

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 10/25/2024 1:23:22 PM

First name: Anon

Last name: Anon

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I am opposed to the proposal chosen by the Forest Service. My reason is two-fold. First, it is far too drastic, too large-scale with significant risk of creating great irreversible damage, especially for species that live via connected roots (I do not remember the technical term for this phenomenon, but 'experts' should know it). Second, I have never yet seen evidence that humans possess sufficient/deeper/wider/more profound understanding of Nature than Nature itself does. There are thousands of examples of this inadequacy/failure/disaster. One that comes to mind at present is the failure to do what is needed to protect bees. I don't care whose official responsibility it is. Direness means it is everyone's responsibility. In both these situations (regarding bees and trees), humans possess hubris, a very disproportionate conviction of knowing all that needs to be known and acting in a limited, human-centered framework, to an unjustified degree. Species which have lived long on Earth should not be terminated or brought to the edge of extinction because humans do not know and/or do not care that those lifeforms have great value to the life-on-earth-organism as a whole. In fundamental ways, we live because they live. We do not live because the Forest Service is omniscient, or is under the delusion that it is.