# Essay2 Draft

## Introduction

### 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.

## Thesis

## The Divine Functions of Nature

### The Givers

### Leopold wants to figure out whats going on.

### Genuinely interested in exercising power to create and destroy plants.

### It as if all through out

### Why does he use these divine functions to create and destroy plants?

### He uses his bias as a tool to determine the reasons of using the axe in his hand.

### Is this axe in hand decision an exercise power?

### Would he not be examining the inclinations of his use of these tools that of which are the creation and destruction of plants.

### Leopold’s reference to farmer that describes ancestral motives

### The Takers

### Leopold suggests that his bias is:

#### Aldo Leopold, a longtime wielder of the axe, claims to have as many biases as there are species of trees on his farm (source)..

#### Leopold tries to examine biases as a transitional tool.

#### Leopold argues that a natural bias allows for him to see with a calm assurance, whether or not his actions are truly for the good of the land. Leopold makes an early assumption that: “not all trees are created free

### The limitations of Leopold’s model

### The good of the land

### Leopold towards the end of his essay, may have concluded in thought that humans are in fact beneficiaries of

#### The use of divine functions in the good of the land. Hey

### A Human Centered Universe

### Ecocentrism

### Berry and Leopold’s prudent planning for our environment and how it their definitions might differ; that is to define the sustainment 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.

### 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

### 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.
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