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“Standing on bare ground—I am bathed by the blithe air and uplifted into infinite space—all me egotism vanishes. I become a transparent eyeball; I am nothing; I see all; the currents of the Universal being circulate through me; I am part and parcel of God.” —Ralph Waldo Emerson, Nature

“The world, I have come to believe, is a very queer place, but we have been part of this queerness for so long that we tend to take it for granted. We rush to and fro like Mad Hatters upon our peculiar errands, all the time imagining our surrounding to be dull and ourselves quite ordinary creatures. Actually, there is nothing in the world to encourage such an idea, but such is the mind of man, and this is why he finds it necessary from time to time to send emissaries into the wilderness in hopes of learning great events, and it also serves for him, that will resuscitate his waning taste for life.... One must seek, then... a natural revelation.” —Loren Eiseley, “The Judgment of the Birds”

A city on its outside looks like a fortress of steel, glass, asphalt, and concrete, whose gates seem to prevent to everything non-human from entering. Understandably so, it’s easy to conceive a city as the epitome of the Anthropocene, an infringement of Homo sapiens upon the environment where an otherwise high functioning, biologically diverse ecosystem may be. Take Chicago, as an example. Once an area filled with wetlands, savannahs, and prairie, is now mostly pavement, monocultural lawns, and buildings. Of course, as much as we like to think of ourselves as the all-powerful fourth horseman, our fortresses are never impregnable. Pigeons, rats, cockroaches, squirrels, crows, raccoons, dandelions, and milkweed, just to name a few, find no problem navigating our trenches. They flock to our dumpsters, the cracks in the sidewalk, the sides of our highways, our sewers, and even our homes. However, these encounters are rarely treated or experienced as encounters with nature. Pigeons in the city may attract bird feeders, cockroaches a scream, a dandelion in the sidewalk may simply be walked over, but rarely are these encounters recognized as being testaments to the vigor of biological entities to persist and adapt, themselves spectacular natural phenomena. For those looking to commune with nature, the instinct is to retreat away from the city to the nature preserve. There is something to be said about such communes and such experiences with biodiversity that we longer have access to on a regular basis. Few things compare to the grandeur and sublimity of standing in a forest of redwoods or a giant sequoias, but that is not to say that there is not also something to be gained, whether we realize it or not, to become more attune with the natural within the unnatural. That is, within our suburban and urban anthropogenic landscapes that predominate the landscape of the 21st century.

In the everyday life of an urbanite, how often do we conceptualize driving to a restaurant as an experience within an ecosystem? I cannot possibly answer this question for everyone on earth, but the answer for myself, as I am sure it is for many others, is not very often if at all. Much of our life is perceived as navigating through a system of anthropogenic landscapes, whether physical, or more metaphorical such as the schooling system or the professional world, some type of separate world that exists a part from the rest of the ecological world. In many ways this is an accurate way to view the everyday. Humans have altered our environment in such a way that we are omnipresent, whether in a physical sense or by extension, we are entering. Understandably so, it’s easy to conceive a city as the epitome of man and nature, it allows “the mean egotism” to vanish, and what they can call their own. Furthermore, the “city of wings” resolves the dual reflection on is a testament to the agency of the pigeon, their ability to persist in abundance, still exists in many cities. To these people, breeding and feeding pigeons is a pastime, and the diversity of plumages that are characteristic of Columba livia domestica highly admired (BBC, 2007).

Who ultimately is right in this issue? Who do we give the right to claim their own? While certainly right for some, or as beautiful and admirable to others, what does their existence in our city say about our way of life and our relationship with nature? I would argue that they are in fact non-human organisms who circulate through me; I am part and parcel of God.” —Ralph Waldo Emerson, Nature

“Standing on bare ground—I am bathed by the blithe air and uplifted into infinite space—all me egotism vanishes. I become a transparent eyeball; I am nothing; I see all; the currents of the Universal being circulate through me; I am part and parcel of God.” —Ralph Waldo Emerson, Nature

“A city on its outside looks like a fortress of steel, glass, asphalt, and concrete, whose gates seem to prevent to everything non-human from entering. Understandably so, it’s easy to conceive a city as the epitome of the Anthropocene, an infringement of Homo sapiens upon the environment where an otherwise high functioning, biologically diverse ecosystem may be. Take Chicago, as an example. Once an area filled with wetlands, savannahs, and prairie, is now mostly pavement, monocultural lawns, and buildings. Of course, as much as we like to think of ourselves as the all-powerful fourth horseman, our fortresses are never impregnable. Pigeons, rats, cockroaches, squirrels, crows, raccoons, dandelions, and milkweed, just to name a few, find no problem navigating our trenches. They flock to our dumpsters, the cracks in the sidewalk, the sides of our highways, our sewers, and even our homes. However, these encounters are rarely treated or experienced as encounters with nature. Pigeons in the city may attract bird feeders, cockroaches a scream, a dandelion in the sidewalk may simply be walked over, but rarely are these encounters recognized as being testaments to the vigor of biological entities to persist and adapt, themselves spectacular natural phenomena. For those looking to commune with nature, the instinct is to retreat away from the city to the nature preserve. There is something to be said about such communes and such experiences with biodiversity that we longer have access to on a regular basis. Few things compare to the grandeur and sublimity of standing in a forest of redwoods or a giant sequoias, but that is not to say that there is not also something to be gained, whether we realize it or not, to become more attune with the natural within the unnatural. That is, within our suburban and urban anthropogenic landscapes that predominate the landscape of the 21st century.

In the everyday life of an urbanite, how often do we conceptualize driving to a restaurant as an experience within an ecosystem? I cannot possibly answer this question for everyone on earth, but the answer for myself, as I am sure it is for many others, is not very often if at all. Much of our life is perceived as navigating through a system of anthropogenic landscapes, whether physical, or more metaphorical such as the schooling system or the professional world, some type of separate world that exists a part from the rest of the ecological world. In many ways this is an accurate way to view the everyday. Humans have altered our environment in such a way that we are omnipresent, whether in a physical sense or by extension, we are entering. Understandably so, it’s easy to conceive a city as the epitome of man and nature, it allows “the mean egotism” to vanish, and what they can call their own. Furthermore, the “city of wings” resolves the dual reflection on is a testament to the agency of the pigeon, their ability to persist in abundance, still exists in many cities. To these people, breeding and feeding pigeons is a pastime, and the diversity of plumages that are characteristic of Columba livia domestica highly admired (BBC, 2007).

Who ultimately is right in this issue? Well it not my intent hear to stake a claim in the rightness or wrongness of humans dealing harshly with species deemed invasive, health hazards, or even the commodification of these animals, as in the case of pigeons and pigeon people. It is rather to explore what this means to our society. As troubling as pigeons may seem to some, or as beautiful and admirable to others, what does their existence in our city suggest about reality of our urban landscapes and what natural revelations might they reveal?

In his essay “The Judgment of the Birds,” Loren Eiseley brings the reader into his New York hotel room in which he shares with the reader a transcendental experience he had with pigeons. He claims that while city may seem crowded with the human, “Nevertheless, in any city there are true wilderness where a man can be alone. It can happen at a hotel room, or on the roofs at dawn” (Eiseley, L, N.A.) He supports this claim with an eloquent account of his experience with pigeons leaning out the window of his hotel room:

“I found I was looking down from that great height in to a great series of curious cupolas or lofts that I could barely make out in the darkness. As I looked, the outlines of these lofts became more distinct because the light being reflected from the wings of the pigeons who, in utter silence, were beginning to float outward upon the city. In and out through the slits in the cupolas passed the white-winged birds on their mysterious errands. At this hour the city was theirs, and quietly, without the brush of a single wing tip against stone in that high, eerie place, they were taking over the spires of Manhattan... I leaned farther out. To and fro the white wings, to and fro. There were no sounds from any of them. They knew man was asleep and this light for a little while was theirs. Or perhaps I had only dreamed about man in this city of wings—which he could surely have never built.

In this passage, the reader gains access to a meditation on the meaning of the pigeon within the city environment. In Eiseley’s mind, his experience with the pigeons is transcendental in that it allows him to see human society from an outside perspective, effectively bringing Eiseley to a profound revelation. That being, the city is not just a space for Homo sapiens, but rather an environment composed of multiple interconnected worlds. In this case, New York is home to humans normally busy by the day, however, up in the cupolas it is home to the “city of wings,” the realm of the pigeon.

What is the significance of this realm of the pigeon? For one, as Eiseley points out, this “city of wings” is not one that can be made by humans. Or another of looking at it, the realm of the pigeon that Eiseley reflected on is a testament to the agency of the pigeon, their ability to persist and thrive within the urban atmosphere, and to even create something that they can call their own. Furthermore, the “city of wings” resolves the dualism of man and nature, it allows “the mean egotism” to vanish, and what emerges is the convergence agencies of man and pigeon. Consequently,
the “city of wings,” while itself a romantic metaphor, is realist deconstruction of the city ecosystem. It recognizes the anthropogenicism which is the city, but rightfully inserts the non-human back it the picture. It is the lesson that we may have built New York, but it will never be just ours.

**Couch Dwellers, Periplaneta americana and Blatella germanica**

Few organisms can claim that they can experience a hydrogen bomb and live to tell the tale. The cockroach is one of those few organisms. The German cockroach, Blatella germanica, can live up to 45 days without food, and over two weeks without food or water. The American cockroach, even more extreme, has been reported to live over 90 days without food and 40 days with neither food nor water. They are true survival machines. At the same time, as far as household pests go, few are as hated or are killed with such vigor and grandeur as the cockroach (with the exception of maybe a few other black rats, like the **Killer Rat**). Even so, it appears that the American cockroach, among the sparse list of organisms capable of surviving nukes (as well). In the 4 billion dollar pest control industry, the cockroach owns roughly 240 million dollars just by itself. Thus in a nutshell, the life of the German and the American cockroach are characterized by constant slaughter, but even better survival. Consequently, these familiar insect continue to prolude their ways into our cities and homes, and more than likely will into the unforeseeable future (Schweid, R. 1999).

What is known as the German and American cockroaches, are names that do in fact do much justice the actual origin of these animals. The American cockroach is actually thought to have originated in Africa, but thanks to the European slave trade, they became transported across the continents unbeknown to the Europeans who would ignoranty name them. A similar phenomena is behind the name of the German cockroach, which is actually originally thought to be endemic of Ethiopia, but ventured from the region thanks to humans (more than likely Phoenician traders), and established itself across Europe, eventually globally after the Europeans began colonizing. While being used in a variety of laboratory experiments, ranging from medical to pest management purposes (what better way to figure out how to kill something than study its weaknesses in a lab), the cockroaches have never been even close to being in the full control of humans. Their swift spread across the world and their continued virulence within human society are testaments to the truly uncanny ability of cockroaches to persist in almost any environment they encounter and to maintain a wilderness within the anthropogenic landscapes that litter the land (bid, 72).

How does the story of the cockroach differ from that of the pigeon? The pigeon, unlike the cockroach, flies in plain sight and does carry near the stigma that the roach does. Perhaps only rats could compete with the roach in this regard, the roach more than being just outside the walls, but within the most intimates spaces of human society. The office building, the apartment, the house, and even our couches are not safe from these wild animals. Even more so than the pigeon, the cockroach infringes upon the human-nature dichotomy, the one that gives us the false illusion that our everyday is anything other but an encounter in an ecosystem full of dynamism. While we have dismantled the biodiversity that once riddled the landscape, the roach reminds us that this extinction was not absolute and that there are organisms even more capable of us at surviving. When we uncover the sofa cushion to discover an infestation of roaches, we are reminded of just anthropogenic landscapes cannot escape the wilderness. Where we go, the roach goes, and there is only so much we can say about that. Cockroach synanthropy may be the bane of many, but their persistence within our society grounds us in an ecological reality. To ponder the cockroach is to be transcended from the egotism of the everyday.

**The Corvid Complex, Corvus brachyrynchos**

The American crow, Corvus brachyrynchos, is one of the United States most common birds. With a range that encompasses the entirety of the US mainland and some of the southern parts of Canada, it is difficult to go anywhere in US and not encounter at least one specimen of this species. Unlike our previous species that we looked at, the American crow is native to North America, perhaps for as much as 1-2 million years. Since the first human stepped onto the continent, American crows were there watching our ancestors, observing them carefully, waiting patiently to figure out some way to capitalize on this new mammalian intruder. And capitalize they have (Grade, D., 2005).

The American crow, like humans, tends to prefer open fields with scattered trees. Dense woodlands are not favorable to them and our instead occupied by one of America’s other great Corvus—Corvus corax, the black raven. Thus the indigenous peoples of the American prairies were of great help to our corvid companions, as their burnings helped thin out tree stand, but left just the right amount for them to be able to roost comfortably. The same is true for the indigenous peoples of the south and the east whose settlements and agricultural stands provided more than enough space for them to occupy a niche not at odds with raven’s. Furthermore, it is specifically the advent of agriculture that would really change things for the American crow, as the fields of corn squash and beans that indigenous peoples grew provided an unprecedentedly easily obtainable abundance of nutrients for the crows to capitalize on. So effective and wide spread were these exploitations of the crow, that indigenous peoples across the United States development intricate cultural systems to combat them, including a mix of plant poisons, noise makes, and temporary lodges in food fields for designated to keep the crops safe from the winged opportunists (Grade, 153, 2012).

When the Europeans came to America, things were not much different. In fact, things only got better for the crow. With the destruction of the Eastern forests, the crow would start its ascent to unprecedented population abundance across America. Furthermore, the Europeans would also introduce another valuable food source—garbage. Thus for every city and every farm that began to pop up, so did the crow population increase. In fairness to our ancestors, this famous mongrel of agriculture is no pigeon. In fact American crows and their relatives are considered to be some of the most intelligent creatures on earth. Crows possesses the ability to both problem solve and use tools. Furthermore, as their change in geographical synanthropy since the 1950s has also demonstrated, the crow is also capable of swift mass social change. While still roaming the countryside, especially around grain elevators in the winter, the crow, like humans, has become increasingly an urban species. Thought to be at a population 100,000, 000 million by the end of the 19th century, the crow population took a sharp decrease over the first half of the 20th century thought to have been the result of the forests coming back in the east and wide spread persecution of the animal in the country side. However, even after the West Nile virus outbreak that came in 1999, their population is still over 31,000,000—well above what it would have been if humans had not come (Grade, 159, 2012).

Being one of the most successful of our native species to adapt to human encroachment on all aspects of the landscape, has not by any means led to being championed as symbol of biological perseverance. Furthermore, while the crow has gained increased academic popularity in the last few decades, while being one of the common birds of the continent is one of the least studied. Is it the commonness itself which has historically made the crow unattractive as a topic of science? Does it in some way seem too human of a subject to be a worthy study of natural sciences? Perhaps this reasoning has some historical truth, but it not that contentious to claim that the crow is often an organism easily passed by, one rarely pondered by most people. At same time, it might be pointed out, it has been used a profound literary symbol, often being a sign of death or darkness. A flock of them itself is referred to as a murder. However, the meaning we have historically placed with the crow—as a varmint of agriculture, as a noisy nuisance, and symbol of darkness—does not do justice to what the crow stands for in an ecological or philosophical sense. While the crow itself often emerges in our reality as a norm within the anthropogenic environments we navigate, it exists there like the pigeon and the cockroach—out of its ability to adapt and persist. Otherwise stated, the crow is part of our everyday because of its own agency. When we pass the crow on the power line, in the oak tree, or in the garbage dump, we can nod them off completely as I’m sure most do, or we can dismiss them as parasites, but what lurks beneath their dark plumage is an untamed wilderness that resist the human. A wilderness that takes the human and capitalizes on it, effectively making their own world out of the one we perceive as our own; it is a corvid complex occupying a realm amidst the pigeons, roaches, and humans of the fragmented anthropogenic landscapes.

**The Philosophy of Synanthropy**

Synanthropic organisms, by definition, associate with Homo sapiens. Part of the consequence of this association, these organisms have the tenacity to get caught up in the fallacious human-nature dichotomy that we may have built New York, but it will never be just ours. When the Europeans came to America, things were not much different. In fact, things only got better for the crow. With the destruction of the Eastern forests, the crow would start its ascent to unprecedented population abundance across America. Furthermore, the Europeans would also introduce another valuable food source—garbage. Thus for every city and every farm that began to pop up, so did the crow population increase. In fairness to our ancestors, this famous mongrel of agriculture is no pigeon. In fact American crows and their relatives are considered to be some of the most intelligent creatures on earth. Crows possesses the ability to both problem solve and use tools. Furthermore, as their change in geographical synanthropy since the 1950s has also demonstrated, the crow is also capable of swift mass social change. While still roaming the countryside, especially around grain elevators in the winter, the crow, like humans, has become increasingly an urban species. Thought to be at a population 100,000, 000 million by the end of the 19th century, the crow population took a sharp decrease over the first half of the 20th century thought to have been the result of the forests coming back in the east and wide spread persecution of the animal in the country side. However, even after the West Nile virus outbreak that came in 1999, their population is still over 31,000,000—well above what it would have been if humans had not come (Grade, 159, 2012).

Being one of the most successful of our native species to adapt to human encroachment on all aspects of the landscape, has not by any means led to being championed as symbol of biological perseverance. Furthermore, while the crow has gained increased academic popularity in the last few decades, while being one of the common birds of the continent is one of the least studied. Is it the commonness itself which has historically made the crow unattractive as a topic of science? Does it in some way seem too human of a subject to be a worthy study of natural sciences? Perhaps this reasoning has some historical truth, but it not that contentious to claim that the crow is often an organism easily passed by, one rarely pondered by most people. At same time, it might be pointed out, it has been used a profound literary symbol, often being a sign of death or darkness. A flock of them itself is referred to as a murder. However, the meaning we have historically placed with the crow— as a varmint of agriculture, as a noisy nuisance, and symbol of darkness— does not do justice to what the crow stands for in an ecological or philosophical sense. While the crow itself often emerges in our reality as a norm within the anthropogenic environments we navigate, it exists there like the pigeon and the cockroach—out of its ability to adapt and persist. Otherwise stated, the crow is part of our everyday because of its own agency. When we pass the crow on the power line, in the oak tree, or in the garbage dump, we can nod them off completely as I’m sure most do, or we can dismiss them as parasites, but what lurks beneath their dark plumage is an untamed wilderness that resist the human. A wilderness that takes the human and capitalizes on it, effectively making their own world out of the one we perceive as our own; it is a corvid complex occupying a realm amidst the pigeons, roaches, and humans of the fragmented anthropogenic landscapes.
but natural. When we throw trash on the ground in the city, it inextricably
linked to the pristine forest. That is, the consequences of our actions ap-
ppear in nature. Pollution, habitat destruction, and species extinction is a
tragedy, but the systems that cause it functions the way it does because
we—all living things—are linked dynamic systems and the laws governing
are consequential actions are natural. It is useful conceptually to other the
destructive tendencies of humans, but it equally useful to understand that
the reasons systems collapse is a natural response to shock. To remove
the barrier between the natural and the unnatural is to remind us that we
part of one environment. Our synanthropic companions, parasite and mu-
tualist a like, remind us of the fallacious divide we get tricked into in many
everyday experiences because they are first and foremost a reminder of
the agency of non-humans that exists in (in a true sense) and outside (in a
more conceptual sense) of our anthroposphere. While immersing one’s self
to the sublimity of the forest may seem more attractive, the synanthrope
can as much of a tool of transparency as these more pristine environments.
Given their proximity, they are perhaps one of the easiest ways to dis-
card the egotism of human society, to experience a natural revelation that
contextualizes our biological existence within a greater realm of ecological
interaction. Thuds the philosophy of the synanthrope can be summarized
as such: The next time you walk to the store and see a crow on top of a
church, the next time you see pigeons on resting under the heat laps at
train stop, or after you squash the unwelcomed cockroach in your house,
take time to appreciate the ability of life to persist, to realize that even in
our cities we are inherently ecological agents, and that the agency of other
things is omnipresent even in our most anthropogenic landscapes of the
21st century.

Note: Eukaryon is published by students at Lake Forest College, who are
solely responsible for its content. The views expressed in Eukaryon do not
necessarily reflect those of the College.
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