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. Inversely this reinforces the long known fact that humans are in a way, parasites, and our host of course: Mother Nature. It makes no difference to the wild mushroom growing on the side of a tree as to whether its existence harms, or replenishes the tree. But if that very tree is struck by lightning, the mushroom shall face its ultimatum and the universe in which it knows; becomes threatened.

Wendell Berry draws upon this ideology within *“Preserving Wildness”*. The mushroom growing on a nearby tree in the Harvard Yard is living in a mushroom centered universe. The squirrel that built a nest, or pile of leaves amidst that very tree top, is living in a squirrel-centered universe. The same rule applies to humans, as not only is each human living in a human-centered universe, but also each person is living in a self-centered universe.

Certain circumstances however, prove that it is possible to see from another’s point of view, but it is often considered a rare occurrence. As with Loren Eiseley’s encounter with a crow one night: “To see from an inverted angle, however, is not a gift allotted merely to the human imagination” (Eiseley, 527) We see that in order to maintain the balance between man and wild, we must sacrifice material items for the greater good of our planet. But what must be defined as the greater good if not to exist for our own survival? Are all environmentalists greedy? For what is their reasoning behind global warming? They sell us the idea that we should recycle anything and everything rather than throwing it in the garbage. Regardless as to whether this will result in an increase of carbon monoxide levels in the atmosphere, we still neglect to tend to it. But why?

Surely we cannot escape this anthropocentric (human-centered) tendency. The upside however, is that it will ultimately be for the “well-being” of our planet. *But*, I feel as if the only way that a environmentalist can be a *true* environmentalist, is when the day comes that we longer need the Universe, Earth, Mother Nature, or even a backyard garden. A prideful generation is one day destined to explore some distant planet. And I’m sure that they too will make the same mistakes that we once, or have yet, to of made. But in the end, there will never be a way that I can prove *to* *be or not to be –* living in a self-centered universe.

It is a rare occurrence in which one ventures out of a self-centered universe. (Eiseley) Regardless, both Loren Eiseley and Wendell Berry romanticize of a spiritual: “marvel” (Eiseley) or “landscape of harmony” (Berry) in which all living species exist entirely within a “democratic” or egalitarian” society. Even the weasel infiltrating Michael Polan’s freshly planted garden has a duty to fulfill. (Polan, Gardening)With that being said, we’ve realized that the future is in the hands of each and every one of us. Yet we still continue to face problems imposed by nature and its resources. 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. This holds true for even if we remain self-centered or biased in nature.

One cannot deny however, that nature is a democracy. The fact is that any effort to try to consolidate the wild, no matter how thoughtful the plans are, will ultimately result in failure. Ironically however, our demise is in fact a perfectly natural event, comparable to that of the dinosaurs. “The Lord giveth, and the Lord taketh away” (67) so claims Aldo Leopold. And I think this is to blame for the extinction of the dinosaurs.

All that is of relation to us as an individual is to be deemed as good, but only in our own mind. 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. We the people must wield nature as a tool, a tool that is subject to only a limited amount of uses. The prevention of shoddy workmanship with this tool (nature) and the prevention of a monopolized management are all factors that must be examined when attempting to solve present day environmental issues.

Classically throughout time however, humans relentlessly attempt to solve all problems that are deemed the most unsolvable. If a problem was to arise right now, this very moment. I could soon prove it to be obsolete by creating an even bigger problem than the original. By giving you the solution, a new problem was of course created. It is our thirst as a species to be bothered by these obscure, yet essential nuances commonly attributed to Nature. It is for that very reason that we thrive as a species dominating this Earth. We live and breathe to constantly excel forward, and in fact, our society’s obsession with unsolved problems will continue indefinitely.

Along side my obsession with creating and solving problems is a fondness for the human will. Preservation efforts compose of exceedingly impossible obstacles, yet we still proceed. Even in the most farfetched situations, the human will continues to show its power. The typical contestant in a beauty pageant will give the most classical response to questions saying something along the lines of “I would like to solve world hunger, and help promote world peace”. Obviously an overwhelming amount of these aspirations have yet to come even close to their goal. My point being is, that if the girl at the beauty pageant truly aspired, put forth the will, time, and money, and by a long shot solved the problem of world hunger; we would be due for a newer, much larger, and more difficult dilemma simply because of a chain reaction effect that was the result of solving world hunger. It is very unlikely that within the near future we will have solved world hunger, let alone one of Leopold’s hypothetical problems.

The most inquisitive part about mankind however is that we never seem to stop searching for answers. For as long as we search for answers to mankind problems, Nature in the end will transform respectively into an equally bigger problem. And when we solve any given nature problem, it too will cause an unpredictable spiral effect that just never seems to end, nor did we see it start. We have no clue what the consequences are of solving big world problems, yet we continue to put forth the effort just because it is hard coded into our genes. This instinct dates farther back, to our great great great ancestors. Whoever they may have been, one thing remains intact - they all were the same exact way. They created a stockpile of problems and then left them for us, the future generation to solve. The same will happen to future generations regardless as to whether our motives are angelic or `sinister. The fact is that if we *don’t* do something about it quick, we might just end up betteroff.

Holy crap.

Wait! Did he just say we’d be *better* off? What I mean by this is simple, you can only cause harm to nature if you are wielding a tool. If you wield no tool, then simply put, you have no responsibility. Generally the first rule of Consequentialism is to do no harm. Despite Leopold’s Utilitarianism methods, I feel as if he is viewing the problem from a perspective that doesn’t require him to make a living off the land. I think that if Leopold had to live only off nature his concern amongst the price of timber: “The pine will ultimately bring ten dollars a thousand, the birch two dollars” (Leopold pg. 69) and other factors will continue to add towards his bias. According to Leopold, “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 Pg. 68) and by doing this, “we avoid responsibility for the misuse of any tool save our own” (Leopold Pg. 68)
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