eaten, or part of an ecosystem moving carbon and nutrients. None of those views is complete. Ecology works by choosing the scale that contains the cause and then checking what crosses the boundary.

Populations can grow rapidly when resources are abundant, but growth changes the conditions that made it possible. Food per individual falls, disease can spread, enemies respond and reproduction changes. This negative feedback can restrain abundance without producing a fixed carrying capacity. Weather, habitat, movement and other species keep changing the effective limit.

Communities add interaction. Competition can narrow where a species persists. Predators can suppress prey and indirectly release organisms farther down a food web. Mutualists can make difficult habitats usable. Parasites can change population dynamics without consuming much biomass. Engineers such as beavers, corals and trees alter the physical setting itself. The niche is therefore not an address. It is a set of conditions, resources, encounters and effects.

Two kinds of traffic run through all of this. Energy enters, mainly through photosynthesis, and is progressively lost as heat through metabolism. Matter is reused. Carbon, nitrogen and phosphorus can move through producers, consumers, waste, detritus and decomposers before returning to living tissue. The dead are part of the operating system.

Food webs matter because consequences travel. A predator may alter plants without touching them. An abundant species may have modest leverage, while a rarer species can hold open space, build habitat or control a dominant competitor. Interaction strength is uneven, and indirect effects are often where the ecological result appears.

Disturbance is not a temporary insult to an otherwise balanced nature. Fire, flood, storms, drought, grazing and disease can help organise communities. What follows depends on severity, frequency, season, dispersal and history. Succession is contingent rather than a march towards one inevitable climax.

Some systems absorb change and recover. Others reorganise. Feedback can make a new regime self-reinforcing, so removing the original pressure does not necessarily retrace the path back. That possibility is the deepest reason ecology distrusts snapshots and simple reversal stories.

Human activity now changes ecological systems through land and sea use, direct exploitation, climate change, pollution and invasive alien species. These pressures meet inside food webs and biogeochemical cycles rather than arriving one at a time. The central ecological question is therefore not merely what lives here. It is what changes what, at what scale, through which pathway, and what happens next.

That is the book.

Why You Should Care

A lake can turn green because a farmer spread fertiliser kilometres away. The extra phosphorus reaches water, algae grow, dead cells sink, microbes decompose them and consume oxygen, and fish may end up with less usable habitat. The visible damage occurs several steps after the original action. Ecology is the discipline that follows those steps instead of stopping at the first effect.

That habit matters because modern life hides ecological dependence unusually well. Food arrives wrapped and refrigerated. Drinking water appears from a tap. Waste disappears into a pipe. Buildings separate us

from weather and soil. Yet crops still depend on water, nutrients, pests, decomposers and often pollinators. Fisheries depend on nurseries, prey, predators and ocean conditions. Rivers depend on whole catchments. Infrastructure changes the route by which ecological processes reach us; it does not abolish them.

Ecology also explains why counting can be insufficient. A habitat may contain many species and still have lost the interaction that once organised it. A predator can be uncommon yet strongly affect prey behaviour and abundance. A small population of an ecosystem engineer can create habitat for many others. Conversely, a locally common species can have little control over wider flows. Richness and abundance matter, but function depends on identity, interaction and scale.

The subject is also a defence against false reversibility. It is tempting to think that if pressure caused decline, removing the pressure should restore the previous state. Sometimes it does. Sometimes the pressure has already changed soil, sediments, seed sources, predators, competitors or habitat structure, and those changes now maintain a different system. Recovery can follow a different route from deterioration.

This is why environmental interventions often disappoint when they target an object rather than a mechanism. Removing one species can release another. Preventing every small fire can alter fuels and future fire behaviour. Restoring a habitat patch can fail if dispersal routes have vanished. Reducing nutrient input can take years to produce clear water if sediments continue releasing stored phosphorus. Ecology asks which feedback, bottleneck or connection now controls the outcome.

Timing creates another class of hidden change. Two species can remain present in the same landscape while their encounters weaken. Earlier springs can shift flowering, insect emergence and migration by different amounts. A plant and its pollinator can therefore share a map and miss one another in time. Ecological relationships occupy calendars as well as places.

There is a further reason to care: ecological change can be quiet before it is

abrupt. Soil carbon can decline, seed banks can shrink, habitat patches can become isolated, or nutrients can accumulate in sediment while the visible system still looks familiar. A drought, fire or disease outbreak then appears to cause a sudden collapse, when it may have exposed vulnerability built over years. Ecology trains attention on those slow variables before the final event attracts all the blame.

The discipline offers no universal recipe. Ecologists often explain mechanisms more confidently than they predict exact outcomes. A result from one lake or grassland may change with climate, history or spatial scale. Large experiments are difficult, long records are scarce, and real communities contain more interactions than any model can include.

That limitation is useful rather than embarrassing. Ecology teaches you what kind of answer to distrust: a fixed number without a time scale, a species list offered as a mechanism, a single cause in a network, or a promise that nature will return to an earlier state because the original disturbance stopped. It replaces those shortcuts with sharper questions about flows, encounters, feedback and scale.

Once you can ask those questions, a landscape stops looking like scenery. It becomes a set of processes producing the next moment.

The Core Ideas

1. Scale Changes the Answer

A fox is not an ecological explanation. To understand the fox, you need its prey, competitors, parasites, dens, climate, hunting ground and the seasons that rearrange all of them. Ecology begins when the organism stops being treated as a self-contained object.

This sounds obvious until you try to draw a boundary. An organism is surrounded by an environment, but the environment is not merely the weather and the ground. It includes other organisms, many of which are changing the physical conditions. Trees shade soil, slow wind and move

water into the air. Earthworms restructure soil. Reef-building corals create hard habitat in open water. Beavers turn moving streams into ponds. The distinction between life and setting remains useful, but cause runs both ways across it.

Ecologists organise this confusion into levels. A population is members of one species in a defined place. A community is the interacting populations there. An ecosystem includes the community, the physical environment and the movement of energy and matter between them. None is the one correct unit. Each reveals a different problem. The abundance of a moth may be explained at population level by births and deaths, at community level by host plants and parasitoids, and at ecosystem level by nutrient supply and disturbance.

Habitat and niche make the same distinction from another angle. Habitat is where an organism lives. Niche is harder: the conditions it can tolerate, the resources it uses, the times and places in which it acts, and the effects it has on others. A nest box can supply habitat. It does not supply food, remove competitors or guarantee a workable niche.

Joseph Connell made this visible on a Scottish shore in the early 1960s. Two barnacles occupied different bands of rock. The smaller Chthamalus could survive lower down, but there it was crowded and pushed off the rock by the larger Semibalanus, then called Balanus. Higher up, Semibalanus could not endure the heat and drying. One boundary was biological, the other physical. Where Chthamalus could live in the absence of its competitor was wider than where it lived in the full community. The difference became a textbook case of fundamental and realised niches.

Ecologists expose these relations by changing one part at a time. Shade one group of plants, exclude grazers from another, transplant barnacles across the shore, or compare the same species along a moisture gradient. The experiment asks whether the surrounding condition merely accompanies the pattern or helps cause it. Field reality remains messier than the treatment, but the intervention gives the relationship a direction.

Scale then changes the answer. Competition may exclude a species from a square metre while storms keep both species present across a coastline. A dry week can kill seedlings while a wet decade expands a forest. What looks stable in a five-year study may be one phase of a century-long cycle. Ecology is full of arguments that are both right because their observers chose different windows.

The discipline's basic move is therefore relational. Ask what the organism exchanges, suffers, alters and depends on, then ask over what space and time. A relation may be negligible for one individual and decisive when repeated across a population. It may be strong locally and disappear after movement connects patches. Ecological explanation grows by joining these scales without pretending one can stand in for the others. The fox becomes understandable when the world around it enters the sentence.

2. Population Growth Creates Its Own Resistance

Every population is an accumulation of four processes: births, deaths, arrivals and departures. If births and arrivals exceed deaths and departures, it grows. The arithmetic is plain. The behaviour it produces is not.

When each individual leaves more than one descendant, growth compounds. One pair becomes four, four become eight, and the curve bends upward because every addition can add more. Bacteria in fresh broth, an introduced insect without enemies, or deer entering empty habitat can increase at rates that look explosive. Exponential growth is not an exotic state. It is what reproduction does before its consequences catch up.

Those consequences create density dependence. Crowding can reduce food per individual, make infection easier, increase competition for territories or attract predators. Birth rates fall, death rates rise, or both. The population generates a response that slows its own growth: a negative feedback.

This is often compressed into carrying capacity, usually written K, the population size an environment can sustain. The phrase encourages the wrong picture of a hard shelf. Capacity moves. Rain changes plant growth. A harsh winter locks food beneath snow. Predators arrive. A new disease

spreads. Individuals deplete one resource and switch to another. The number that can persist this year may not be the number that can persist next year, and a population can damage the conditions on which its former capacity depended.

St Matthew Island in the Bering Sea supplies a brutal example. Twenty-nine reindeer were introduced in 1944. With abundant lichens, few predators and little hunting, the herd reached an estimated 6,000 by 1963. By 1966 only 42 remained. The familiar moral is that the herd crossed a fixed carrying capacity and starved. The evidence is more instructive. Heavy grazing had reduced winter forage, body weights had fallen, and the winter of 1963 to 1964 brought exceptional snow and weather. Density and climate interacted. The crash was not one cause crossing one line.

Feedback can also run the other way at low density. Some organisms struggle to find mates, defend themselves, hunt cooperatively or alter habitat when too few remain. Reproduction or survival may improve as a small population grows, then decline after crowding begins. This positive low-density relationship is called an Allee effect. It means scarcity can reinforce scarcity, which is one reason a remnant population can continue falling even after the original threat eases.

Time lags make the feedback harder to see. A long-lived population can remain abundant after recruitment has failed, because adults embody favourable conditions from earlier years. Predator numbers may continue rising after prey growth has slowed. Trees can survive drought while producing few seedlings, postponing the visible decline for decades. Present abundance is therefore a record as well as a state.

Chance matters throughout. A storm can kill regardless of density. A run of male births can matter in a tiny population. Immigration can rescue one local population while emigration drains another. Ecologists therefore separate deterministic feedback from demographic and environmental stochasticity, the ordinary randomness of who reproduces and what conditions arrive.

Populations are also spread across patches rather than poured into one

container. A pond can lose its frogs while nearby ponds supply colonists. A productive patch can export more individuals than it receives, while a poorer sink persists only through immigration. Link enough local populations and the regional metapopulation can survive repeated local extinctions, provided movement continues. This creates a rescue effect, but it can also hide decline. A patch may look self-sustaining while recruits are arriving from somewhere else. Fragmentation matters because it changes the demographic equation before it removes every patch.

Population ecology is not the search for one number at which nature becomes full. It is the study of rates that respond to population size, conditions and history. Limits exist, but they are verbs before they are ceilings.

3. Interactions Rewrite the Niche

Species do not enter relationships with labels attached. The same two organisms can harm one another, benefit one another or barely interact depending on hunger, density, season and place. Ecologists classify interactions because the signs matter, but the categories are starting points rather than contracts.

Competition occurs when organisms reduce one another's access to a limiting resource. It can happen within a species or between species, and it does not require combat. Two plants compete while standing still because each intercepts light or withdraws water. Competition can end in exclusion, but coexistence often depends on partitioning: different feeding times, root depths, prey sizes or microhabitats reduce overlap enough for both populations to persist. Connell's barnacles show exclusion within one band and coexistence across the shore because physical stress changes the contest.

Predation, herbivory and parasitism transfer energy from one organism to another, but their ecological effects differ. A predator usually kills several prey during its life. A grazer removes part of many organisms and may stimulate regrowth or kill the plant depending on intensity. A parasite lives in

or on a host, often for much of its life, and gains from keeping that host alive long enough to reproduce. These consumers can limit abundance, change behaviour and prevent one competitor from monopolising resources.

Mutualism gives both partners a net benefit. Flowers exchange nectar or pollen for transport by animals. Mycorrhizal fungi receive carbon from plants and extend access to soil nutrients and water. Corals house photosynthetic partners that supply much of their energy. Yet mutualism is not friendship. Interests overlap without becoming identical. A plant limits how much sugar it gives, a pollinator may steal nectar without pollinating, and a partner that helps under nutrient shortage can become a cost when nutrients are abundant.

Facilitation covers cases in which one organism improves conditions for another without requiring a balanced exchange. A shrub can shade seedlings in a hot dry place. Mussel beds create crevices that protect smaller animals. The importance of facilitation often rises under physical stress, which is why communities cannot be understood through competition alone.

Interactions also change behaviour before they change numbers. Prey may avoid rich feeding areas when predators are present, plants may alter chemistry after herbivore damage, and competitors may shift activity into different hours. These non-consumptive effects can redistribute energy and risk across a landscape without leaving an obvious pile of bodies.

The more surprising effects are indirect. A predator can benefit a plant by suppressing an herbivore. A parasite can weaken a dominant competitor and thereby help several other species. An abundant prey can keep a predator population high enough to depress a rarer prey, a relation called apparent competition because the two prey never contest the same resource. The food web carries the effect between them.

This is why removing one species rarely produces one clean subtraction. Its prey, predators, competitors, hosts, partners and habitat all face new conditions. Some respond immediately. Others respond after reproduction,

decomposition or migration catches up. A species interaction is less like a link in a static diagram than a change in the rules under which other populations live.

The public image of nature divides organisms into enemies and allies. Ecology replaces moral categories with consequences. Eating can preserve diversity. Help can become exploitation. Competition can be weakened by disturbance or strengthened by drought. The sign belongs to the relationship in its context, not to the species forever.

4. Energy Flows, Matter Returns

Every ecosystem runs on a budget. The budget has two currencies, and confusing them obscures most of how it works.

Energy enters mainly when plants, algae and some microbes capture sunlight and store part of it in chemical bonds. Gross primary production is the total captured. Producers use some of that energy to maintain and build themselves, so net primary production is what remains available for growth and for consumers. A green field can therefore capture a great deal of energy while offering less new tissue than its colour suggests.

When a caterpillar eats a leaf, much of the leaf is not assimilated. Of what enters the caterpillar, much is spent on respiration, movement and maintenance, then leaves as heat. Only a fraction becomes new caterpillar available to a bird. The same losses recur at each transfer. This helps explain why food chains tend to be short and why large predators are fewer than the organisms feeding them.

The famous ten per cent rule says roughly one tenth of production passes from one trophic level to the next. It is useful for building intuition and poor as a law. Transfer efficiency varies with food quality, metabolism, temperature, body size and whether the ecosystem is aquatic or terrestrial. A cow does not turn grass into cow at the same rate that zooplankton turn algae into zooplankton. The secure principle is loss, not a fixed percentage.

Matter behaves differently. Carbon, nitrogen, phosphorus, water and other

elements are rearranged rather than used up. A carbon atom can move from air into grass, into an antelope, into dung, into a microbe and back to air. Nitrogen can be fixed from the atmosphere by microbes, built into proteins, excreted, decomposed and transformed through several chemical forms before another root takes it up. Phosphorus usually arrives through weathering rock and has no large atmospheric reservoir, which gives it a different geography and timescale.

Elements must also arrive in workable proportions. A leaf may contain ample carbon yet little nitrogen or phosphorus for the animal eating it. The consumer then processes much material, discards the excess and remains limited by the scarcer element. Decomposers face the same arithmetic. This ecological stoichiometry helps explain why food quality, nutrient supply and decomposition are linked even when the total mass of material looks abundant.

Rates matter as much as totals. A forest can hold a large stock of carbon while adding little new biomass each year. A grassland can hold less standing material yet turn it over quickly. Ecologists therefore separate stocks from fluxes: what is present from how fast it enters, leaves and changes form. A large pool with a slow turnover behaves differently from a small pool replenished every week.

The dead are central. In many terrestrial ecosystems, far more plant material enters the detrital pathway than is eaten while alive. Fallen leaves, wood, faeces and carcasses are fragmented by animals and chemically dismantled by fungi and bacteria. Decomposition releases nutrients in forms producers can use, while some carbon enters long-lived soil pools. Temperature, moisture, oxygen and tissue chemistry control the rate, which is why a cold bog can accumulate peat while warm moist litter disappears quickly.

Energy and nutrient supply can constrain the whole web from below. Add nitrogen to a nitrogen-limited grassland and plant production may rise, though the extra supply can favour a few fast-growing species and reduce diversity. Add phosphorus to many fresh waters and algae can bloom. When

the algae die, decomposition consumes dissolved oxygen, turning increased production into hypoxia and fish death. The same nutrient that limits growth in one place becomes pollution in excess.

A food web drawn only from living producer to herbivore to predator is therefore half a map. The other half runs through waste, death, decomposers and soil or sediment. Energy passes through and escapes. Matter keeps returning, provided the organisms and processes that perform the return remain in place.

5. Food Webs Carry Indirect Effects

A food chain tells you who can eat whom along one route. A food web shows that consumers have alternatives, prey have several enemies, and effects can reach organisms that never touch. The web is a better picture, but it creates a harder question: which links matter most?

Robert Paine answered by removing one species. On a rocky shore in Washington State, he repeatedly prised the predatory sea star Pisaster ochraceus from experimental plots. Mussels expanded into the space the sea star had kept open. Several other species declined or disappeared locally as the mussels monopolised the rock. Pisaster was not the most abundant organism, but its effect was disproportionate to its abundance. Paine called this kind of influence keystone predation, borrowing the architectural stone whose removal can compromise an arch.

Keystone species are not a fixed guild of large predators. A pathogen, pollinator, herbivore or competitor can exert disproportionate control. Nor does the label mean the species is important in every place. The effect depends on the network and on the response being measured. A sea star that controls mussels on one shore may matter less where waves, heat or recruitment already limit them.

Trophic cascades are one way leverage travels. Predators reduce or alter herbivores, which changes plants or algae. The effect may come from killing prey, changing where prey feed, or both. Cascades are strong in some lakes, streams and coastal systems, and weaker or more diffuse in many

species-rich terrestrial webs. Saying that predators matter is safe. Predicting the size and route of the cascade requires local knowledge.

Control also moves upward. Primary production can be limited by light or nutrients, prey by plant production, and predators by prey supply. Ecologists once argued over top-down versus bottom-up regulation as competing descriptions. Most systems contain both. Nutrient enrichment may increase algae from below while fish determine which grazers survive to eat them from above.

Some organisms exert leverage by changing habitat rather than eating. Beavers fell trees and impound streams, altering water depth, flow, sediment and the area available to wetland species. Reef corals, kelps, peat-forming mosses and burrowing animals also create or modify physical structure. These ecosystem engineers change the network by rebuilding the stage.

Interaction strength matters. A consumer with several weak alternative foods may absorb the loss of one route, while a few strong links can control particular pathways. A strong link joining otherwise separate compartments may transmit disturbance across the web. Network diagrams become useful only when arrows are weighted by rates and placed in space.

Complexity does not automatically create stability. In the 1970s, Robert May showed that large random networks of strong interactions are mathematically less likely to settle at a stable equilibrium. Real webs are not random. Many links are weak, strong interactions are arranged in particular patterns, diets shift and space divides communities into compartments. Those features can damp disturbance. Others can transmit it. The question is not whether complexity is good. It is what kind of complexity, with what interaction strengths and response diversity.

The practical lesson is severe. Abundance is not influence, and direct links do not reveal all causes. To understand a food web, look for monopolists, suppressors, habitat builders, bottlenecks and alternative routes. The species that seems visually dominant may be replaceable. The quiet one

holding the structure open may not be.

6. Disturbance and History Build the Pattern

A fallen tree opens a patch of light. A flood strips plants from a bank and deposits new sediment downstream. Fire consumes vegetation, redistributes nutrients and leaves survivors in uneven pockets. These events are called disturbances because they disrupt organisms and resources. The name can make them sound external to the ecosystem. Often they are part of its ordinary operation.

After disturbance, communities change through succession. Fast colonists reach open space, modify conditions and are joined or replaced by species that grow more slowly, tolerate shade or compete differently. Early ecologists often described this as a march towards a stable climax community. The sequence can be directional, but the single destination is unreliable. Soil, surviving organisms, seed sources, weather and the next disturbance alter the route. History stays in the result.

A disturbance regime includes more than the event's name. Frequency, intensity, season, size and spatial pattern determine what survives and what can return. Two fires of equal area can have different effects if one burns patchily in spring and the other consumes soil organic layers during drought. Organisms are adapted, if at all, to regimes rather than to an abstract category called fire.

The contrast between primary and secondary succession shows how much legacy matters. Primary succession begins where little biological inheritance remains, such as fresh lava or newly exposed glacial ground. Soil must develop and colonists arrive across difficult distances. Secondary succession begins after disturbance leaves soil, roots, microbes, seeds or surviving patches. Recovery can be faster because the system is rebuilding from stored structure rather than starting from bare mineral.

Disturbance is defined relative to an organism and a scale. Fire kills an individual tree and may maintain an open woodland over centuries. A flood destroys a nest and creates gravel bars required by another species.

Frequent grazing can suppress shrubs; its removal can permit woody plants to take over. Calling an event destructive does not yet tell you what pattern it creates across a landscape.

This leads to several meanings of stability. Resistance is how little a system changes during disturbance. Resilience, in one common modern use, is how well it recovers afterwards. Persistence asks whether populations or functions continue at all. A community can resist drought but recover slowly once damaged. Another can fluctuate widely yet return quickly. Combining these under the single word stable creates false agreement.

Biodiversity can support stability through response diversity. Species performing similar functions may react differently to heat, drought or disease, so one continues when another fails. Long-running grassland experiments have found that more diverse plant communities often maintain production more steadily across variable years. Yet richness alone is not a guarantee. Which species are present, how their responses differ, and which function is being measured all matter.

The intermediate disturbance hypothesis proposed that diversity should peak at middling disturbance, where neither dominant competitors nor disturbance-tolerant colonists take over. It became famous because the story is elegant. Reviews have found no universal hump-shaped rule. Frequency, intensity, extent, productivity and species traits produce many patterns. Ecology keeps the mechanism and rejects the slogan.

The image of pristine nature as a finished arrangement is therefore misleading. Ecosystems have legacies, gaps, scars and recurring shocks. Remove every disturbance and you do not freeze nature in its ideal state. You select for a different system, sometimes while storing the fuel for a larger change.

7. Feedback Can Make Change Persist

Negative feedback restrains change: prey decline, predators find less food, and predation pressure falls. Positive feedback amplifies it: vegetation loss exposes soil, erosion makes plant recovery harder, and further vegetation is lost. Ecosystems contain both. Their balance determines whether a disturbance fades, persists or pushes the system into another state.

Shallow lakes provide the clearest model. In a clear lake, rooted water plants stabilise sediment, absorb nutrients and provide refuge for zooplankton that graze algae. Clear water lets more light reach the plants, reinforcing the clear state. Add enough phosphorus and algae multiply, shading the plants. Plant loss exposes sediment to resuspension and removes refuge for grazers. Nutrients remain available, turbidity blocks plant recovery, and a new set of feedbacks maintains murky water.

Reducing phosphorus remains necessary, but the route back may not retrace the route in. The turbid state can persist at nutrient levels under which the clear state once survived. This difference between the threshold for collapse and the conditions required for return is hysteresis. It explains why stopping a pressure can be followed by disappointing recovery without proving that the intervention was pointless.

Not every ecosystem has two neat stable states, and not every abrupt change is a threshold crossing. External conditions can keep moving. Recovery can be slow rather than blocked. Sparse observations can make a gradual transition look sudden. Alternative-state language is strongest where mechanisms, models and experiments agree, not wherever a graph bends sharply.

Ecological memory can either aid recovery or hold the new state in place. Seed banks, surviving roots, old burrows and nearby source populations can rebuild the former community. Altered soils, missing habitat builders and established invaders can do the opposite. What remains after disturbance determines which feedback gets the first chance to operate.

The concept still changes how ecological risk should be read. Slow

variables can prepare fast change. Nutrients accumulate in sediment, old trees disappear without replacement, soils dry, herbivores decline or habitat fragments until a visible event triggers reorganisation. The final storm or fire attracts attention because it is dramatic. The system's vulnerability was built earlier.

Human activity now acts through several direct pressures at once. Changes in land and sea use remove and divide habitat. Fishing, hunting and harvesting alter abundance and age structure. Climate change shifts temperature, water and seasonal timing. Pollution changes chemistry. Invasive alien species create new interactions. These pressures meet inside food webs rather than arriving in separate compartments, so their combined effect need not equal the sum of each in isolation.

Feedback also means living systems can modify physical change. Loss of vegetation can alter fire, water and carbon storage. Coral death removes reef structure that once reduced waves and sheltered recruits. Thawing soils can release stored carbon. Ecology does not replace climate science or biogeochemistry, but it shows why organisms are participants in planetary change rather than passengers.

The causal loop of the book now closes. Ecology begins by refusing to separate an organism from its relationships. That same relational structure can make change hard to reverse. Once neighbours, flows and habitat have reorganised, the new pattern changes the conditions faced by every component and begins reproducing itself.

The property that gives ecosystems persistence is also what can make damage persistent. That does not make every alteration irreversible. It means recovery has a mechanism too. Seeds must arrive, habitat builders must return, nutrient stores must change, or the reinforcing loop must weaken. Hope without that causal route is no more ecological than despair without one.

How It Actually Works

A lake is never only a lake

Stand beside a small temperate lake in early spring and it looks self-contained. Water fills a basin. Reeds edge the shore. Fish move beneath the surface. The boundary seems obvious.

Ecologically, it is a fiction. Water enters from rain, groundwater and streams carrying dissolved minerals, organic matter and whatever the catchment has acquired from farms, roads, forests and towns. Insects hatch from the lake and become food for birds over land. Leaves fall in. Fish-eating mammals carry nutrients out. Geese carry them in. Wind moves heat and organisms across the surface. A lake is a useful unit because many processes happen within it, but its causes cross the shoreline continually.

This is the first practical rule of ecology: choose a boundary that fits the question, then remember what crosses it. If the question is why algae are increasing, the lake may be too small a frame because the answer could sit kilometres away in the catchment. If the question is why one fish species occupies deeper water than another, the whole watershed may be too large. Scale is not an afterthought. It decides which causes are visible.

Spring gives a clean starting point because winter has stripped away much of the previous season's visible production. As light increases, algae and aquatic plants capture solar energy and turn carbon dioxide, water and nutrients into new tissue. Ecologists call the rate at which producers create organic material primary production. That production is the main energetic income of the system.

But sunlight alone does not determine the amount. Light can be blocked by depth or turbidity. Nitrogen or phosphorus can limit growth. Grazers can consume algae nearly as fast as they are made. Cold water can slow metabolism. A lake with abundant light may produce little because a nutrient is scarce. Add that nutrient and the response can be dramatic.

Production starts the traffic

Phytoplankton are eaten by zooplankton. Zooplankton are eaten by small fish. Small fish are eaten by larger fish and birds. Some plant tissue is grazed directly, but much of the lake's production enters another route: cells die, faeces sink, leaves fall in, and organic material becomes detritus.

The detrital route is not a side channel. Bacteria and fungi decompose dead material, converting large organic molecules into forms that other organisms can use and releasing nutrients back into circulation. Small invertebrates consume decomposers and fragments. Fish eat those invertebrates. What looks like a food chain therefore becomes a web with living and dead material joined together.

Energy and matter behave differently inside that web. Energy enters mainly as sunlight, is captured chemically, passes through organisms and is gradually dissipated as heat through metabolism. It does not cycle back to the sun. Carbon, nitrogen and phosphorus are matter. They can be reused many times. A phosphorus atom released from a dead algal cell can be taken up by another producer, pass into a grazer, return in waste and enter a new round.

This difference is why ecosystems need a continual energy supply but can run for long periods on repeated use of limiting elements. It is also why the loss of decomposers would be catastrophic. The green surface depends on the organisms processing what has died beneath it.

Trophic efficiency is often taught as a ten-per-cent rule, as though exactly one tenth of the energy at one level becomes biomass at the next. The useful idea is narrower. Transfers are inefficient because organisms do not eat all available biomass, do not assimilate everything they eat and use much of what they assimilate for respiration and maintenance. The fraction varies greatly among organisms and ecosystems. What remains true is the consequence: less usable energy is generally available to support biomass at higher trophic positions.

Populations write their own limits

Suppose a mild spring produces abundant phytoplankton. Zooplankton now have more food, so survival and reproduction may improve. Their population rises after a delay. Increased grazing then suppresses phytoplankton. Small fish feeding on zooplankton may rise later still, reducing the grazers and allowing algae another release.

This is feedback. The current state changes the conditions that produce the next state. It can generate cycles without any external clock. Wild systems add weather, age structure, refuges, migration, disease and alternative foods, so the pattern is rarely as clean as a textbook predator-prey graph. The mechanism remains useful because it tells you what to look for: delayed responses between linked populations.

Density matters in other ways. When fish are crowded, food per individual can fall, disease may spread more easily and competition for breeding sites may intensify. Population growth therefore often slows as abundance rises. That does not imply a permanent carrying capacity written into the species. The effective ceiling changes with temperature, prey, habitat, predators, oxygen and the wider landscape.

Movement can make local decline compatible with regional persistence. A fish population may disappear from a small connected pond and later be recolonised. Aquatic insects may occupy patches linked by adult flight. Ecologists use metapopulation ideas when colonisation and local extinction are both part of the explanation. The important shift is from asking whether a patch is occupied to asking how the network of patches keeps being occupied over time.

Neighbours change the niche

As summer develops, species are sorted by more than physiology. A plant may tolerate a depth range in the absence of neighbours but be confined to a smaller zone when shaded by taller species. A fish may be able to survive at several depths yet feed only where predators, prey and oxygen conditions allow it to persist. The place an organism could occupy and the place it does occupy are not necessarily the same.

Competition is one mechanism. Predation is another. Parasites and pathogens can alter abundance without removing large amounts of biomass. Mutualists can make a habitat usable that would otherwise be marginal. Habitat-forming organisms can alter the physical world itself. Reeds slow water and trap sediment. Mussels filter particles. Beavers elsewhere turn streams into ponds. Corals build three-dimensional structures that become habitat for thousands of other organisms.

The important word is conditional. Two species can compete for one resource and facilitate one another under harsher conditions. A predator can stabilise coexistence by suppressing the strongest competitor, or destabilise a small prey population if no refuge exists. A mutualism can become costly when the partner's benefit disappears. Ecological interaction types are useful labels, but the effect depends on abundance, environment and what else is present.

This is where food webs begin to behave unlike chains. If a large predatory fish suppresses smaller fish that eat zooplankton, then more zooplankton may survive, which can reduce phytoplankton. The predator has an indirect effect on algae without eating a single algal cell. Change one link and the consequence can travel through several others.

Such cascades are real but not automatic. Omnivory, alternative prey, behavioural avoidance, nutrient supply and habitat complexity can weaken or redirect them. The correct lesson from famous predator examples is not that every ecosystem is controlled from the top. It is that interaction strength is uneven, and some species have effects far larger than abundance alone

would predict.

Summer separates the water

By summer, sunlight warms the surface. In many lakes the warm upper water becomes less dense than the cold water below, producing layers that mix poorly. This physical change reorganises ecology.

Near the surface, light can support photosynthesis. In deeper water, sinking organic matter is decomposed. Microbes respire while doing that work and consume oxygen. If the lower layer is isolated from the atmosphere and decomposition demand is high, oxygen can fall sharply. Fish that need well-oxygenated cold water may be squeezed between warm water above and low oxygen below.

The same lake can therefore contain different ecological worlds stacked vertically. The boundary is not a wall. It is a temperature gradient maintained by physics and reinforced by biological activity.

Autumn cooling can break the stratification and mix oxygen and nutrients through the water column again. Seasonal turnover is a reminder that an ecosystem is not one state. A census taken in June and another in October can describe the same lake accurately while making it look like two different systems.

Time scale changes interpretation elsewhere too. A meadow after a fire may appear devastated at one week, full of germination at one year and transformed in species composition after a decade. A forest can maintain roughly constant total biomass while individual trees die and are replaced. Stability has to be attached to a variable and a time window before the word means much.

Disturbance is part of the machinery

A storm can mix the lake in midsummer. A drought can lower its level and concentrate nutrients. A flood can bring sediment and new organisms. A cold winter can kill fish. Disturbance removes biomass, changes resources or alters physical conditions, but that does not make disturbance an external violation of an otherwise balanced system.

Many ecosystems are organised partly by recurring disturbance. Fire can maintain open habitats. Floods can reset river bars. Grazing can prevent one plant from dominating. Storms can create canopy gaps where light reaches seedlings. The ecological question is therefore not whether disturbance occurs, but its regime: how often, how intensely, how long, over what area and in what season.

The intermediate disturbance hypothesis once offered an attractive general rule that diversity should peak at intermediate disturbance, with weak disturbance allowing competitive exclusion and strong disturbance eliminating too many species. It remains a useful mechanism in some settings, but broad empirical tests do not support it as a universal law. Disturbance interacts with productivity, dispersal, life histories and the spatial pattern of the event.

Succession describes change after disturbance, but it is not a conveyor belt heading towards one ordained climax. Which species arrive first matters. Surviving roots, seed banks and soil organisms matter. Nearby source populations matter. So do later fires, grazing and climate. History changes the next set of possibilities.

Patchiness is part of the design

Walk around the shoreline and the lake changes over metres. One bay is sheltered and silty, another exposed and stony. Reeds create cover, fallen wood creates structure, depth changes light, and inflowing streams deliver different material. Organisms respond to that patchiness, then add more of it. A mussel bed, plant stand or nesting colony can create conditions that differ sharply from the surrounding water.

This spatial variation can preserve diversity by preventing one competitor or predator from controlling every place at once. Refuge matters. So does recolonisation. A disturbance that clears one patch may create opportunity if survivors or immigrants can reach it. The same disturbance across the entire landscape can have a different result because there is nowhere left to supply recruits.

Connectivity therefore has two faces. It can rescue declining populations and move genes, seeds or larvae between patches. It can also spread disease, predators, invasive species or disturbance effects. More connected is not automatically better. The relevant question is what is moving, between which patches, and at what rate.

Ecology becomes clearer when space is treated as structure rather than empty distance. A habitat map records area. An ecological map asks which places differ, which are linked, and which organisms can cross the gaps.

The catchment arrives in the water

Now add people to the watershed. Fertiliser is applied to fields. Wastewater adds nutrients. Soil erosion moves phosphorus bound to sediment. The lake does not experience these as separate social categories. It experiences altered rates of material entering the system.

Whole-lake experiments in Canada made this mechanism unusually visible. In the Experimental Lakes Area, David Schindler and colleagues manipulated nutrients at ecosystem scale. One famous experiment divided a lake and added phosphorus to only one side of the treatment regime. The phosphorus-enriched water developed the conspicuous algal response that smaller experiments had predicted. Later work helped establish phosphorus control as central to reducing eutrophication in many fresh waters.

Why can extra production end with dead fish? Because the first consequence is not the final one. Nutrients stimulate primary producers. More organic matter is then available to sink and decompose. Microbial respiration consumes oxygen. If physical mixing cannot replace it fast enough, low-oxygen conditions spread. A treatment that began by

increasing growth can end by making habitat unusable for animals that need oxygen.

The exact outcome depends on depth, temperature, flushing, food webs, sediments and nutrient ratios. That variation is not a loophole in the mechanism. It is the mechanism operating through different system structures.

Pollutants, introduced species, harvest and climate warming enter the same web of interactions. A warming lake may stratify earlier or for longer. Harvest can change fish size structure and predator abundance. An invasive mussel can alter water clarity and nutrient pathways. A shoreline development can remove nursery habitat while also increasing runoff. Real ecosystems receive combinations, and the combinations can create responses that would not be predicted from each pressure in isolation.

When the lake starts helping the change

Most change is gradual. Some is not. Shallow lakes provide one of ecology's clearest examples of how feedback can make two contrasting regimes possible under similar external conditions.

In a clear-water state, submerged plants stabilise sediment, take up nutrients and provide refuge for zooplankton that graze algae. Clearer water then allows more light to reach the plants. Several processes reinforce the clear state.

Increase nutrient loading enough and algae may become dense. Water becomes turbid. Submerged plants lose light and decline. Without plant cover, sediment is more easily resuspended and refuge disappears. Fish that prey on zooplankton may keep grazers low. Turbidity then helps maintain the turbid state.

The important feature is not the dramatic phrase tipping point. It is that the system can begin generating conditions that favour its current regime. If that happens, reducing nutrient input to the previous level may not be enough to recover the former state. The return path can differ from the decline path.

Ecologists call that hysteresis when the threshold for recovery differs from the threshold for deterioration.

Alternative stable states are not a universal explanation for ecological change, and demonstrating them in nature is difficult. Long transients, unmeasured drivers and gradual change can imitate threshold behaviour. The concept earns its place when there is evidence for the feedbacks that would maintain different regimes, not because a graph happens to bend sharply.

The system is larger than the lake

Step back once more. Lakes are connected to rivers, wetlands, forests and human land use. Populations are connected by dispersal. Migrants carry energy and nutrients between habitats. Climate links distant regions through temperature and precipitation. A local food web sits inside a landscape and a climate system.

This is why ecological answers change with scale. A fire can reduce local abundance and maintain regional habitat diversity. A reserve can hold suitable habitat yet fail if organisms cannot reach it. A species can remain globally common while disappearing from many local communities. Local species richness can even rise while communities across a region become more similar to one another.

Modern ecology therefore combines experiments, long-term observations, remote sensing, genetic and chemical tracers, automated sensors, statistical models and networks of field sites. No single method is enough. Experiments help identify causes but usually operate at limited scales. Observational records cover larger areas and longer periods but carry confounding factors. Models make assumptions explicit and allow mechanisms to be tested, but their predictions are only as useful as their structure and data.

The discipline works by moving among these imperfect views. A mechanism survives when it explains patterns across more than one method, scale or system without claiming more precision than the evidence supports.

How we know

Ecology has an unusual evidence problem: the relevant unit may be a lake, forest, coastline or migration network that cannot be replicated like test tubes. Strong inference therefore comes from combinations of evidence. Field manipulations such as Connell's barnacle removals and Paine's sea-star removals isolate interactions. Whole-ecosystem experiments such as the Experimental Lakes Area test whether mechanisms survive in a complete system. Long-term plots and censuses reveal slow change and recovery. Remote sensing extends observation across landscapes. Models expose what a proposed mechanism would imply if its assumptions were true.

Each method leaves something out. Small experiments can miss landscape processes. Large observations can confuse cause with correlation. Historical sequences can contain unique accidents. The best ecological claims are those that remain standing when different methods with different weaknesses converge on the same mechanism.

What People Get Wrong

"Nature is balanced"

The image is ancient: left alone, nature settles into harmony, with predators preventing excess and every species occupying its proper share. Ecological feedback can produce regularity, but there is no universal set point. Populations fluctuate, climates shift, species arrive, and fires, floods and storms leave legacies. Some systems cycle. Some drift. Some change direction after a rare event.

The myth also confuses regulation with harmony. Predator-prey feedback can keep abundance within bounds while individual animals starve or are killed. Stability at one level can be maintained by relentless turnover at another.

The myth persists because a human lifetime is a poor viewing window. A

mature woodland can look timeless while its age structure records old storms and land use. A stable average can hide constant turnover underneath. The correction matters because balance creates the wrong baseline. It can also hide shifting baselines: each generation accepts the depleted system first encountered as normal and judges later change against it. Historical records, fossils, photographs and local knowledge extend the comparison beyond living memory. Disturbance is not always damage, and removing disturbance can transform the system one hoped to preserve. The useful question is not whether nature has returned to normal. It is which processes, ranges and feedbacks have persisted.

"Carrying capacity is a fixed number"

Textbook graphs often draw a horizontal line labelled K and show a population approaching it. The line is a model parameter, not a fence installed in the landscape. Food, water, shelter, disease, predators, weather and the population's own effects all move the number that can persist.

A population can also overshoot because present abundance reflects favourable conditions in the past. Long-lived animals survive after reproduction has exceeded renewal of their food. A harsh season then exposes the gap. St Matthew's reindeer did not encounter one timeless ceiling. High density, depleted forage and exceptional winter conditions met at once.

Managers sometimes need a number, and estimates can guide harvest, stocking or reserve design. The honest number is therefore conditional and usually a range. It should move when rainfall, habitat quality, age structure or competition moves.

Carrying capacity remains useful when treated as an outcome, estimated for a defined population, place and period. Treat it as a property stamped on a habitat and it hides the mechanism. Limits are conditional, and populations can change them.

"A food chain is how an ecosystem is organised"

Grass, rabbit, fox is easy to remember because it gives every organism one job and every effect one route. Real consumers switch foods. Prey have several enemies. Omnivores feed across trophic levels. Juveniles and adults can occupy different positions. Dead material enters a detrital web that may process more production than grazers do.

A chain is useful for following one transfer of energy. It becomes misleading when used as the architecture of the system. Remove one prey and a predator may switch to another. Add nutrients and several paths can strengthen at once. A change can reach a plant through a predator that never touches it.

A useful food web also includes interaction strength. A predator that eats one prey rarely may matter less than a weak-looking link used by millions of consumers. Lines without rates turn every possible meal into an equal force and can make the web look more connected than it functions.

Food webs are harder to draw because they admit alternatives and indirect effects. That difficulty is the reason to use them. The central ecological question is rarely who eats whom once. It is how the network rearranges when rates and choices change.

"About ten per cent of energy always reaches the next level"

The ten per cent rule survives because it explains two large patterns quickly: food chains are short and predators are scarce. It is an order-of-magnitude teaching aid, not a constant of nature.

Transfer depends on what is measured. Consumption efficiency asks how much production is eaten. Assimilation efficiency asks how much eaten material crosses the gut. Production efficiency asks how much assimilated energy becomes new biomass rather than respiration. Warm-blooded animals spend heavily on metabolism. Woody plant tissue is difficult to consume. Aquatic algae are often more edible and turn over faster than

terrestrial vegetation.

The number can even depend on where the level is drawn. Detritivores feed on material from several living levels, and omnivores cross categories. Averaging them into one step can hide the route by which production reached the consumer.

The robust conclusion is that usable energy declines at each transfer, often sharply. Writing 10 per cent beside every arrow gives fake precision and can produce bad estimates. Use the rule to understand the pyramid, then replace it with measured rates when the number matters.

"Mutualism means cooperation without conflict"

Both partners gain from a mutualism, but neither has renounced its own interests. Plants benefit when animals move pollen between flowers. Animals benefit from nectar or pollen. That overlap does not stop nectar robbing, pollen theft, poor service or the plant restricting access.

The sign can also change with conditions. Mycorrhizal fungi may improve a plant's access to scarce phosphorus or water, while the carbon cost becomes less worthwhile when soil resources are abundant. Some partnerships depend on sanctions, partner choice or repeated exchange because cheating remains possible.

Some mutualisms are ancient and tightly integrated; others are loose exchanges among replaceable partners. Dependence matters. Losing one pollinator may be disastrous for a specialised plant and barely noticed by a generalist visited by twenty species.

Calling mutualism cooperation imports a moral story that ecology does not need. The relation persists when benefits, costs and alternatives make it favourable to both sides. That is more interesting than harmony because it explains why the association can be strong, conditional and vulnerable at the same time.

"More species always means a healthier ecosystem"

Experiments often find that greater plant diversity increases production, resource capture or stability. Different species use resources in complementary ways, and varied responses can insure a function against drought or disease. Those are substantial results. They do not turn species richness into a universal health score.

A polluted pond can contain many tolerant or introduced species while losing the functions and native community that mattered. A naturally species-poor bog can be intact. Adding a predator can reduce local richness while restoring a process. Composition, abundance, traits, genetic diversity, connectivity and the chosen function all change the judgement. Two communities with the same richness can differ completely if one contains habitat builders, predators and decomposers while the other contains many species performing similar roles. Redundancy may protect a function, but identity can still decide whether the function exists.

Even the count depends on scale. Restoring varied habitats can raise regional diversity while some individual patches become dominated by fewer specialists. Local loss and regional gain can occur together, as can the reverse.

Richness is easy to count, so it attracts meanings it cannot carry. Ask which species, which function, which spatial scale and compared with what baseline. More can be better without making every larger count better.

"Remove the pressure and nature will bounce back"

Some ecological recovery is impressive. Stop a disturbance and surviving organisms reproduce, recolonise and rebuild. The error is assuming that reversal must follow the same path as decline.

Pressure can remove seed sources, soil structure, habitat builders or predators. Nutrients can remain in sediment. An introduced species can

maintain new interactions. A turbid lake can keep its plants shaded after phosphorus inputs fall. The system is then governed by feedback created during degradation, and recovery may require conditions beyond those that once kept it healthy.

The missing ingredient may be time, recolonisation or a rare sequence of favourable years. Ecologists distinguish a blocked return from a long transient by following mechanisms and trajectories, not by declaring failure after one season.

Slow recovery is not proof of an irreversible threshold, and active intervention belongs to conservation rather than to every ecological explanation. The general correction is enough: history changes the starting state. Remove the cause because it is necessary. Do not confuse necessary with sufficient.

Use It

Trace the flow

When a system produces a surprising outcome, follow energy and material before reaching for motive or labels. What entered? What was transformed? Where did it accumulate? What left?

A green algal bloom looks like an excess of life. Trace the flow and the later oxygen shortage becomes intelligible: nutrients enter, algae capture energy and grow, dead cells sink, decomposers consume oxygen, and animals face hypoxia. The visible symptom appears after several transfers.

The same lens works in soil, forests and food webs. Ask what pays for new biomass, where waste goes, and who performs the return journey from dead material to usable nutrient. A system can look rich while depending on one narrow inflow, or look wasteful while recycling the substance that limits it. Stocks tell you what is present. Flows tell you how it continues.

Look for feedback, not snapshots

A snapshot gives a state. Ecology asks what that state causes next.

A large prey population feeds more predators, which can reduce future prey. Dense plants shade seedlings, which changes later recruitment. Vegetation slows erosion, allowing more vegetation to establish. The first two relations tend to damp change; the third can amplify it. Naming the feedback tells you whether the present pattern is likely to restrain or reproduce itself.

This prevents two common errors. The first is projecting a short trend forever, as though rapid growth creates no response. The second is treating a sudden change as having a sudden cause. Positive feedback can store vulnerability while the surface looks steady, then turn a small trigger into rapid reorganisation. Ask what response the current state generates, and whether that response pushes the system back or farther away.

Change the scale

Before accepting an ecological claim, alter the frame. Does it remain true over a metre, a watershed and a region? Over one season, a generation and a century?

A species can decline in one patch while thriving regionally. Local richness can remain high while every site becomes more alike. Fire can kill most organisms within a plot and maintain habitat diversity across a landscape. A predator can suppress prey in an enclosure while prey movement weakens the effect outside it.

Boundaries deserve the same treatment. A reserve, lake or woodland is crossed by water, animals, pollutants and seeds. What appears to be an internal change may have arrived from a catchment or source population beyond the map. Draw the boundary where the process operates, not where administration happens to stop.

Scale is not a nuisance added after the answer. It is part of the answer. Many disputes disappear when each claim is attached to its spatial and temporal window. The practical habit is to state the window before the

conclusion: abundance where, measured when, compared with which period? An answer without scale is often a result waiting to be misused.

Find the slow variable

Visible ecological change is often controlled by something that moved quietly beforehand. Soil organic matter declines over years. Nutrients accumulate in sediment. Old trees die faster than young trees replace them. Habitat patches become isolated one road at a time. The final drought, fire or disease outbreak then receives all the blame because it is the event people saw.

Slow variables matter because they alter feedback and reduce options. A forest with many age classes can lose some trees and retain structure. A forest made of similarly old trees may look intact until mortality arrives together. A lake can absorb nutrient inputs until sediments, plants and grazers reorganise.

When a system seems suddenly fragile, ask which capacity had already been spent. Monitoring only the fast variable is like watching the match and ignoring the fuel.

Ask what altered the encounters

Populations do not interact in the abstract. They meet through space, timing and behaviour. Change those encounters and the ecological relation changes even if the species list does not.

A road can divide breeding habitat without removing every animal. Warmer springs can shift flowering and insect emergence at different rates. Artificial light can change when predators and prey are active. Fishing can remove large individuals and alter who eats whom. A disease can spread faster when hosts crowd around a new food source.

This lens is useful because habitat loss is often described as area alone. Area matters, but arrangement, corridors, edges and timing decide whether organisms find mates, hosts, prey and refuge. Ask who now meets more often, who no longer meets, and which encounter has moved into the wrong

season. Ecology happens at contact.

Separate resistance from recovery

A system that changes little during a shock is resistant. A system that changes and returns quickly is resilient in the recovery sense. These qualities can point in different directions.

A mature stand of large trees may resist a mild drought because deep roots reach water, yet recover slowly if the trees die. A grassland can brown rapidly and regrow after rain. Judging both by the size of the first visible change confuses two different capacities.

The distinction also changes what evidence counts. A before-and-after photograph can show resistance or visible damage, but recovery requires repeated measurement. Production may return before species composition, and vegetation cover before soil structure. Different indicators can announce success at different dates without any of them being false.

The distinction improves any discussion of stability. Ask what must persist: species composition, total production, soil retention, water clarity or some other function. Then ask whether success means absorbing the disturbance, recovering afterwards or avoiding a threshold. The word stable is too cheap until the object and timescale are named.

The limits

Ecological thinking can become an excuse for paralysis. Everything connects to everything, context matters, interventions have indirect effects, and certainty is scarce. All true. None means that action is impossible or that every claim deserves equal doubt.

Some mechanisms are well established. Nutrient enrichment can cause eutrophication. Habitat removal reduces the space and connectivity available to dependent organisms. Harvest can change population structure. Greenhouse warming changes physical conditions to which species and interactions respond. Uncertainty concerns magnitude, timing and local outcome more often than the existence of the pressure.

The systems lens can also tempt people into treating ecosystems as persons with health, needs or intentions. Those metaphors can guide attention and then overreach. Ecology can describe persistence, production, diversity and change. It cannot decide by itself which species, landscape or future people ought to value. That judgement belongs to ethics, politics and conservation.

Nor should feedback language be turned into prophecy. A loop that could amplify change may be weak. A threshold in a model may not exist in the field. A correlation across sites may reflect an omitted cause. Use ecological concepts to sharpen questions, then demand evidence at the relevant scale.

The one thing to keep

Keep the consequence after the consequence.

Most explanations stop one step too early. A predator kills prey. Fertiliser grows plants. Fire destroys vegetation. A dam holds water. Each statement can be true and still miss the ecological result.

What happens because prey became scarce? Which competitor gains after plants grow? What recruits into the burned patch? Which sediment, temperature and species follow the dammed water? The second consequence often travels through a different organism or process, and the third may return to reinforce the first.

That habit changes the natural world from scenery into causation. The tree is not only standing there. It is shading soil, lifting water, feeding fungi, catching wind and changing the seedlings that can replace it. The wolf is not only eating. It is altering prey numbers, movement and the pressure placed on plants. The dead leaf is not finished. It has entered another route through the web.

Ecology does not ask you to memorise every connection. It asks you to expect connections, then trace the few strong enough to change the system. Once you do, a landscape no longer looks like a collection of things.

It looks like what happens next.

Terms

These are the words that let ecologists separate questions that ordinary language blurs. Each term is useful only when its boundary, scale or measured quantity is made explicit.

Ecology. The science of how organisms relate to one another and to physical conditions, including the processes that determine distribution, abundance, energy flow and material cycling across space and time.

Habitat. The place or type of place in which an organism lives. Habitat describes location and structure, not the full set of resources, tolerances and relations required for persistence.

Niche. The conditions a population can tolerate, resources it uses, times and places in which it acts, and effects it has on competitors, consumers and habitat. A niche is relational, not an address.

Population. Members of one species occupying a defined area and connected enough by reproduction, movement or shared conditions to be studied as a demographic unit with changing births and deaths.

Metapopulation. A regional set of local populations linked by dispersal. Local patches can be colonised, rescued or lost while the wider population persists, so connectivity and patch dynamics become part of demography.

Community. Populations of different species living and interacting in a place. Community boundaries are chosen for a purpose and may shift with scale, season, dispersal and sampling method.

Ecosystem. A community together with its physical environment and the exchanges of energy and matter between them. The term can apply to a pond, forest, catchment or the biosphere, depending on the question.

Abundance. The number or amount of an organism in a defined area. It may be measured as individuals, biomass, cover, density or another quantity suited to the organism and question.

Density dependence. A change in birth, death, immigration or emigration rate caused by population density. Competition, disease, social behaviour and predator response commonly create it, often with a delay.

Carrying capacity. The abundance that can persist under specified conditions. It is an emergent and moving outcome, not a permanent maximum stamped on a habitat.

Limiting factor. A resource, condition or interaction that most constrains a biological rate under the circumstances. Change supply, season or neighbours and a different factor may become limiting.

Allee effect. Reduced individual survival or reproduction at low population density, often because mates, cooperative defence, habitat modification or other benefits become too scarce.

Competition. A relation in which organisms reduce one another's access to a limiting resource. It can occur without direct contact and within or between species.

Predation. Consumption in which a predator kills prey and usually takes several prey during its life. Predators can alter prey abundance, behaviour and community structure.

Herbivory. Consumption of plants or algae. Grazers may remove tissue without killing the organism, and their effects range from stimulating regrowth to changing whole landscapes.

Parasitism. A relation in which a parasite gains resources from a host and reduces its fitness, usually while depending on the host remaining alive for some period.

Mutualism. An interaction giving both partners a net benefit under stated conditions. Benefits can be unequal, partners can cheat, dependence can differ, and the sign can change with context.

Primary production. The rate at which producers build organic matter from carbon dioxide using light or chemical energy. Net production excludes

energy producers use themselves through respiration.

Trophic level. A position in a feeding pathway, such as producer, herbivore or predator. Omnivory, life-stage changes and detrital feeding make real positions less tidy than textbook levels.

Food web. A network of feeding relations among organisms. It reveals alternative routes, omnivory and indirect effects that a single food chain cannot show, especially when links are weighted.

Detritus. Dead organic material and waste, including leaves, wood, faeces and carcasses. It feeds a major pathway through decomposers and detritivores in soils, sediments and water.

Decomposition. The physical and chemical breakdown of dead organic matter, driven largely by fungi, bacteria and detritivores, which releases nutrients and carbon compounds.

Biogeochemical cycle. The movement and transformation of an element such as carbon, nitrogen or phosphorus through organisms, atmosphere, water, soil, sediment and rock.

Keystone species. A species whose ecological effect is large relative to its abundance. The label depends on the system and mechanism, not body size or public appeal.

Ecosystem engineer. An organism that creates, modifies or maintains physical habitat, thereby changing resources and conditions for other species. Beavers and reef corals are familiar examples.

Succession. Directional change in community composition after new habitat or disturbance. The route depends on colonists, survivors, soil, climate, interactions, dispersal and further disturbance rather than one ordained endpoint.

Disturbance. An event or process that removes organisms, changes resources or disrupts structure. Its meaning and effect depend on intensity, frequency, season, extent and ecological scale.

Resistance. The degree to which a population, community or function changes little during a specified disturbance. Resistance does not imply rapid recovery, continued diversity or survival after severe damage.

Resilience. The capacity to absorb disturbance without losing organisation, or, in another common use, to recover afterwards. The object, disturbance, reference state and timescale must be stated.

Regime shift. A substantial and persistent reorganisation of an ecosystem's structure, function or feedback. Some regime shifts cross thresholds and show hysteresis; others reflect sustained external forcing or long transients.

Go Deeper

The inviting overview: Sean B. Carroll, *The Serengeti Rules: The Quest to Discover How Life Works and Why It Matters* (Princeton University Press, 2016). Carroll tells the story of biological regulation through the scientists and field systems that exposed it, moving from molecular control to predators, herbivores and whole landscapes. It is narrower than a general ecology textbook and stronger for it. Read it for the human route into feedback, keystone effects and trophic cascades, with enough narrative movement to carry a newcomer. Its focus on regulation makes it an ideal bridge from familiar wildlife stories to ecological mechanism.

The full discipline: Michael Begon, Colin R. Townsend and John L. Harper, *Ecology: From Individuals to Ecosystems*, 4th ed. (Blackwell Publishing, 2006). This is the large version of the subject compressed here: populations, interactions, communities, ecosystems and applications, with the mechanisms separated carefully and supported by experiments. It is a university textbook, so nobody should expect a continuous story. Use it as a reference when one idea in this book needs its assumptions, equations, exceptions and evidence restored. The chapters can be read independently, so the size need not become a sentence.

The classic model: Robert H. MacArthur and Edward O. Wilson, *The Theory of Island Biogeography* (Princeton University Press, 1967;

reprint with a new preface, 2001). A short, demanding book that shows ecological compression at its best. Area, isolation, immigration and extinction become a theory of species number, deliberately ignoring much detail to expose a testable mechanism. Some terminology and extensions have aged, but the central lesson remains: a useful model earns its place by making structure visible, not by pretending to contain the world. Reading the original also reveals how much influence can come from a model that is explicit about what it leaves out.

The necessary correction: John Kricher, *The Balance of Nature: Ecology's Enduring Myth* (Princeton University Press, 2009). Kricher traces the cultural appeal of natural equilibrium and explains why modern ecology replaced it with disturbance, contingency, feedback and historical change. The argument occasionally pushes hard against a phrase that ecologists themselves use in several technical senses, but that tension is useful. Read it after this book to remove the last traces of the idea that an ecosystem has one ordained state to which it must return. It is the best companion here for understanding why historical change and disturbance belong inside the model rather than outside it.

Notes and Sources

The Whole Thing in One Page and Why You Should Care

Ecology as relationships, distribution and abundance. The book's organising definition follows Michael Begon, Colin R. Townsend and John L. Harper, *Ecology: From Individuals to Ecosystems*, 4th ed., and the historical definition given by Ernst Haeckel in 1866: relations between organisms and the surrounding external world. Arthur Tansley's ecosystem concept supplies the insistence that organisms and physical conditions belong in one system.

Energy flow, material cycling and decomposition. Raymond Lindeman's trophic-dynamic account is the historical foundation. Eugene P. Odum and

Gary W. Barrett, *Fundamentals of Ecology*, and F. Stuart Chapin III, Pamela A. Matson and Peter M. Vitousek, *Principles of Terrestrial Ecosystem Ecology*, support the modern distinction between stocks, fluxes, primary production, decomposition and biogeochemical cycles. The claim that much terrestrial production enters detrital rather than live-grazing pathways is a broad synthesis, not a single global percentage.

Nutrient enrichment and oxygen loss. David Schindler's whole-lake experiments established the central role of phosphorus in freshwater eutrophication and demonstrated the sequence from nutrient enrichment to algal growth. The later oxygen decline through decomposition is standard aquatic ecology. Current institutional material from the United Nations Environment Programme was checked on 9 August 2026; it describes excess nitrogen and phosphorus as causes of eutrophication, algal blooms and hypoxia. No global count of dead zones is used because inventories and definitions change.

Seasonal mismatch and climate. The example of flowering, insects and migrants illustrates a general mechanism rather than claiming one universal trend. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, Sixth Assessment Report, Working Group II, assesses observed changes in distributions, seasonal timing and interactions, while stressing variation among species and regions.

Human-driven pressures. The five categories used here come from the 2019 IPBES Global Assessment: land and sea use change, direct exploitation of organisms, climate change, pollution and invasive alien species. The categories overlap in their ecological effects and are not presented as five independent experiments.

The Core Ideas

Organism, population, community and ecosystem. Definitions and distinctions follow Begon, Townsend and Harper; Robert E. Ricklefs and Rick Relyea, *Ecology: The Economy of Nature*; and Tansley's 1935 paper. Ecosystem boundaries are analytical choices, so the same place may be studied at several nested scales.

Habitat and niche. G. Evelyn Hutchinson's 1957 concluding remarks formalised the fundamental niche as an n-dimensional region of conditions permitting persistence. The modern idea of a realised niche is broader than competition alone and can include consumers, mutualists, dispersal and other constraints. The text uses competition for a clear first model rather than as a complete definition.

Connell's barnacles. Joseph H. Connell's 1961 work on the Scottish shore showed that interspecific competition restricted the lower distribution of *Chthamalus*, while physical stress restricted the upper distribution of the larger barnacle then called *Balanus balanoides*. That species is now generally placed in *Semibalanus*. The historical *Chthamalus stellatus* material has also been affected by later taxonomic revision. The ecological result, separating physical tolerance from competitive restriction, remains secure.

Population feedback and carrying capacity. Logistic growth is a useful model of density dependence, not a claim that wild populations approach one fixed ceiling. The treatment follows Begon, Townsend and Harper and avoids turning K into a permanent property of habitat. Time lags, age structure, environmental variation and population-driven habitat change all move the realised limit.

Spatial populations. Source-sink dynamics, local extinction, recolonisation and the rescue effect follow Begon, Townsend and Harper and Ilkka Hanski's *Metapopulation Ecology*. The text uses metapopulation in the broad instructional sense of local populations linked by dispersal. Strict classical models impose narrower assumptions about discrete patches and

extinction-colonisation dynamics.

St Matthew Island reindeer. David R. Klein recorded the introduction of 29 reindeer in 1944, an estimated population of 6,000 in 1963 and 42 survivors counted in 1966. Klein interpreted the crash through food supply interacting with severe winter conditions. Frank L. Miller and colleagues later argued that extreme winter weather was more decisive than a simple density-driven starvation narrative. The manuscript preserves the common ground: heavy use of forage, high density and exceptional winter conditions interacted, so the case does not demonstrate a timeless carrying-capacity line.

Allee effects. The description is the standard demographic definition: individual fitness or population growth can rise with density at low abundance because mating, cooperation, defence or environmental modification become easier. No claim is made that all small populations display an Allee effect.

Species interactions. Competition, predation, herbivory, parasitism, mutualism and facilitation follow standard ecological definitions in Begon, Townsend and Harper. Mutualisms are treated as context-dependent exchanges because costs, benefits and partner behaviour vary. The text does not imply that a mutualism becomes antagonistic whenever one partner gains more.

Non-consumptive and indirect effects. The claims that predators can alter prey behaviour and that indirect effects can pass through third species are established community ecology. Apparent competition refers to two prey species negatively linked through a shared enemy, not to direct competition for a resource.

Primary production and trophic transfer. Lindeman's 1942 synthesis established trophic dynamics. The ten per cent figure is retained only as a rough teaching approximation. Ecological efficiencies differ among consumption, assimilation and production, and vary strongly with taxon, tissue and ecosystem.

Carbon, nitrogen and phosphorus. The broad cycles follow Chapin,

Matson and Vitousek and Odum and Barrett. Nitrogen fixation and the absence of a large atmospheric phosphorus reservoir are standard distinctions. The manuscript does not attempt a full global carbon or nutrient budget, which belongs to biogeochemistry and climate titles.

Ecological stoichiometry. Robert W. Sterner and James J. Elser support the account of elemental imbalance between resources and consumers. Carbon-rich material can remain nutritionally poor when nitrogen or phosphorus limits growth, linking food quality, consumer processing and nutrient recycling.

Paine and keystone predation. Robert T. Paine's 1966 paper reports that removing predators from rocky intertidal plots allowed a dominant competitor to monopolise limiting space and reduced local diversity. The text uses the experiment to explain disproportionate effect. It does not claim that all predators are keystones or that the effect has identical strength on every shore.

Trophic cascades and top-down or bottom-up control. The formulation follows later food-web ecology and Sean B. Carroll's accessible synthesis. Cascades can arise through mortality or behaviour, and their strength varies among systems. Bottom-up resource limitation and top-down consumer control are presented as interacting processes rather than exclusive schools.

Ecosystem engineers. Clive G. Jones, John H. Lawton and Moshe Shachak introduced the modern physical ecosystem-engineering framework in 1994. Beavers, reef corals and burrowing organisms alter habitat through physical modification. Keystone effect and engineering are different mechanisms, though one species can fit both descriptions.

Complexity and stability. Robert M. May's 1972 result concerns randomly assembled mathematical systems and local stability around equilibrium. It overturned the casual assumption that adding species and strong links must stabilise a network. Real food webs are non-random and include weak interactions, compartments, adaptive feeding and spatial structure, so May's

result is a challenge to explain stability rather than a prediction that diverse natural systems must collapse.

Succession and disturbance. Frederic Clements developed an orderly successional and climax model. Henry A. Gleason argued for individualistic species responses and historical contingency. Modern ecology accepts directional succession in many cases without one universal endpoint. Primary and secondary succession differ in surviving biological legacies, but the distinction is a continuum in some field settings.

Resistance, resilience and persistence. C. S. Holling's 1973 paper distinguished rapid return near equilibrium from the capacity to absorb change without shifting organisation. Later literature uses resilience both for persistence within a regime and for recovery after disturbance. The manuscript therefore requires the object, disturbance and timescale to be named.

Biodiversity and stability. David Tilman, Peter B. Reich and Johannes M. H. Knops reported greater temporal stability of productivity in more diverse grassland plots over a decade. Later long-term experiments support insurance and complementarity mechanisms, while also showing that composition and time matter. The book narrows the claim to measured functions and rejects species richness as a universal health score.

Intermediate disturbance. Jeremy Fox argued in 2013 that the classic intermediate disturbance hypothesis should be abandoned as a universal prediction. Other ecologists have defended narrower formulations. The manuscript uses the least controversial conclusion: disturbance can promote coexistence through several mechanisms, but a general hump-shaped diversity rule is not supported across all systems.

Alternative states, thresholds and hysteresis. Marten Scheffer and colleagues reviewed mechanisms and evidence across lakes, reefs, woodlands and other systems. Shallow lakes provide the clearest teaching case because submerged plants, algae, grazers, fish, sediment and nutrients can reinforce clear or turbid conditions. Not every abrupt shift

proves bistability, and the manuscript states that limitation directly.

How It Actually Works

Lake boundaries, catchments and scale. The lake sequence is a synthetic teaching model supported by standard ecosystem ecology in Begon, Townsend and Harper; Odum and Barrett; and Chapin, Matson and Vitousek. The shoreline is treated as a useful analytical boundary rather than a sealed system because water, organisms, nutrients and organic matter continually cross it.

Primary production, detritus and trophic transfer. Lindeman's trophic-dynamic framework supports the distinction between producers, consumers and decomposers and the directional transfer of energy. The familiar ten-per-cent figure is not used as a rule. Transfer efficiencies vary with consumption, assimilation, tissue quality, metabolic rate and ecosystem type.

Population feedback, density and movement. Density dependence, delayed predator-prey responses, source-sink dynamics and metapopulation persistence follow Begon, Townsend and Harper and Hanski. The lake example uses these mechanisms qualitatively and does not claim that simple Lotka-Volterra equations reproduce a particular natural population cycle.

Conditional interactions and indirect effects. Competition, predation, parasitism, mutualism, ecosystem engineering and trophic cascades are treated as context-dependent. Paine's rocky-shore removals and later trophic-cascade research establish that indirect effects can be strong, while the text avoids the broader claim that every apex predator controls its ecosystem from the top down. Estes and colleagues' 2011 *Science* review was checked as a synthesis of trophic downgrading across marine, terrestrial and freshwater systems.

Stratification and oxygen. Seasonal thermal stratification, restricted mixing and oxygen consumption by decomposition are standard limnology. The account is deliberately qualitative because depth, wind, temperature,

productivity and residence time determine how strongly a particular lake stratifies and deoxygenates.

Disturbance and succession. Turner (2023) supports the treatment of disturbance as a regime defined by frequency, severity, duration, extent and timing, and the growing concern that climate change is producing novel disturbance regimes. Fox (2013) is used to reject the intermediate disturbance hypothesis as a universal diversity law, not to deny that intermediate disturbance mechanisms can operate in particular systems.

Whole-lake eutrophication experiments. Schindler's Experimental Lakes Area work is the key source. The 1974 *Science* paper reports whole-lake nutrient manipulations and rapid eutrophication under phosphorus enrichment; related experiments established phosphorus control as central in many fresh waters. The narrative does not imply that phosphorus is the limiting nutrient in every aquatic system.

Patchiness and connectivity. Spatial heterogeneity, refuges, colonisation and dispersal are standard landscape and metapopulation ecology. Connectivity can support recolonisation but can also transmit enemies, disease and invasive species, so the text avoids treating connectivity as an unconditional good.

Alternative regimes and hysteresis. Scheffer and colleagues (2001) provide the major synthesis of catastrophic shifts and alternative stable states. Shallow clear-water and turbid-water lakes are a canonical example because aquatic plants, sediment resuspension, grazing and water clarity can form reinforcing feedbacks. The manuscript explicitly distinguishes demonstrated alternative regimes from any abrupt ecological change and notes that long transients or unmeasured drivers can mimic threshold behaviour.

Current combined pressures. IPBES identifies land and sea use change, direct exploitation, climate change, pollution and invasive alien species as the leading direct drivers of change in nature globally. IPCC AR6 Working Group II documents observed climate-related shifts in ecosystem structure,

species distributions, timing and interactions, with impacts varying by system and region. Both assessments were rechecked on 9 August 2026.

Evidence strategy. The final *How we know* passage follows the methodological logic of ecology: manipulative field experiments identify mechanisms at limited scales; whole-system experiments retain more feedbacks but are hard to replicate; long-term observation captures slow variables; remote sensing extends spatial coverage; and models make assumptions explicit. Claims are strongest where methods with different weaknesses converge.

What People Get Wrong, Use It and Terms

The seven corrections derive from the sources above. John Kricher supports the historical persistence of balance imagery. Daniel Pauly's 1995 note supplies the shifting-baseline concept used in the first correction. Begon, Townsend and Harper support carrying capacity, food-web structure, ecological efficiencies, mutualism and diversity measures. Tilman and later biodiversity experiments support the qualified diversity-stability account. Holling and Scheffer support the distinction between resistance, recovery and regime change.

The practical lenses are editorial applications of ecological reasoning, not findings from one experiment. They remain within ecology by asking about flows, feedback, scale, slow variables, encounters and types of stability. Ethical and policy choices are explicitly left to conservation, politics and environmental ethics.

The glossary uses mainstream definitions, with warnings where terminology varies. Resilience has more than one established use. Regime shift does not automatically imply alternative stable states. Carrying capacity and niche are analytical concepts whose measured values depend on conditions and scale.

Go Deeper

Bibliographic identities, editions and publishers for all four recommendations were checked. *The Serengeti Rules* is an accessible narrative synthesis. *Ecology: From Individuals to Ecosystems* is the comprehensive technical reference. *The Theory of Island Biogeography* is the primary classic, cited in its 1967 first publication and 2001 Princeton reprint. *The Balance of Nature* is the contrasting interpretive work.

Bibliography

Primary and foundational works

Clements, Frederic E. *Plant Succession: An Analysis of the Development of Vegetation*. Washington, DC: Carnegie Institution of Washington, 1916.

Connell, Joseph H. 'The Influence of Interspecific Competition and Other Factors on the Distribution of the Barnacle Chthamalus stellatus'. *Ecology* 42, no. 4 (1961): 710-723.

Darwin, Charles. *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection*. London: John Murray, 1859.

Elton, Charles S. *Animal Ecology*. New York: Macmillan, 1927.

Gause, Georgii F. *The Struggle for Existence*. Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins, 1934.

Gleason, Henry A. 'The Individualistic Concept of the Plant Association'. *Bulletin of the Torrey Botanical Club* 53, no. 1 (1926): 7-26.

Hanski, Ilkka. *Metapopulation Ecology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Haeckel, Ernst. *Generelle Morphologie der Organismen*. 2 vols. Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1866.

Holling, C. S. 'Resilience and Stability of Ecological Systems'. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* 4 (1973): 1-23.

doi:10.1146/annurev.es.04.110173.000245.

Hutchinson, G. Evelyn. 'Concluding Remarks'. *Cold Spring Harbor Symposia on Quantitative Biology* 22 (1957): 415-427.

Jones, Clive G., John H. Lawton and Moshe Shachak. 'Organisms as Ecosystem Engineers'. *Oikos* 69, no. 3 (1994): 373-386.

Klein, David R. 'The Introduction, Increase, and Crash of Reindeer on St. Matthew Island'. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 32, no. 2 (1968): 350-367.

Lindeman, Raymond L. 'The Trophic-Dynamic Aspect of Ecology'. *Ecology* 23, no. 4 (1942): 399-417.

Lotka, Alfred J. *Elements of Physical Biology*. Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins, 1925.

MacArthur, Robert H., and Edward O. Wilson. *The Theory of Island Biogeography*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1967. Reprint with a new preface, 2001.

May, Robert M. 'Will a Large Complex System Be Stable?' *Nature* 238 (1972): 413-414. doi:10.1038/238413a0.

Paine, Robert T. 'Food Web Complexity and Species Diversity'. *The American Naturalist* 100, no. 910 (1966): 65-75. doi:10.1086/282400.

Schindler, David W. 'Eutrophication and Recovery in Experimental Lakes: Implications for Lake Management'. *Science* 184, no. 4139 (1974): 897-899. doi:10.1126/science.184.4139.897.

Scheffer, Marten, Steve Carpenter, Jonathan A. Foley, Carl Folke and Brian Walker. 'Catastrophic Shifts in Ecosystems'. *Nature* 413 (2001): 591-596. doi:10.1038/35098000.

Simberloff, Daniel S., and Edward O. Wilson. 'Experimental Zoogeography of Islands: A Two-Year Record of Colonization'. *Ecology* 51, no. 5 (1970): 934-937.

Tansley, Arthur G. 'The Use and Abuse of Vegetational Concepts and

Terms'. *Ecology* 16, no. 3 (1935): 284-307.

Tilman, David, Peter B. Reich and Johannes M. H. Knops. 'Biodiversity and Ecosystem Stability in a Decade-Long Grassland Experiment'. *Nature* 441 (2006): 629-632. doi:10.1038/nature04742.

Volterra, Vito. 'Fluctuations in the Abundance of a Species Considered Mathematically'. *Nature* 118 (1926): 558-560. doi:10.1038/118558a0.

Modern works and assessments

Begon, Michael, Colin R. Townsend and John L. Harper. *Ecology: From Individuals to Ecosystems*. 4th ed. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2006.

Carroll, Sean B. *The Serengeti Rules: The Quest to Discover How Life Works and Why It Matters*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2016.

Chapin, F. Stuart III, Pamela A. Matson and Peter M. Vitousek. *Principles of Terrestrial Ecosystem Ecology*. 2nd ed. New York: Springer, 2011.

Cook, Robert E. 'Raymond Lindeman and the Trophic-Dynamic Concept in Ecology'. *Science* 198, no. 4312 (1977): 22-26.

Fox, Jeremy W. 'The Intermediate Disturbance Hypothesis Should Be Abandoned'. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 28, no. 2 (2013): 86-92. doi:10.1016/j.tree.2012.08.014.

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. *Climate Change 2022: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability*. Contribution of Working Group II to the Sixth Assessment Report. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2022.

Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services. *Summary for Policymakers of the Global Assessment Report on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services*. Bonn: IPBES Secretariat, 2019.

Kricher, John. *The Balance of Nature: Ecology's Enduring Myth*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009.

McIntosh, Robert P. *The Background of Ecology: Concept and Theory*.

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

Miller, Frank L., Samuel J. Barry and Wendy A. Calvert. 'St. Matthew Island Reindeer Crash Revisited: Their Demise Was Not Nigh, But Then Why Did They Die?' *Rangifer* 25, no. 2 (2005): 75-97.

Odum, Eugene P., and Gary W. Barrett. *Fundamentals of Ecology*. 5th ed. Belmont, CA: Thomson Brooks/Cole, 2005.

Pauly, Daniel. 'Anecdotes and the Shifting Baseline Syndrome of Fisheries'. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 10, no. 10 (1995): 430. doi:10.1016/S0169-5347(00)89171-5.

Ricklefs, Robert E., and Rick Relyea. *Ecology: The Economy of Nature*. 8th ed. New York: W. H. Freeman, 2014.

Sterner, Robert W., and James J. Elser. *Ecological Stoichiometry: The Biology of Elements from Molecules to the Biosphere*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002.

United Nations Environment Programme. 'Nutrient Management: The Issue'. Updated 10 December 2024. Verified 9 August 2026.

United Nations Environment Programme. 'Phosphorus'. Updated 16 July 2025. Verified 9 August 2026.

Wulf, Andrea. *The Invention of Nature: The Adventures of Alexander von Humboldt, the Lost Hero of Science*. London: John Murray, 2015.