

Tribhuvan University

July 2022

Nature as an Actor in Jon Krakauer's *Into Thin Air*

Jagat Thakulla

**A Thesis Submitted to the Central Department of English, T.U.
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Degree of Master of Arts in English**

By

Jagat Thakulla

Roll No.: 72

Symbol No.: 280830

T. U. Registration No.: 9-2-552-29-2014

Nature as an Actor in Jon Krakauer's *Into Thin Air*

Central Department of English

Kirtipur, Kathmandu

July 2022

Acknowledgements

First of all, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my thesis supervisor, Tara Lal Shrestha, PhD, Asst. Prof. at Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University, Kirtipur, Kathmandu, for his valuable time, close observation and regular support. His directions and motivations throughout the research paper helped me to complete this research paper on time.

I am also indebted to the Head of Department of English, Prof. Jib Lal Sapkota, PhD, for his encouraging advices. Similarly, I would be delighted to extend my gratefulness to all respected Lecturers and Professors of CDE for their valuable directions in conducting the research as well as in my academic success.

Furthermore, I must express my very profound gratitude to my parents, Mauni Thakulla and Dikra Thakulla for their never ending love, support and motivation. In the same way, I would like to share my innermost gratitude to my maternal uncle, Gokul Bahadur Saud, to my uncle, Keshab Saud, my elder brother, Prakash Thakulla and to the whole family for their financial and emotional support throughout my years of study.

Lastly, I would like to extend my gratitude to my friends, Keshab Khadka, Mahesh Nepali and Anil Sapkota for their help with the research work. And, my thankfulness goes to those authors and researchers whose works have been consulted during the preparation of this thesis.

July 2022

Jagat Thakulla

Nature as an Actor in Jon Krakauer's *Into Thin Air*

Abstract

*This research is an attempt to portray Jon Krakauer's *Into Thin Air* from the perspective of ecocriticism where the notion of nature as an actor has been used. It analyzes the exploitation of Mt. Everest, and how the power of Mt. Everest challenges and changes the existing anthropocentric mindsets. It follows details from starting of Mt. Everest climbing to the impact of climbing on its climbers. In the beginning, it seems that climbers are getting victory over it. But, later on, their victory turns into defeat. The research questions the human-centered notions which valorize the excessive use and exploitation of nature. So, this memoir is representation of nature as an actor. Particularly, the ideas of Cheryll Glotfelty have been used. Overall, this paper attempts to extend the horizon of preservation, sustainability, and equal respect of nature which is the only way to save this earth and human beings including other species and its ecosystem.*

Key Words: Anthropocentrism, Exploitation, Actor, Ecocriticism, Preservation of Nature

This research analyzes Jon Krakauer's *Into Thin Air* from the perspective of ecocriticism. It analyzes how exploitation of nature takes place, and how the power of Mt. Everest challenges and changes the existing anthropocentric mindsets which valorize human domination over nature. The dominant characters of this non-fiction are particularly from the west, and they are Rob Hall, Stuart Hutchison, Jon Krakauer, Scott Fischer, Sandy Hill Pittman, Neal Beidleman, and others. This text covers the details from starting of Mt. Everest climbing to the impact of Sagarmatha climbing on its climbers. In the beginning, it seems that human beings are getting their victory over it. But, later on, it does not become what its climbers want it to be. It becomes an

active participant for the plight of its climbers who do not give proper care and respect to it. This memoir can be called as representation of nature as an actor. To explore the issue, theoretical insights related to the ecocriticism propounded by Cheryll Glotfelty and others have been employed.

All the characters of this travelogue plan to climb Mt. Everest by the help of the Sherpas. They try to claim their victory over it. For this reason, some of them have registered companies which help people to climb Mt. Everest, and so many people pay the handsome amount of money for helping them to climb over it. They choose very particular season in order to make their climb successful. They even threat their life just for the sake of getting at the top of Mt. Everest. In the beginning of this text, they seem to get what they have determined to do even after they face a lot of obstacles in their track to Mt. Everest. But, in the middle and ending part of their journey, they get into a real trouble. Sagarmatha does not show any sympathy and empathy towards the sufferings of its climbers. Some of them loose their life while getting at the summit and returning from it. It means that their domination does not remain for a long time despite adopting some resistance strategies to save their life by being relied on their own instincts and on modern tools.

Through this memoir, the author presents the impact of commercialization of Mt. Everest and the impact of Mt. Everest climbing on its climbers. So, the researcher questions such practices which promote anthropocentrism. The questions that arise in the research are; why should we build the concept of ecocentrism? Why do we take nature as an actor by leaving the exploitative nature of anthropocentric mindsets? Solving these queries will be the aim of this paper.

This personal narrative depicts the events happened in Mt. Everest. It is chaptered into twenty one parts including epilogue and author's note. Its beginning

chapter deals with the events of summiting Mt. Everest whereas the last chapter deals with his returning at Everest Base Camp. It is a personal account of Krakauer's experience of the 1996's Mt. Everest disaster where eight climbers were killed including his guide Rob Hall, and so many others were stranded by a big storm in Mt. Everest.

The story of *Into Thin Air* begins with the notification of Krakauer's hiring by *Outside* magazine to write an article on the commercialization of Mt. Everest. He decides to join the climbing service called Adventure Consultants led by Rob Hall. Their climbing is divided into the camps, namely, Camp One, Camp Two, Camp Three and Camp Four. They arrive at the Base Camp and spend few weeks there. Then, they make a few trips up to the other camps to gain the speeding process. The group led by Hall makes a summit push in the beginning of May. During the climbing, Krakauer gives us details of his teammates, guides and other groups on Everest. He brings together the events that happen in the weeks spent on mountain. Most of them have problems adjusting to the altitude, losing weight, moving slowly and feeling tired easily. Some of them are qualified, other are naïve and highly reliant on their guides.

Despite facing so many odds, only in Chapter 11, the first death occurs. Then, all the climbers become familiar with the existence of death on Everest. Everything starts to fall apart when the actual summit push comes. Hall chooses a 2:00 pm turn-around time, that is, everyone must turn back to the Camp whether they reach at the top of Everest or not at 2:00 pm. Only Krakauer and a few other climbers reach at the top before the decided time. Other members of the group reach to the top up to 4:00 pm. They neglect the turn-around time. Rob Hall and Doug Hansen, member of Hall's team are among the late arrivals to the top. Scott Fischer and his team also reach so

late.

That afternoon, the heavy storm hits the summit. Fortunately, Krakauer gets the tail of it and reaches the base of Camp Four successfully. He is in the safe distance of his teammates and has no knowledge what is there in store for his teammates. Two members, Hall and Hansen get abandoned where Hansen runs out of supplemental oxygen and stops continuation. Similarly, another group gets stranded in the storm and later, an assistant guide rescues all of others but two of them are left guessing them dead. Fischer also gets abandoned. Later, he is found dead. A Sherpa guide tries to rescue Hall and Hansen but, dies during rescue. Beck Weathers comes back to the Camp miraculously despite leaving him on the mountain assuming dead. Weather gets a number of amputation and surgeries for his injuries caused by the storm. Nearly a dozen people die on Everest that season and Krakauer, actually there to write on the trade of taking people up to the mountain, does not forget what he feels, faces and sees there.

Jon Krakauer is an American mountaineer and writer. He was born in Brookline as the third of five children of Lewis Joseph Krakauer and Carol Ann. At the age of eight, his father made him known to the mountaineering. He met former climber, Linda Mariam Moore in 1977 and married in 1980 with her. After the publication of his book, *Into Thin Air*, they moved to Boulder, Colorado from Seattle, Washington. He has written so many best selling writings, like, *Into the Wild*, *Into Thin Air*, *Under the Banner of Heaven*, *Where Men Win Glory: The Odyssey of Pat Tillman* as well as so many magazine articles. He was one among so many who faced ill-fated expedition to the summit of Mount Everest in 1996 which was one of the scariest disasters in the history of Everest expedition.

One was led by Rob Hall and another one was led by Scott Fischer. Both of

the parties successfully led clients to the summit but faced severe difficulty during the descent. Irresponsible choices made by guides of both parties during the storm led to a number of deaths including both head guides. He has publicly criticized the commercialization of Everest publicly. He also received an Arts and Letters award for Literature from the American Academy of Arts and Letters in 1999.

Since the publication of this book, it has received so many appreciations and criticisms from different forums of critical scholarships. Different critiques have viewed their opinions differently. And some of them are mentioned below;

Nam T. in her review titled, “Book Review: Into Thin Air” writes, “Jon Krakauer... establishes that ever since he was a kid, climbing Mt. Everest was his dream... Into Thin Air uses a consistent tone of language to identify whether the situation represents relief or tension... The narrative offers a variety of twists and turns throughout the plot...” Here, Nam T. writes about the likes of writer and his way of writing this book using ‘tone of language and narrative styles. It is said that climbing Mt. Everest is his childhood dream. In short, this review is all about the writing style of this book, and details mentioned in it.

Another critic, Alastair Scott in her news article, “Fatal Attraction” writes about the cause of the death of those many climbers, “What went wrong? Why was the approaching storm ignored? And, most emphatically, why are "tourists" with more money than expertise being taken up Everest in the first place? Jon Krakauer... in “Into Thin Air”... People climb Mount Everest because it -- and the money -- is there.” Scott puts some questions regarding the storm and deaths caused by it. While reading this review, we agree with these questions. He does not blame the storm; rather, he blames the people who just try to climb Mount Everest because they have money. When they have money, their expertise is ignored and treated more carefully.

In the same manner, another critic, Michiko Kakutani in his news article, “Mount Everest Has Only One Kind of Luck: Bad” writes, “As the journalist Jon Krakauer notes... 12 climbers had lost their lives on the mountain... Krakauer gives us both a tactile appreciation of the dangerous allure of mountaineering and a compelling chronicle of the bad luck.” In this review, Kakutani writes about the nature of Everest which causes deaths of so many people caused due to the bad luck type of nature of Everest. It also includes the profits would have gained by Hall and Fischer if they had descended successfully. And their dreams are scattered because Mount Everest is all the time bad to its climbers with its bad luck.

Another critic, Kate writes in her writing titled, “Into Thin Air (By: Jon Krakauer, Review By: Kate), “*Into Thin Air*, by Jon Krakauer... is one of the most compelling books I have ever read. Heartbreaking as this story is, Krakauer is suspenseful... parts of *Into Thin Air* made me want to cry... is beautifully written, I could read it cover to cover countless times, without ever getting bored....” Kate writes about the impact of reading this book which is spellbinding, tearful and so emotional. The story is very touchy and beautiful. She recommends us to read whether we love hiking or not. She has written it describing its shadow on its readers.

In the same manner, Andrew Pulver in his news article, “Total Bull: Into Thin Air Author’s Opinion of Everest Movie” writes, “Jon Krakauer... has criticized the recently released film of the disaster as “total bull”... and the article reports he was particularly annoyed by a scene in the film in which his character refuses to help in rescue attempts after a request from Anatoli Boukreev....” Here, Pulver explains the reaction of Krakauer after the release of movie based on ‘the catastrophic 1996 expedition on Everest.’ He takes the movie as ‘total bull’ because of its failure to acknowledge the situation of the catastrophic event. He is particularly angry with the

scene where his rejection to take part in the rescue attempt is portrayed negatively.

Primarily, most of the aforementioned reviews are confined to the issues like, writing style, cause of death of the climbers, Mt. Everest as a bad luck, impact of reading this book on its readers and anger of Krakauer on his role in movie. Some of the reviews like Nam T. and Kate seem to be limited up to Krakauer's strategies of writing this book and the emotional impact of this book on its readers. On the other hand, Alastair Scott remains limited up to causes of death of climbers which is money. On the contrary, Michiko Kakutani has intensively blamed Mount Everest for the death of its climbers because of its bad nature. Pulver just explains the reaction of Krakauer after the release of movie where his rejection to be the part of rescue team is depicted as a selfish act. These all reviewers have given credit to Krakauer for his effort to document the catastrophic event of 1996 on Mount Everest.

However, the above-mentioned reviewers have not analyzed this novel from the ecocentric perspective. Unlike these reviews, the researcher, in this research paper, is attempting to explore this novel through the lens of ecocentrism showing the domination of human over nature, anthropocentric nature of human and the consequences of rejecting nature as a decider of our life. Regarding theoretical insights to deal with Krakauer's novel, the researcher has brought theoretical insights of ecocentric theorists like, Glotfelty, and others as well in order to talk about the issues of representation of nature in literature minutely.

The concept of the eco-criticism emerged quite recently as eco-criticism was officially heralded by the two seminal works, both published in the mid 1990s, *The Eco-criticism Reader* edited by Cheryll Glotfelty and Harold Fromm, and *Environmental Imagination* by Lawrence Buell. In "The Eco-criticism Reader Landmark in Literary Ecology" Cheryll Glotfelty writes, "The term eco-criticism was

possibly coined in 1978 by William Rueckert in his essay “Literature and Ecology: An Experiment in Ecocriticism”.... By ecocriticism Rueckert meant “the application of ecology and ecological concepts to the study of literature” (xx). It is somehow clear that for the first time William Rueckert used the term, ecocriticism in 1978 to show the implication of ecology and ecological notions in literature.

Similarly, in the same text, Glotfelty also tries to define ecocriticism, and writes, “... eco-criticism is the study of relationship between literatures and physical environment. Just as feminist criticism examines language and literature from gender – consciousness perspective, and Marxist criticism brings an awareness of modes of production and economic class... eco-criticism takes an earth centered approach to literacy studies” (xviii). He also tries to tie the knot of literature and physical environment which depicts the existence of ecology in literature as feminist examines literature from gender-based perspective and Marxist takes class struggle in literature.

Glotfelty further writes, “To negotiate between human and non-human world, Ecocriticism puts one foot on literature and other on land” (xix). In this way, ecocriticism takes literature and environment together. The same kind of statement is also delivered by Kumari Shikha in her article entitled “Ecocriticism in Indian Fiction.” She states, “Ecocriticism takes an earth-centered approach to literary criticism. Ecocritics and theorists are concerned with the questions if the nature is being represented in a piece of literature or if the physical setting has a role in the plot” (3). So, ecocriticism stands on earth centered concept where it examines whether nature is represented in the creation of literature or physical setting is given a proper space in it.

In the same manner, defining ecocriticism, Joe Gray, Ian Whyte and Patrick

Curry, in “Ecocriticism: What it means and what it implies” writes, “Ecocentrism sees the ecosphere- comprising all Earth’s ecosystem, atmosphere, water and land- as the matrix which birthed all life and life’s sole source of sustenance” (130). By this statement, it is clear that ecocriticism is such a lens which takes all the things in it including ecosystem, atmosphere, water and land which are the vital elements of life and its sustainability.

Some of us may have the question like, why ecocriticism is so important in literature, N Humaida, in “The importance of ecocentrism to the level of environment awareness for sustainable natural resources” writes, “Ecocentrism is important for natural resources sustainability as it has a wider scope and also long term and future effects toward the natural environment” (5). It is important for the natural resources which are the sole reasons of our life and the sustainability of the natural environment. Environment does not come alone when it gets academic space, it comes with literature.

To know more about ecocriticism, we have to know the difference between ecocriticism and anthropocentrism. For the same purpose, in “Why ecocentrism is the key pathway to sustainability”, Helen Kopnina et al write, “Ecocentricism finds inherent (intrinsic) value in all of nature. It takes a much wider view of the world than does anthropocentrism, which sees individual humans and the human species as more valuable than all other organisms” (35). Ecocentricism sees intrinsic value in all the things available in nature whereas anthropocentrism puts humans and their interests at the top and other things at the bottom.

Again, Helen et al write, “Ecocentrism is the broadest term for worldviews that recognize intrinsic value in all life forms and ecosystems themselves, including their abiotic components. Anthropocentrism, in contrast, values other life forms and

ecosystems insofar as they are valuable for human well-being, preferences and interests” (35). In nutshell, these two statements show the nature of ecocentricism and anthropocentricism where the first one is more natural in real sense and the latter one is more oriented towards the human beings and their personal interests neglecting the importance of other organisms. How can we imagine our life without preserving nature in real? How can we have human centered values at the tops disrespecting the nature which is the sole of our survival?

Showing the selfish nature of anthropocentricism, in “Ethics: Theory and Contemporary Issues” B MacKinnon mentions, “People who hold anthropocentric view acknowledge themselves as being the only most significant entities in the universe while disregarding animals and plants unless they provide life necessities such as nutrition, clothing, shelter and medical benefits” (331). Here, MacKinnon exposes those people who hold anthropocentric concepts where they take themselves as the consumers of other organisms and disregard other things unless they hold utility values for them.

It is very clear that ecocentrism is very much important for the present generation as well. But, the bitter reality is that so many of us are still holding anthropocentric mindsets, rejecting ecocriticism. This scene does not hinder the people who advocate for the safety of this earth. While explaining the broader scope of ecocriticism, Geoff Holloway writes, “Ecocentrism is an all-encompassing concept covers geo-diversity and bio-centrism but extends the letter. Also, by definition, ecocentrism is the basis of calls for the Rights of Nature” (1). Here, it is very apparent that ecocriticism is such a concept which does not discriminate between biotic and abiotic, rather it takes all the things present in the nature equally. It most importantly advocates for the rights of this nature which is the sole source of all the things.

Similarly, mentioning the nature of ecocriticism, Haydn Washington writes, “Ecocentrism is the only approach that is totally non-utilitarian or humanity-first in its orientation. Ecocentrism includes maintaining geodiversity and biodiversity” (137). It does not have any consumerist nature. It follows the path of welfare of geo-diversity and biodiversity.

Glotfelty writes, “Others re-envision God as immanent in creation and view the earth itself as sacred” (XXII). When we believe that God has created this whole universe, mother earth is taken as sacred which is not less than God. The incident of taking not only earth, but also its small part, Sagarmatha as Goddess is mentioned in the text. When Krakauer writes, “To appease Sagarmatha... the Sherpas had built more than a dozen beautiful, meticulously constructed stone chortens at Base Camp, one for each expedition. A perfect cube five feet high, the altar in our camp was capped with a triumvirate of carefully selected pointed stones, above which rose a ten-foot wooden pole crowned with an elegant juniper bough” (128). The Sherpas take Sagarmatha as Goddess which must be pleased before putting foot on it, otherwise it would acts back which is not a good sign for the climbers and the people dwelling near it. So, they take it as a sacred thing present to protect and nurture the people around it.

In the similar way, Helen Kopnina et al. in *Why Ecocriticism is the Key Pathway to Sustainability* write, “... an awareness of complex interconnectedness. This aligns the science of eco-centricity very closely to belief systems of those indigenous peoples (and others) who have in various ways come to see themselves as part of a sacred world” (40). Here, it is also very vividly depicted that we are connected to the environment where indigenous and others take themselves as the part of nature which is sacred, and take nature as God.

In the text too it is mentioned that indigenous people take earth as sacred and take themselves as the part of sacred world. Krakauer writes, “Tibetans who lived to the north of the great mountain already had a more mellifluous name for it, Jomolungma which translates to “goddess, mother of the world,” “goddess of the sky” (14). Tibetans have their own name for Mt. Everest which is Jomolungma meaning ‘goddess, mother of the world’ and ‘goddess of the sky.’ Through this, it is clear that indigenous people find God in the form of earth and take themselves as the part of the sacred world.

In the same manner, Helen Kopnina et al. write, “With such spiritualities, even people who are entirely naturalistic in their worldviews often speak of the Earth and its ecosystems as sacred and thus worthy of reverent care and defense” (39). The trend of giving the status of pious to the earth is also observed in naturalists which is a good sign for the preservation of the earth. In the text also the Sherpas defense for the protection of the chastity of Sagarmatha. Krakauer writes that the act of having intimate scene there is not liked by the Sherpas, “they fundamentally disapproved of sex between unmarried couples on the divine flanks of Sagarmatha” (127). Similarly, in the next incident too, the Sherpas defense the mother earth when Krakauer writes, “The Sherpas, however, had a different diagnosis: they believed that one of the climbers on Fischer’s team had angered Everest-Sagarmatha, goddess of the sky-and the deity had taken her revenge on Ngawang” (127). They believe that if anything wrong is done on Mt. Everest, they have to pay for that. So, they request others not to anger Sagarmatha, the goddess of the sky.

World Commission on Environment and Development, in *Our Common Future*, writes, “Development must not endanger the natural systems that support life on Earth: the atmosphere, the waters, the soils, and living beings” (45). Even the

WCED has declared that we must not damage natural system which is the sole source of life on earth. But, in practice, we are not following it which is also presented in this text. WCED imagines such environment, but we are just opposite to it. Krakauer writes, “Some of my teammates fared even worse than I in the meager air and unhygienic environment” (68). Is this the development WCED visions? We are in a wrong track. We have to realize it soon. Otherwise, Sagarmatha itself will put us in our real place. We must work for the support of life, atmosphere, the waters and the soils.

In the introduction section of *The Ecocriticism Reader: Literary Ecology*, Cheryll Glotfelty writes, “Despite the broad scope of inquiry and disparate levels of sophistication all ecological criticism shares the fundamental premise that human culture is connected to the physical world, affecting it and affected by it” (XIX). It is shown by the research done by the eco-critics that the cultures of human beings are affected by ecology and at the same moment become the part of affecters to the ecology. It means these both are interrelated to each others. Our culture is the main affected factor from our physical world.

The same kind of scenario is seen in the text too where the author writes, “To appease Sagarmatha, this year-as every year-the Sherpas had built more than a dozen beautiful, meticulously constructed stone chortens at Base Camp, one for each expedition. Five long chains of brightly colored prayer flags were then strung radially from the pole above our tents to protect the camp from harm” (128). People near Sagarmatha and their culture is very much affected by the presence of Sagarmatha. They try to make happy to Mt. Everest in order to make every climb successful. They make chortens in the name number of expedition teams. Their culture is directly connected to Mt. Everest. Because of their cultural practices, the surrounding of Mt.

Everest is also gets affected. It is true that our culture shapes the environment and at the same time, our culture gets shaped because of the environment of a particular area. Similarly, Glotfelty again writes, “Current environmental problems are largely of our own making, in other words, a by-product of culture” (XXI). Because of us and our culture, so many environmental problems are in existence. Particularly, the culture of victory over nature practiced by the westerners is the dominant causing factor of generating ecological problems.

To tell how we are responsible for creating ecological problems, Krakauer writes, “Just back from the lip of this chasm, at the Col’s westernmost edge, the tents of Camp Four squatted on a patch of barren ground surrounded by more than a thousand discarded oxygen canisters. If there is a more desolate, inhospitable habitation anywhere on the planet, I hope never to see it” (161). The main environmental problem creator is human being. We have a habit of polluting environment. It is all because of our culture. Specially, while climbing Mt. Everest, we have a culture of using oxygen cylinder. It is ethical or not that is a different question, but, at the same time, we have built a habit of leaving those cylinders there without further considering its effects on environment. So, the author sees the left-over cylinder, he takes it as one of the dirtiest places on earth ever seen by him.

In *Environment Ethics: Between Anthropocentrism and Ecocentrism*, the team of academia writes, “Human exploitation and abuse of the natural environment has been observed on a global scale.” The tendency of exploiting and abusing nature is increasing day by day which is studied very thoroughly. The same kind of deed is done in the text too. The increment in numbers of tourist in Mt. Everest has been included in *Into Thin Air*. Krakauer writes, “Over the past half decade, the traffic on all of the Seven Summits, but especially Everest, has multiplied at an astonishing

rate” (22). The trend of climbing and claiming their feet has been increasing which has been observed in the text too. To point out the same issue, Krakauer writes this text.

Similarly, Krakauer tells us about how this book has been written. He writes, “In March 1995 I received a call from an editor at *Outside* magazine proposing that I join a guided Everest expedition scheduled to depart five days hence and write an article about the mushrooming commercialization of the mountain and the attendant controversies...” (24). Editor of *Outside* magazine calls him to join the expedition of Mt. Everest, and reports to the editor and his team regarding marketization and commercialization of Mt. Everest which is an example of abuse of Sagarmatha, not only locally, but also globally.

Bron Taylor et al., quoting the lines of United Nations, write, “Setting aside any doubts that economic growth, not biodiversity conservation, was the priority, the document declared, “States have the sovereign right to exploit their own resources” in the pursuit of their social and economic development objectives” (1091). The decider of using nature is UN which gives authority of exploiting the resources of a particular country is up to that particular country. It does not talk about the limitations of exploitation of nature. Excessive use of nature is the sovereign right of a country. The same right is also exercised by Nepal while it comes to the point of Mt. Everest climbing.

As UN allows the nations to use their resources as they wish. Nepal also chooses the same way to exploit in the name of use for development. Problem is felt in Mt. Everest regarding pollution and human traffic, Nepal has chosen the way of solving such problems by increasing fee of climbing. Krakauer writes, “In 1991 the Minister of Tourism charged \$2300 for a permit that allowed a team of any size to

attempt Everest. In 1992 the fee was increased to \$10000 for a team of up to nine climbers, with another \$1200 to be paid for each additional climber” (22). Nepal has increased the fee for per climber which is decided by Nepal itself. Nepal has worked for its own development in the name of solving problems seen in Sagarmatha which is not a good sign for the preservation of ecosystem.

In the same manner, in *Environment Ethics: Between Anthropocentrism and Ecocentrism*, the team of academia writes, “Abandoning anthropocentrism is impossible instantly; however we can distinguish our nature-consumption outcomes and intervene when the need is vital to our survival, and not because it is a desire or interest.” Here, it is said that we cannot totally ignore the human needs and our reliance on nature for the fulfillment of our needs. But, we have to rely on nature when it comes to our survival, not of our interest. The recent trend is quite different where we are guided by their interest. We try to do what comes under our desire, not for our survival which is not so good. If the same trend continues, ecology will be disturbed, so do human race.

In order to show the intervention of human beings on nature, not because of need, but because of desire, Krakauer writes, quoting Mallory, who is linked to Everest, “While on a lantern-slide lecture tour of the United States, it was he who so notoriously quipped, “Because it is there” when an irritating newspaperman demanded to know why he wanted to climb Everest” (15). This man just speaks out his true intention of climbing Mt. Everest. He simply says that Mt. Everest is there, so he wants to climb on it. It is his interest, not obligation. Similarly, to show us more evidences of our vested interest, Krakauer again writes, “Hall’s strategy was to lay siege to the mountain” (73). Hall tries to climb Mt. Everest before others in order to expand his business of mountaineering. At any cost, he wants to climb on it. To do

this is not his need, but desire to be the first. He is also guided by desire, not by need.

In the same manner, despite his bad health condition because of mountain climbing, Doug does not stop his journey. He consists on climbing. Krakauer writes, "... he hadn't slept in a couple of days, hadn't eaten. But he was determined to strap his gear on and climb when the time came... Doug was going to keep climbing toward the top as long as he was still able to breathe" (162-163). Here, the desire of Doug is presented which tells us about his craziness to climb on Mt. Everest in his second attempt. He was failed in his first attempt. For this time, he has stopped sleeping and eating because of hunger of climbing on it. This time, he is in fully determination that he has to climb on it if it costs his life. We can see how he is driven by his interest, not need. He is fully blinded in his desire of climbing Mt. Everest which is the current picture of human beings who prefer desire, rather than need in case of being relied on nature.

Margit Koszegi et al., quoting F. Probald in their article, write, "... the decline of determinism by a change of the way of thinking which appeared in the developed countries in the 1950s and 1960s. This new way of thinking is based upon the absolute faith in technical development that cannot accept any controlling act of nature" (95). The developed countries, in the 1950s and 1960s, started believing in the technology rather than nature. They even disregarded the power of the nature. So, the same trend is going on in the present world as well where people are using tools to overcome nature.

To tell the faith of climbers in modern tools, Krakauer writes, "He said, "... You've done some pretty sick climbs-stuff that's way harder than Everest. We've got the big E figured out; we've got it totally wired. These days, I'm telling you, we've built a yellow brick road to the summit" (66). It happens when Fischer approaches

Krakauer for the first time in order to tell him about his expedition. Fischer encourages him to come with him because he wants to enlarge his tourism business. Fischer ignores the supremacy of Mt. Everest and tells him to be fully confident in order to climb on Sagarmatha. And, he even assures him in terms of safety by telling him that his team has built the yellow brick road and wired. They have more than belief in their wire and road. But, bad luck is that they cannot remain safe when the turn goes to Mt. Everest. It means excessive rely on tools to rule over nature is a good idea.

Similarly, to put out another event which indicates human reliability on tools, Krakauer writes, “Beck, Stuart, and Lou unpacking brand-new mountaineering boots that, by their own admission, had scarcely been worn. I wondered if they knew the chance they were taking by coming to Everest with untried footwear” (74). Climbers like, Beck, Stuart and Lou go for trying the new untried mountain boots on which Krakauer has a doubt. The main point is that how they can rely on such product which is not yet certified and tried in the area where there is a great chance of being failure even after being tested and tried. So, relying on tools is not good in case of climbing Mt. Everest.

In *Ecocentrism*, Geoff Holloway writes, “Given the exploitative threat by tourism... there is a need to work together, with ecocentrism having primacy” (5). In the present world, tourism is taken as the better source of income for the development of a country. But, nobody talks about its bad impacts. So, the countries like, Nepal has been facing a serious problem where increment in the number of tourists is causing damage to the whole environment of Mt. Everest. To cope up with this problem, we must have a concept of ecocentrism at the top of the means of solutions.

The bad aspect of tourism industry is also presented in the text too. Krakauer

writes, “Just back from the lip of this chasm, at the Col’s westernmost edge, the tents of Camp Four squatted on a patch of barren ground surrounded by more than a thousand discarded oxygen canisters. If there is a more desolate, inhospitable habitation anywhere on the planet, I hope never to see it” (161). Sagarmatha is very much polluted because of our own faults. Krakauer tags it as one of the worst places in terms of pollution caused by tourism.

Similarly, another event which also shows the bad side of tourism business, Krakauer writes, “I had heard many stories about how Everest had been turned into a garbage dump by the ever-increasing hordes, and commercial expeditions were reputed to be the primary culprits” (60). Krakauer writes about what he heard about Mt. Everest before being there. He sees the real surrounding of Everest, and finds the same as he heard in the form of story. People go there as the tourists and leave their used material everywhere carelessly which helps it names as the dumping site. So, tourists are the major antagonists to make Sagarmatha one of the dirtiest places.

In the same manner, again, to show the dark nature of tourism, Krakauer writes, “Longtime visitors to the Khumbu are saddened by the boom in tourism and the change it has wrought on what early Western climbers regarded as an earth paradise, a real-life Shangri-La. Entire valleys have been denuded of trees to meet the increases demand for firewood” (45). Because of increment in the number of tourists earlier, new visitors have not got chance to see the earlier Sagarmatha which was the epitome of paradise, but the beauty of Mt. Everest has been lost in order to meet the demand of visitors. This all turns the place from paradise to hell. This is only caused by tourism.

The team of academia in *Environment Ethics: Between Anthropocentrism and Ecocentrism* writes, “The relationship between anthropocentrism and patriarchy, as

proposed by Keller and Golley is that they are both ‘validated by the same conceptual logic’, i. e. anthropocentrism and patriarchy encourage dominion over women and nature where they are disregarded in some decision and negatively affected.” Till now, the world is guided by the patriarchal mindset which encourages domination over women. In the same way, anthropocentrism encourages domination over nature. It guides us to exploit nature as much we need. So, there is a similarity between patriarchy and anthropocentrism where both of them motivate people to exploit women and nature as our wish.

The concept anthropocentrism always motivate us to dominate over nature. It does not allow us to take nature as equal as us. Krakauer writes, “Scott had this burning ambition to be a great climber, to be one of the best in the world” (63). He wants to win all the mountains just to pacify his burning desire of being the best in the world. As the patriarchy wants to suppress women, anthropocentrism always exploit nature.

Even people do not take the dangers in mountain seriously. It is because of their inferior mentality towards nature. Krakauer writes, “I was also surprised to see that Boukreev didn’t have a backpack-customarily guide would carry a pack containing ripe, first aid supplies, crevasse-rescue gear, extra clothing... Boukreev was the first guide I’d ever seen, on any mountain, ignore this convention” (178). This kind of carelessness is because of the mentality which tells us that human being is here to consume nature, exploit nature, and use nature as he wants. This mindset is similar to patriarchy.

In *The Humanity of Global Environment Ethics*, Wapner and Matthew write, “It is agreeable to conclude that people are smart enough to find solutions for many challenges... it is not always possible because at times political and economical

factors alter our inner decent choice... people fail to take care of one another... where many lives are regarded worthless, and through the remarkable difference between social classes” (204). Nobody rejects the concept of human supremacy on finding solutions of so many challenges. But, so many times, we fail to decide on time because of our political and economic greed. In war and the clash with nature, we even fail to take care of each other because of our concepts like, rich and poor and importance of self and neglecting others’ lives. The only way to make our earth very safe is to through our respect towards ecosystem.

How the economical factor guides us to make wrong decision is shown in the text too. Krakauer writes, “Fischer... was exceedingly motivated to get clients to the summit, especially a celebrity client like Sandy Hill Pittman. Likewise, having failed to get anybody to the top in 1995, it would have been bad for Hall’s business if he failed again in 1996-especially if Fischer succeeded” (273). Fischer has an intention to climb at the top of Mt. Everest at any cost. He has a fear of losing his climbing business if he fails this time. So, we can guess that he is totally guided by money. For that he even compromises with the predetermined time of turning back. His rivalry is with Hall who is also in the same business. So, he ignores the turning time and allows his climbers to get at the top which causes their death. So, it is clear that people are termed as the most rational in decision making, but money changes our inner decision and leads us to take wrong decision causing even loss of life.

Another important point is that people start neglecting others in order to save themselves by putting others’ lives in danger. To show the selfish nature including ignoring each other in need, Krakauer tells us that Boukreev, a guide in Fischer’s team comes down to the South Col hours in front of anyone else. Krakauer writes, “Indeed, by 5:00 P. M., while his teammates were still struggling down through the

clouds at 28,000 feet, Boukreev was already in his tent resting and drinking tea... One of the clients from that group has nothing but contempt for Boukreev, insisting that when it mattered most, the guide “cut and ran” (210). When his teammates are in the need of his expertise, Boukreev leaves them in their own problems and reaches at the tent for his own safety. This is what we call the selfish nature of human being, and we ‘fail to take care of one another.’

In the same manner, to show the another event of being careless to one another in need, Krakauer tells us the nature of another team from South Africa that they have a strong radio which is needed to Krakauer’s team to call Hall’s team in order to manage a rescue team to rescue the survivors in up. Krakauer writes, “... to call up to Woodall on the South Col and say, ‘Look, this is an emergency. People are dying up there. We need to be able to communicate with the survivors in Hall’s team to coordinates a rescue. Please, lend your radio to Jon Krakauer.’ And Woodall said no. It was very clear what was at stake, but they wouldn’t give up their radio” (218-219). One of the team members of Krakauer calls Woodall for asking him to lend his radio to Krakauer which is needed for rescue the survivors, but he rejects to help them. It’s out of our thought why some people perform such behavior when other fellows need us in their problems. It is clear that we start neglecting other in their problems.

Beck is in the grip of storm, and in the need of help, otherwise he is about to die. Krakauer writes, “Jesus fucking Christ!” he wailed when he saw me, his features twisted into a rictus of agony and desperation. “What’s a guy have to do to get a little help around here!” He’d been screaming for help for two or three hours, but the storm had smothered his cries” (255). While coming back to tent, Krakauer faces the plight of Beck. Beck is in the need of genuine help, but nobody comes to help him. Even Krakauer sees him screaming in agony, he leaves him and continues his journey.

Here, it is shown that human being fail to take of one another in need.

People start behaving differently because of people's economic status. When one of the helpers in Hall's team, Ngawang falls from High Mountain, he does not get enough care as other high class person gets. Krakauer writes, "If it had been one of Scott's clients who was this sick, instead of Sherpa, I don't think he would have been treated so haphazardly. By the time they get Ngawang down to Pheriche it may be too late to save him" (112). Ngawang gets an accident, but does not get treatment on it. It is because of his poor economic condition, and hi is Sherpa. If he had been rich and westerner, he would have been saved. So, it is clear that people are treated on the basis of their wealth where the poor do not enough care and the rich get more than they deserve.

Similar event is also mentioned in the text where wealthy people and celebrity figure are treated with special care even in the climbing of Mt. Everest. Krakauer writes, "... she brought this humongous duffel bag full of gourmet food that took about four people to even lift. She also brought a portable television and video player so she could watch movies in her tent. I mean, hey, you've got to hand it to Sandy: there aren't too many people who climb mountains in that kind of high style" (116). Beck Weathers narrates to Krakauer that Sandy Hill Pittman goes in climbing with her luxurious things like, duffle bag full of food gourmet food, portable television, and video player. It shows that people are treated differently because of their economic status. This type of showy nature of her is criticized by others. And Krakauer writes, "A great many people were offended by her ostentatious displays of wealth, and by the shameless way she chased the limelight. As Joanne Kaufman reported in the Wall Street Journal...." (118). Her behavior during her climb is widely criticized even in the Wall Street Journal.

To put forward the same concept, Margit Koszegi et al., in *Human – Environment Relations in Modern and Post-modern Geography*, quote G. Judkins and others, "... the environmental factors were determinative causes of racial differences, cultural practices, moral values, ingenuity and the ultimate capabilities of any given population" (91). Here, it is clear that environment is the decision maker to our racial differences, cultural differences, moral values and the ability of population.

In the text too, we are given some examples of cultural and moral differences. Krakauer writes, "To appease Sagarmatha, this year-as every year-the Sherpas had built more than a dozen beautiful, meticulously constructed stone chortens at Base Camp, one for each expedition" (128). The culture of pleasing mountain with this unique way is not a practice of west. It is only us who worship Mt. Everest. In the same manner, when the matter comes to moral values, the Sherpas reject the practice of sleeping of unmarried girl and boy and having physical relation. Krakauer writes, "Base Camp, the amorous assignations that took place in this woman's tent were duly noted by other members of her team, especially the Sherpas, who sat outside pointing and snickering during the encounters. "[X] and [Y] are sauce-making, sauce-making" (127). This act is not liked by the Sherpas. Krakauer writes, "But despite the Sherpas' laughter (to say nothing of their own notoriously libertine habits), they fundamentally disapproved of sex between unmarried couples on the divine flanks of Sagarmatha" (127). It is because of their moral values and respect for Sagarmatha. Having sexual relation in consent is very common in west, but here in Sagarmath, it is not accepted. It is all because of environmental factor which decides our cultural and moral practices.

Again Glotfelty writes, "... most ecocritical work shares a common motivation: the troubling awareness that we have reached the age of environmental

limits, a time when the consequences of human actions are damaging the planet's basic life support system. We are there. Either we change our ways or we face global catastrophe, destroying much beauty....” (XX). It is warned by the researchers that environment must not be damaged anymore because we have already at the limitation. If we continue to damage environment, we will have to face the big problems globally including the extinct of so many species. So, it's time to change our way or to face the results of our insane decisions and deeds.

It is clear that we are at the edge of the environment limits, but we are not yet ready to accept. Even in Mt. Everest, there is a big problem caused by us. Krakauer writes, “I had heard many stories about how Everest had been turned into a garbage dump by the ever-increasing hordes, and commercial expeditions were reputed to be the primary culprits” (60). We are still in the way to increase the numbers of climbers which is the major contributors of pollution on Sagarmatha. Nobody is paying attention to make Mt. Everest pollution free. We are turning our back to this issue. We are destroying the natural beauty of Mt. Everest. We are destroying the ecosystem of it. One day, we will have to remorse for not stepping ahead before being too late.

In the same manner, Glotfelty writes, “Psychology has long ignored nature in its theories of the human mind. A handful of contemporary psychologists, however, are exploring the linkages between environmental conditions and mental health...” (XXI). Glotfelty tells us that nature has been ignored while studying human mind in psychology. But, recently, contemporary psychologists are giving space to mental health in their study of psychology. They are trying to see how the environment affects our mental health. They are even at the stage of accepting environment as an effective factor to decide our mental status.

The fear of being killed is seen in Krakauer's wife. When he flies for Mt.

Everest climbing, his wife tells him to be safe because his wife and children rely on him. Krakauer writes, “She sensed the true dimensions of my desire, and it scared her. “If you get killed,” she argued with a mix of despair and anger, “it’s not just you who’ll pay price. I’ll have to pay, too, you know, for the rest of my life. Doesn’t that matter to you?” “I’m not going to get killed,” I answered. “Don’t be melodramatic” (84). She has a fear of being defeated by Sagarmatha. So, she requests him to be safe and sound. He also promises of taking a safe route. It gives us the sense that environment shapes out mentality.

In the same manner, to dig out the linkage between our mental status and environment, Krakauer writes, “As I write these words, half a year has passed since I returned from Nepal, and on any given day during those six months, no more than two or three hours have gone by in which Everest hasn’t monopolized my thoughts. Not even in sleep is there respite: imagery from the climb and its aftermath continues to permeate my dreams” (284). It’s already been half a year and Krakauer tells us how he feels after being returning from Mt. Everest. The memory of Sagarmatha is still in his mind. The trauma he experienced in Mt. Everest is still haunting him each and every day, two or three hours have been captured by the events that had happened in Mt. Everest. Not only in his awaken time, but also in his dream in, he gets the memory of climb. So, it can be concluded that the effect of environment is seen in our mental forms. So, when the psychologists try to address the issue of mentality, they should take environment in full consideration.

The team of academia again writes, “If humanity is born with greediness, it is intelligent enough to see that it is only facing a dark future.” It is believed that human beings have got greediness by birth, so we are excused whenever we show our greediness. But, too much greediness from nature is posing a threat to the whole

human race. If we don't quit the nature of greediness, we ourselves lead to the dark.

The text has included the events in which we can observe the greedy nature of human beings. Krakauer writes, "Makalu" Breashears told the Taiwanese leader, "Chen has died." "O.K," Gau replied. "Thank you for the information." Then he assured his team that Chen's death would in no way affect their plans to leave for the summit at midnight"(156). Breashears informs to his leader about the death of one of his members of team. But, in the world of greediness, Chen does not take this incident seriously, rather takes it lightly, and orders his other members to be ready for summit. We can observe here that some of are not even moved by the death of their nearest ones. We have become that much selfish where we only dream for our own success. Even during the very strong storm, their team gets into trap and most of them died there. It indicates that our greediness leads us to the darkness.

Another event from the same text also shows the similar kind of scene, and Krakauer writes, "The money itself didn't seem terribly important to Fischer. He cared little for material things, but he hungered for respect-from his family, from his peers, from society at large-and he knew that in our culture money is the principal gauge of success" (65). Here, we are told that Fischer is driven by money. So, he starts his business of mountain climbing which is the good source of earning. But, his greed of earning handsome amount of money leads him to be the killer of so many teammates in his team. Greediness pushes us to the world of death and destruction.

The high level of greediness is seen when Krakauer writes, "Unfortunately, the sort of individual who is programmed to ignore personal distress and keep pushing for the top is frequently programmed to disregard signs of grave and imminent danger as well" (177). The nature of human being is depicted in this quote where it is said that we ignore our personal problems and try to reach at the summit of Mt. Everest at

any cost. While doing this, we neglect the natural phenomena which are very much certain to happen and cause a great danger in our lives. So, we can say that in the name of getting what we desire, we call natural calamity in our life by our own.

Another great example of our greed and its consequence can be taken from what Krakauer writes, “Certainly time had as much to do with tragedy as the weather, and ignoring the clock can’t be passed off as an act of God. Delays at the lines were foreseeable and eminently preventable. Predetermined turn-around times were egregiously ignored” (272- 273). The reason of being killed in Mt. Everest is not only the weather, but also neglecting the time of returning at any cost. Rob Hall is the leader of the team who ignores the predetermined set of rules because of his ambition to be succeeded at any cost. In this way, we can say that primarily, the greed of Hall to be succeeded and to boost his business, at the same moment, secondarily, the climbers’ greed to get at the top of Mt. Everest cause death of them. So, greed brings darkness in our life is seen.

Glotfelty again writes, “Worster and other historians are writing environmental histories, studying the reciprocal relationships between humans and land, considering nature not just as the stage upon which the human story is acted out, but as an actor in the drama” (XXI). It is clear that there is a mutual relation between human beings and nature. The nature is not all the time stage where we perform out activities carelessly. It is even a major character which decides our roles in the drama of human life. So, we must not underestimate the power of nature because all the time nature does not accept what we do to it. It hits back in its own way.

The incidents which prove that nature is an actor in the drama of human beings are present in the text. Krakauer writes, quoting the lines from Eric Shipton’s in *Upon That Mountain*, “We had forgotten the mountain still holds the master card,

that it will grant success only in its own good time” (5). This line makes it clear that it only possible to climb Mt. Everest when it allows us to climb. We cannot succeed climbing in our own wish; rather it is on the wish of Sagarmatha which is the master player in the game. Similarly, another incident from the text also shows the power of nature, Krakauer writes, “Over the course of the evening, the conversation drifted to the inherent risks of climbing-and guiding-Everest, and Litch remembers the discussion with chilling clarity: Hall, Harris, and Litch were in complete agreement that sooner or later a major disaster involving a large numbers of clients was “inevitable” (50). They have realized the immense power of Everest where it is going to claim the lives on so many climbers because we are not taking Sagarmatha seriously; rather we are taking it only as a stage. We have forgotten the active role of nature in our life.

Even the leader of one of the expeditions, Beidleman has senses the anger of Sagarmatha and Krakauer writes, “... the Sherpa teammates met them and carried the injured man to Camp Two. At the point, says Beidleman, “Klev and I just stared at each other in disbelief. It was like, ‘What’s going on here? What have we done to make this mountain angry?’” (250). When we play with nature, it plays back with us very tactfully. So, even, Mt. Everest is also an active actor in this text, not only the stage where climbers play their roles.

In the same manner, Krakauer narrates, “As I began my descent I was extremely anxious, but my concern had little to do with the weather: a check of the gauge on my oxygen tank had revealed that it was almost empty. I needed to get down, fast” (7). Here, it is told that he had not taken weather seriously, but, at the same moment, he checked his oxygen tank whether there is oxygen or not. Why does he check it? The answer is simple, he has a fear of being killed with the tussle of

nature. He takes nature as a decider of his life and death internally. So, we can take this statement as important evidence which verifies nature as an actor.

Krakauer further writes, “The two climbers failed to return to their tent that night, however, and neither Mallory nor Irvine was ever seen again” (16). Where did they go? What happened to them? We can guess the answer as who the boss is, namely, nature. The main weakness of climbers is that they never take nature as an efficient force. When the time comes, nature plays its role where it presents itself as a major character which forces human beings to take nature as an important part of their life. Similarly, Krakauer further writes, “Bass showed that Everest was within the realm of possibility for regular guys. Assuming you’re reasonably fit and have some disposable income, I think the biggest obstacle is probably taking off from your job and leaving your family for two months” (22). Before the beginning of climbing, Bass neglects the power of nature, and takes the act of leaving family for two months seriously. But, when he gets into the trap of nature because of his neglecting nature, he realizes the deciding power of nature and prays for his safety. It is just the result of taking nature as a stage, not as an actor.

Krakauer narrates, “At dark, the Montenegrins returned to the Col to report that the summit had remained out of reach: they’d turned around below the Hillary Step. Between the weather and the Montenegrins’ defeat...” (162). When the rescue team goes to rescue their teammates, they find no way to get to their friends because of weather. They feel that they are defeated by the weather which indicates the place of nature in human’s life, an actor. In the same manner, Krakauer writes, “We would instantly become more vulnerable to HAPE, HACE, hypothermia impaired judgment, and frostbite. The risk of dying would skyrocket” (173). Again, Krakauer writes, “I think it’s pretty unlikely that we’ll get through this season without something bad

happening up high” (100). It is very clear that all the climbers including Krakauer know that as they climb, there is a high rate of dying there which shows their mindsets of taking nature as an actor in the course of their climb. Similarly, Krakauer mentions, “When it came time for each of us to assess our own abilities and weigh them against the formidable challenges of the world’s highest mountain” (87). They have taken Mount Everest as a strong entity which will be very hard to climb over. They take it as ‘formidable challenge’.

Krakauer writes, “Eventually,” warns Tom Hornbein, thirty-three years after his ascent of the West Ridge, “what happened on Everest this season is certain to happen again” (275). Nature is always powerful. It keeps playing its role as an actor. No one can defeat and stop nature. Krakauer further mentions, “Walter Mittys with Everest dreams need to bear in mind that when things go wrong up in the Death Zone- and sooner or later they always do- the strongest guides in the world may be powerless to save a client’s life” (275). Here, it is very clear that no one can stand strong when it comes to tussle with Mt. Everest. Mt. Everest is a strong actor in the race of climbing Everest. Krakauer writes, “Jesus fucking Christ!” he wailed when he saw me, his features twisted into a rictus of agony and desperation... He’d been screaming for help for two or three hours, but the storm had smothered his cries” (255). His friend was trapped into storm. He was looking and shouting for help, but, his screaming was silenced by the storm. Krakauer and his friend knew the power of nature. So, it can be said that nature is an actor, not a stage.

Similarly, another event which indicates the supremacy of nature, Krakauer writes, “Twelve days later, when Breashears and Viesturs climbed over the South Summit on their way to the top, they found Hall lying on his right side in a shallow ice hollow, his upper body buried beneath a drift of snow” (235). After twelve days of

great storm, when Breashears and Viesturs went to climb Sagarmatha, they found the dead body of Hall, a skilled founder of climbing company. It shows that nothing can match with nature. No matter who we are, nature rules over us. So, it is evident that nature as an active actor, not a stage.

Krakauer further writes, “It would be many hours before I learned that everything had not in fact turned out great that nineteen men and women were stranded up on that mountain by the storm, caught in a desperate struggle for their lives” (195). They all have neglected the natural forces and walked on. When the turn comes to nature, it shows its power and they feel very powerless. At the beginning, they take it lightly. Later, they realize that the deciding factor is nature. Similarly, Krakauer further writes, “Someone yelled at us to keep moving our arms and legs. Sandy was hysterical; she kept yelling over and over, ‘I don’t want to die!’ But nobody else was saying a whole lot” (208). When they stranded up on mountain, they suggested some techniques to be alive to one another. One of them, Sandy started crying with the wish of living, not dying there. Not only she, but also her friends realize the power of nature. They take nature as an active actor in their journey.

Wapner and Matthew write, “Unless people recognize the inherent value in every human being and transform this respect towards the environment, Earth will remain under threat” (204). It is up to us whether save or damage it which will even decide our existence. The practice of taking nature as super power is prevalent in the indigenous societies is also delivered by Bron Taylor et al. write, “... such sentiments are relatively common among indigenous societies, which tend to have spiritual perceptions and values and to develop in-depth ecological knowledge that contributes to relatively sustainable life-ways” (1092). Indigenous societies are far ahead of taking nature as a part of sacred world. So, they see spirituality in nature which makes

them ecologically aware in comparison to non-indigenous people. It is not only the duty of indigenous people to take care of nature, it is our duty. All the human beings' responsibility is to work effectively and genuinely in the race of preserving earth.

While working in this text, the researcher has found out the selfish nature of human beings where they reject the presence and importance of nature. They try to defeat nature by getting help from modern tools and technology. They take an act of climbing Mt. Everest as an honor. But, to teach the lesson of importance and power of nature, nature plays its part where it changes the anthropocentric mentality of human beings. The role played by nature in the text is not enough to preserve nature in the sake of saving human and other species, in order to get the expected situation regarding environment, we must do the following things seriously. Firstly, government of Nepal should take nature not only as a source of income, but also as a source of life saving. Secondly, government should try to make its people aware about the importance of nature not only for other living creatures, but also for human beings. Thirdly, curriculum should incorporate the ecosystem in its curriculum from school level to university. Fourthly, Nepalese people should be made aware of ecology by conducting different awareness programs. Finally, government should seek the helping hands of other NGOs and INGOs to preserve and promote the environment.

In conclusion, Krakauer has written his experiences of climbing Sagarmatha where he mentions the catastrophic event occurred in the same place and took so many lives. In the beginning, the climbers take Mt. Everest very carelessly, and ignore the strategies they have made before climbing. As their negligence brings negative consequences, it looks like that their nature consuming mindsets changing into ecology. In order to complete this research, the ideas of Glotfelty and others have

been used in order to make people aware about the power and importance of nature. We must build the positive mentality for nature. We should not take it as a part of thing only created for human consumption. It must be given equal respect as we give to ourselves. When we start neglecting nature's power, we get into troubles which are beyond our control. We must accept that nature is not only a stage where we perform whatever we like to do; it is an active actor which plays its role very creatively, and can have a power to decide the roles of other actors as well.

Works Cited

Environmental Ethics: Between Anthropocentrism and Ecocentrism.

<http://www.academia.edu/1476524/EnvironmentalEthicsbetweenAnthropocentrismandEcocentrism>

Glotfelty, Cheryll. "Literary Studies in an Age of Environmental Crisis."

Introduction. *The Ecocriticism Reader: Landmarks in Literary Ecology*, edited by Cheryll Glotfelty and Harold Fromm. The University of Georgia Press, 1996, pp. xv-xxxvii.

Gray, Joe, et al. "Ecocriticism: What it Means and What it Implies." *The Ecological*

Citizen Vol. 1, No. 2, 2018: 130-131. www.ecologicalcitizen.net

Holloway, Geoff. "Ecocentrism." *Research Gate*, 2019: 1-6.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/332138102_Ecocentrism

Humaida, N. "The Importance of Ecocentrism to the Level of Environment

Awareness for Sustainable Natural Resources." *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environment Science* 399, 2019: 1-6.

Kakutani, Michiko. "Mount Everest Has Only One Kind of Luck: Bad." *The New*

York Times, May 6, 1997. <https://archive.nytimes.com/www.nytimes.com/books/97/05/04/daily/thin-air-book-review.html>

Kate. "Into Thin Air (By: Jon Krakauer, Review By: Kate)." *Helen Temple Cooke*

Library Dana Hall School, Feb. 14, 2018. <https://library.danahall.org/2018/02/14/into-thin-air-by-jon-krakauer-review-by-kate/>

Kopnina, Helen, et al. "Why Ecocentrism is the Key Pathway to Sustainability." *The*

Ecological Citizen, Vol 1, No 2, 2017: 35-41.

Koszegi, Margit, et al. "Human –Environment Relations in Modern and Post-modern

Geography." *Hungarian Geographical Bulletin*, Vol. 64, No. 2, 2015: 87-99.

- Krakauer, Jon. *Into Thin Air*. Pan Books, 1998.
- MacKinnon, B. *Ethics: Theory and Contemporary Issues*. Thomson/Wadsworth Press, 2007.
- Pulver, Andrew. "Total Bull: Into Thin Air author's opinion of Everest movie." *The Guardian*, 28 Sept. 2015. <https://www.theguardian.com/film/2015/sep/28/jon-krakauer-into-thin-air-opinion-everest-movie>
- Scott, Alastair. "Fatal Attraction." *The New York Times*, May 18, 1997. <https://archive.nytimes.com/www.nytimes.com/books/97/05/18/reviews/970518.scott.html?r=1&oref=slogin>.
- Shikha, Kumari. "Ecocriticism in Indian Fiction". *IRWLE* 7.1 (January 2011): 3-10.
- T, Nam. "Book Review: Into Thin Air." *Pikes Peak Library District*. <https://ppld.org/book-reviews/thin-air>
- Taylor, Bron, et al. "The Need for Ecocentrism in Biodiversity Conservation" *Conservation Biology*, Vol. 34, No. 5, 2020: 1089-1096.
- Wapner, P and R. A. Matthew. "The Humanity of Global Environmental Ethics". *The Journal of Environment Development*, Vol. 18, No. 2, 2009: 203-222.
- Washington, Haydn. "The Intrinsic Value of Geodiversity." *The Ecological Citizen*, Vol. 1, No. 2, 2018.
- World Commission on Environment and Development. "Our Common Future". *Oxford University Press*, Oxford, UK. 1987.