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.