* From time to time again humans demonstrate that it is their *nature* to protect—
* Nature. And as ~~ironic~~ as it may be, the attempt to preserve wilderness is often difficult, is generally derived from natural resources. For example, the most basic necessities: ~~food, water, and shelter~~ are what shield us from the harshness of Nature. Albeit if the concern is a matter of weather, or of timber to build homes, these materials of have all originated can all be gathered through “the creation and destruction of plants” (Leopold 67?)In fact, almost *everything* is derived from the biosphere one-way or another. In “Preserving Wildness”, Wendell Berry suggests that the Homo sapiens ‘survival’ instinct, can guide us into the proper balance of mankind and nature. By focusing on two basic agricultural models derived from renowned environmentalists’ we can discuss the pros and the cons of an anthropocentric relationship with nature.
* ~~From time to time again~~, humans attempt to preserve nature. This only results in reinforcing the ~~ideology~~ that humans are in ~~fact,~~ abusers of nature. In *“Preserving Wildness”*, Wendell Berry points out that it is simply not possible for humans to survive in a world fully independent of nature.
* If Leopold were to become economically dependent upon nature,
* he might want to sell the more profitable pine rather than birch: “The pine will ultimately bring ten dollars a thousand, the birch two dollars” (Leopold 69)
* In instance however, Leopold stands to lose money by favoring the preservation of the pine. But why?
* Despite the various other factors that will continue to add on to his bias, he ultimately will remain unmoved by most efforts.
* Leopold is promulgates the importance of conservation, sustainability, setting aside concern for profits in favor of but then what must be defined as the greater good
* and if in fact all men, at some point, can be categorized into vocations. What role could he possibly be playing? Leopold says that we, “classify ourselves into vocations, each of which either wields some particular tool, or sells it, or repairs, or sharpens it, or dispenses advice on how to do so” (Leopold 68) And Leopold’s philosophical revelation states that all men in effect, wield all tools, but the questions remains unanswered as to whether we should wield any at all. (Leopold 68) Under the implication that nature is in fact a tool, it is easy to see the amicability that each vocation has within the correspondences between man and nature.
* In contrast, Wendell Berry sheds light onto both sides of his argument. In “Preserving Wildness” Wendell Berry discusses the proper relation that humanity shares with nature. Berry described this conflict as being “polarized” (Berry 516) amongst two sides. Berry mentions early on that if he were forced to choose between sides, he would choose to be with the nature extremists despite his acknowledgement that it would be after all a poor choice (Berry 517). While this is the side that seems to be entirely too in favor of nature, these so called “nature extremists” typically believe in the universal principal that our “biosphere is an egalitarian system” (Berry 517) and that it should be shared amongst all, including Mother Nature.
* On the other end of the spectrum, Berry defines the group to exist purely of people that are under the assumption that human good is relative to “profit, comfort, and security” (Berry 517). Asserting a universal assumption amongst these so-called “technocrats”, Berry states that they perceive human good merely as a materialistic item that is derived from raw materials. Later suggestions pose this as the group of people Berry holds responsible for the destruction of jobs. This could lead to the implication that these technocrats are against the idea of grass-root economics.
* Berry admits that one must *assume* the existence of nature extremists in order for them to exist. If we do not assume, we see very quickly that we are only left with one *realistic* option. This gives rise to the conclusion that there is only one group, the technocrats, and an alternative arises that Berry defines as being the middle between the two. The question is not a matter of quantities, but rather the philosophical question behind our reasons for wanting to preserve nature in the first place.
* We cannot deny the insatiable hunger that lies within the human to endlessly strive to preserve nature. But why do we do this? The only results we get end up reinforcing the ideology that humans are in fact, abusers of nature. Berry points out all throughout the text that it is simply not possible for humans to survive in a world fully independent of nature.
* Conclusion
* In order for all that is Nature to exist in harmony, we must diverge from our homocentric tendencies and take on an unfamiliar foreign perspective. And this holds true for even if we remain self-centered or biased in our judgment of nature.
* The Lord giveth, and the Lord taketh away, but He is no longer the only one to do so. When some remote ancestor of ours invented the shovel, he became a giver: he could plant a tree. And when the axe was invented, he became a taker: he could chop it down. Whoever owns land has thus assumed, whether he knows it or not, the divine functions of creating and destroying plants.
* **7.** Leopold suggests that the **divine func**tions of ‘giving’ and ‘taking’ **are** tools that of which were derived from a higher power: “The Lord giveth, and the Lord taketh away, but He is no longer the only one to do so.”(Leopold) By implication, Leopold **sugge**sts that the axe in his hand, and shovel are replications of these divine functions, that is to ‘give’ and to ‘take’. It must be noted however, how Leopold associates the words such as: “divine”, “Lord” and “some remote ancestor”, thus suggesting the value he places amongst his heritage, or reveals the extent how it affects his bias. *Our heritage*. with his two more fundamental tools: the shovel and the axe. **God.**
* **It is a little peculiar how Leopold’s illustration of “some remote ancestor”[2] demonstrates the same divine functions that of Leopold’s.**
* **Suggests Leopold’s value of heritage, family, and ancestry.**
* **Ethics of the land**
* **To give or to take. We demonstrate the power of these divine functions. Whether we know it or not. We are in effect creating and destroying plants.**
* A conservationist is one who is humbly aware that with each stroke he is writing his signature on the face of his land.

1.

Proper relation of humanity to nature.

Two extremes, describes first choice (Berry’s choice)

Describes nature conquerors, or technology extremists.

Depicts his choice.

2. The medium between two extremes.

Lists his assumptions.

3. The human and the natural are indivisible yet are different.

1 and 2 present problem, 3 says what we can do about it

We are the same yet indifferent

Since we are so powerful as a species it is important that we establish prudence, justice, fortitude temperance, and other virtues. T.S. Eliot, Ezra Pound, and David Jones making an effort to reweave culture, because we see that culture involves, leads to or is the recovery of nature.

We must change our culture, or reestablish the cultural tasks. Pound quote.

What we gain by the recovery of culture and nature.

Knowledge of how to: farm well, preserve harvest, and replenish forests, and how to make, build, and use, return and restore.

This will make the domestic and wild exist in harmony.

His argument is that “a culture that does not measure itself by nature, by an understanding of its debts to nature, becomes destructive of nature and thus of itself.”

Humans consciously and conscientiously ask “is this good for us?” and “is this good for our place”. Yet the answer is always going to be equivalent. This is when nature strikes back.

Nature is at our mercy. The only tool we have to preserve nature with is culture; and the only thing we have to preserve wildness with is domesticity.

We can’t assume that wildlife reserves will reach our goal of preserving nature.

Those whom agree with berry and are in favor of preserving nature are going to have to see that if we do not have an economy capable of valuing in particular terms the durable good of localities and communities, then we are not going to be able to preserve anything. I.E. Berry would be in favor of increasing the price of lumber. Thus he would argue that it would preserve nature.

### Berry also creates a strikingly, if not intentional, then coincidental, relationship between nature and economics: “Looking at the monocultures of industrial civilization, we yearn with a kind of homesickness for the humanness and the naturalness of a highly diversified, multipurpose landscape, democratically divided, with many margins. The margins are of the utmost importance. They are the divisions between holdings, as well as between kinds of work, and kinds of land. These margins-lanes, streamsides, wooded fencerows, and the like-are always freeholds of wildness, where limits are set on human intention.” (Berry, 530) Now I’m not sure if he intentionally used the words such as: highly diversified, margins, divisions, and holdings on purpose. But when I first read the particular passage, it reminded me of the Stock Market, as if he is comparing Wall Street to Wildness. Berry ends his essay with the following message, “And we should not neglect to notice that, whereas the monocultural landscape is totalitarian in tendency, the landscape of harmony is democratic and free.” (Berry, 530) The fact of the matter is that in order for all that is Nature to exist in harmony, we must diverge from our homocentric tendencies and take on an unfamiliar foreign perspective. And this holds true for even if we remain self-centered or biased in our judgment of nature.