When it comes to preserving nature, there are two distinct sides of the argument:

Nature Extremists

1. Assume that there is no necessary disjuncture or difference between the human estate and the estate of nature, that human good is in some simple way the same as natural good.
2. Believes biosphere is an egalitarian system.
3. Tend to stand aloof from the issue of the proper human use of nature.
4. Use “stewardship” (meaning responsible use of nature) as a term of denigration

Technology Extremists

1. Divide all reality into two parts: human good, which they define as profit, comfort, and security; and everything else, which the understand as a stockpile of “natural resources” or “raw materials,” which will sooner or later be transformed into human good.
2. They wish for example, to solve “the problem of hunger”—if it can be done so glamorously, comfortably, and profitably.
3. They believe the ability something is a reason to do it.
4. University of Illinois researches are, “Looking forward to production without either farmers or farms”.

The Middle (where the problem is)

1. Realizes that we must use nature.
2. It is going to kill us
3. Informal solution
4. Assumes that we can live in harmony with nature
5. We are self-centered naturally
6. To use or not to use nature is not a choice available to use.
7. Human good can’t be synonymous with natural good.