

Do Not Build a World Without Butterflies

A public note on whether progress leaves room for living creatures that do not justify themselves economically.

2026.06.29 17:36 DENNIS HEDEGREEN OPEN V1.0

[HTTPS://HEDEGREENRESEARCH.COM/ARTICLES/DO-NOT-BUILD-A-WORLD-WITHOUT-BUTTERFLIES/](https://hedegreenresearch.com/articles/do-not-build-a-world-without-butterflies/)

Do not build a world without butterflies.

That is not a sentimental line.

It is a civilizational threshold.

A future should not be judged only by what it can produce, extract, optimize, or consume.

It should also be judged by what it still allows to live.

That includes creatures that do not justify themselves economically.

Butterflies are useful here because they make the principle visible.

They are not the only creatures that matter.

They are one of the easiest to erase.

They disappear quietly when landscapes become too clean, too poisoned, too optimized, or too owned.

That matters because modern systems are very good at removing life without sounding like they are doing it.

They call it efficiency.

They call it yield.

They call it logistics, maintenance, protection, cleanliness, productivity, land use, supply security, or pest control.

Each term may describe something real.

But together they can produce a world with fewer edges, fewer habitats, fewer insects, fewer places for fragile life to survive, and fewer creatures allowed to exist without function.

That is why this note is not mainly about whether people personally care about animals.

The larger question is whether the future leaves room for life outside the human optimization loop.

Food belongs inside that question, but it does not contain the whole question. Land use, agriculture, pesticides, urban planning, and public maintenance belong inside it too.

Any serious future has to ask what its systems are pressing out of existence.

That is the real standard.

A society should be judged not only by what it can build, but by what it can build without biologically flattening the world around it.

Butterflies are one answer because they tell us whether ordinary landscapes still hold delicate, living complexity that has no strong economic defense.

That word matters. Not useless. Not meaningless. But unnecessary to the narrow logic that asks every square meter, every season, and every system to justify itself in output terms.

And a civilization is judged partly by what it protects from that logic.

It is obviously judged by how it treats people.

But it should also be judged by whether ordinary life leaves room for birds, insects, pollinators, amphibians, small creatures, and habitats that are not here to serve as scenery, mascot, or supply.

This is one reason the animal question should not be reduced to whether people emotionally love animals.

Sentiment is cheap.

Civilization design is harder.

A society can post photographs of nature and still build conditions that erase it.

A country can praise biodiversity and still subsidize habits of land use, chemical pressure, and infrastructural neatness that leave less room for life each year.

A city can plant decorative green and still produce an environment too fragmented, too sterile, or too optimized for many forms of life to remain.

That is why butterflies are useful.

They are not mainly a symbol of innocence.

They are a readability test.

If they cannot live here, what else has already been designed out?

What kinds of landscapes are we normalizing?

What kinds of creatures have become incompatible with the ordinary idea of progress?

That does not mean every field should be abandoned, every town should become wilderness, or every human need should be treated as ecological sin.

It means the future should not count as mature if it can only preserve life in fenced reserves, curated exhibits, or nostalgic documentaries while ordinary working landscapes become biologically thinner.

The deepest failure would be a world that keeps the image of nature while removing the conditions nature needs.

The problem is not only that some species disappear.

It is that entire systems begin to treat unplanned life as interference.

The cleaner, safer, more optimized, and more administratively legible the landscape becomes, the easier it is to build a world where almost nothing survives unless it has been given a function.

Some people will read this as a plea for butterflies.

It is larger than that.

It is a plea against building a civilization so total that every living thing must either produce, entertain, symbolize, or disappear.

Progress should not mean converting the living world into feed, fuel, scenery, and supply.

It should mean learning how to remain materially capable without making the world biologically empty.

That is the threshold.

If the future cannot leave room for butterflies, it is too narrow to trust with anything else.

RELATION MEMORY

NEARBY [Do Not Build a Future Only Institutions Can Survive](#) · Both pieces judge systems by whether ordinary life can still remain inside the future they build.

NEARBY [Culture Is Inherited to Be Changed](#) · Both pieces ask whether inherited systems are being carried forward in forms that remain worth living inside.

NEARBY [The Pocket Factory Must Not Become Society](#) · Both pieces resist optimization logics that flatten the wider conditions needed for life.

CANONICAL URL: [HTTPS://HEDEGREENRESEARCH.COM/ARTICLES/DO-NOT-BUILD-A-WORLD-WITHOUT-BUTTERFLIES/](https://hedegreenresearch.com/articles/do-not-build-a-world-without-butterflies/)

PDF VIEW GENERATED: 2026-07-11T15:35:45.806Z