# 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 the use of 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.

# Main Body

## The Divine Functions of Nature

### Introduction

### 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.

### If this axe in hand decision in 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.

## Main Body

### 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.

### If Leopold isn’t concerned sparsely with profits 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.

### Berry, Wendell. "Preserving Wildness." *American Earth: Environmental Writing since Thoreau*. By Bill McKibben and Albert Gore. New York, NY: Literary Classics of the United States, 2008. 516-30. Print.

### Leopold, Aldo, Charles Walsh Schwartz, and Aldo Leopold. *A Sand County Almanac. With Other Essays on Conservation from Round River*. New York: Oxford UP, 1966. Print.

# Axe In Hand Paper

“Axe in Hand”, Aldo Leopold

# 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 functions 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 suggests 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.

Other ancestors, less remote, have since invented other tools, but each of these, upon close scrutiny, proves to be either an elaboration of, or an accessory to, the original pair of basic implements. We classify ourselves into vocations, each of which either wields some particular tool, or sells it, or repairs it, or sharpens it, or dispenses advice on how to do so; by such division of labors we avoid responsibility for the misuse of any tool save our own. But there is one vocation-philosophy-which knows that all men, by what they think about and wish for, in effect wield all tools. It knows that men thus determine, by their manner of thinking and wishing, whether it is worth while to wield any.

November is, for many reasons, the month for the axe. It is warm enough to grind an axe without freezing, but cold enough to fell a tree in comfort. The leaves are off the hardwoods, so that one can see just how the branches intertwine, and what growth occurred last summer. Without this clear view of treetops, one cannot be sure which tree, if any, needs felling for the good of the land.

I have read many definitions of what is a conservationist, and written not a few myself, but I suspect that the best one is written not with a pen, but with an axe. It is a matter of what a man thinks about while chopping, or while deciding what to chop. A conservationist is one who is humbly aware that with each stroke he is writing his signature on the face of his land. Signatures of course differ, whether written with axe or pen, and this is as it should be.

I find it disconcerting to analyze, *ex post facto*, the reasons behind my own axe-in-hand decisions. I find, first of all, that not all trees are created free and equal. Where a white pine and a red birch are crowding each other, I have an *a priori* bias; I always cut the birch to favor the pine. Why?

Well, first of all I planted the pine with my shovel, whereas the birch crawled under the fence and planted itself. My bias is thus to some extent paternal, but this cannot be the whole story, for if the pine were a natural seedling like the birch, I would value it even more. So I must dig deeper for the logic, if any behind my bias.

The birch is an abundant tree in my township and becoming more so, whereas pine is scarce and becoming scarcer; perhaps my bias is for the underdog. But what would I do if my farm were further north, where pine is abundant and red birch is scarce? I confess I don’t know. My farm is here.

The pine wll live for a century, the birch for half that; do I fear that my signature will fade? My neighbors have planted no pines but all have many birches; am I snobbish about having a woodlot of distinction? The pine stays green all winter, the birch punches the clock in October; do I favor the tree that, like myself, braves the winter wind? The pine will shelter a grouse but the birch will feed him; do I consider bed more important than board? The pine will ultimately bring ten dollars a thousand, the birch two dollars; have I an eye on the bank? All of these possible reasons for my bias seem to carry some weight, but none of them carries very much.

So I try again, and here perhaps is something; under this pine will ultimately grow a trailing arbutus, an Indian pipe, a pyrola, or a twin flower, whereas under the birch a bottle gentian is about the best to be hoped for. In this pine a pileated woodpecker will ultimately chisel out a nest; in the birch a hairy will have to suffice. In this pine the wind will sing for me in April, at which time the birch is only rattling naked twigs. These possible reasons for my bias carry weight, but why? Does the pine stimulate my imagination and my hopes more deeply than the birch does? If so, is the difference in the trees, or in me?

The only conclusion I have ever reached is that I love all trees, but I am in love with pines.

As I said, November is the month for the axe, and, as in other love affairs, there is skill in the exercise of bias. If the birch stands south of pine, and is taller, it will shade the pine’s leader in the spring, and thus discourage the pine weevil from laying her eggs there. Birch competition is a minor affliction compared with this weevil, whose progeny kill the pine’s leader and thus deform the tree. It is interesting to mediate that this insect’s preference for squatting in the sun determines not only her own continuity as a species, but also the future figure of the pine, and my own success as a wielder of axe and shovel.

Again, if a drouthy summer follows my removal of the birch’s shade, the hotter soil may offset the lesser competition for water, and my pine be none the better for my bias.

Lastly, if birch’s limbs rub the pine’s terminal buds during a wind, the pine will surely be deformed, and the birch must either be removed regardless of other considerations, or else it must be pruned of limbs each winter to a height greater than the pine’s prospective summer growth.

Such are the pros and cons the wielder of an axe must forsee, compare, and decide upon with the calm assurance that his bias will, on the average, prove to be something more than good intentions.

The wielder of an axe has as many biases as there are species of trees on his farm. In the course of the years he imputes to each species, from his responses to their beauty or utility, and their responses to his labors for or against them, a series of attributes that constitutes a character. I am amazing to learn what diverse characters different men impute to one and the same tree.

Thus to me the aspen is in good repute because he glorifies October and he feeds my grouse in winter, but to some of my neighbors he is a mere weed, perhaps because he sprouted so vigorously in the stump lots their grandfathers were attempting to clear. (I cannot sneer at this, for I find myself disliking the elms whose resproutings threaten my pines.)

Again, the tamarack is to me a favorite second option only to white pine, perhaps he is nearly extinct in my township (underdog bias), or because he sprinkles gold October grouse (gunpowder bias) , or because he sours the soil and enables it to grow the loveliest of our orchids, the showy lady’s-slipper. On the other hand, foresters have excommunicated the tamarack because he grows to slowly to pay compound interest. In order to clinch this dispute, they also mention that he succumbs periodically to epizootics of saw-fly, but this is fifty years hence for my tamaracks, so I shall let my grandson worry about it. Meanwhile my tamaracks are growing so lustily that my spirits soar with them, skyward.

To my an ancient cottonwood is the greatest of trees because in his youth he shaded the buffalo and wore a halo of pigeons, and I like a young cottonwood because he may some day become ancient. But the farmer’s wife (and hence the farmer) despises all cottonwoods because in June the female tree clogs the screens with cotton. The modern dogma is comfort at any cost.

I find my biases more numerous than those of my neighbors because I have individual likings for many species that they lump under one aspersive category: brush. Thus I like the wahoo, partly because deer, rabbits and mice are so avid to eat his square twigs and green bar and partly because his cerise berries grow so warmly against November snow. I like the red dogwood because he feeds October robins, and the prickly ash because my woodcock take their daily sunbath under the shelter of his thorns. I like the hazel because his October purple feeds my eye, and because his November catkins feed my deer and grouse. I like the bittersweet because my father did, and because the deer, on the 1st of July of each year, begin suddenly to eat the new leaves, and I have learned to predict this event to my guests. I cannot dislike a plant that enables me, a mere professor, to blossom forth annually as a successful seer and prophet.

It is evident that our plant biases are in part traditional. If your grandfather liked hickory nuts, you will like the hickory tree because your father told you to. If, on the other hand, your grandfather burned a log carrying a poison ivy vine and recklessly stood in the smoke, you will dislike the species, no matter with what crimson glories it warms your eyes each fall.

It is also evident that our plant biases reflect not only on vocations but avocations, with a delicate allocation of priority as between industry and indolence. The farmer who would rather hunt grouse than milk cows will not dislike hawthorn, no matter if it does invade his pasture. The coon-hunter will not dislike basswood, and I know of quail hunters who bear no grudge against ragweed, despite their annual bout with hayfever. Our biases are indeed a sensitive index into our affections, our tastes, our loyalties, our generosities, and our manner of wasting weekends.

Be that as it may, I am content to waste mine, in November, with axe in hand.

# *Initial Observations*

## *Axe in Hand*

### *Thesis: Leopold assumes that whoever owns land must forsee, compare, and decide with the calm assurance that his bias will, on the average, prove to be an irreplaceable tool.*

#### Philosophy and Vocations

##### We classify ourselves into vocations, each of which either wields some particular tool, or sells it, or repairs it, or sharpens it, or dispenses advice on how to do so.

##### But there is one vocation—philosophy—which knows that all men, by what they think about and wish for, in effect wield all tools.

##### It [philosophy] knows that men thus determine, by their manner of thinking and wishing, whether it is worth while to wield any.

#### Intentions

##### Without this clear view of treetops, one cannot be sure which tree, if any, needs felling for the good of the land.

###### If it were for the good of the land Leopold would not chop down the tree.

##### It is a matter of what a man thinks about while chopping, or while deciding what to chop.

###### Immanuel Kant

##### A conservationist is one who is humbly aware that with each stroke he is writing his signature on the face of his land.

#### Bias and Reasoning

##### Our plant biases reflect not only vocations but avocations, with a delicate allocation of priority as between industry and indolence.

##### I find, first of all, that not all trees are created free and equal.

##### I have an a priori bias; I always cut the birch to favor the pine.

##### The wielder of an axe has as many biases as there are species of trees on his farm.

##### His biases are more numerous than neighbors.

##### His plant biases are in part traditional, or passed down from previous generations.

##### The pine will ultimately bring ten dollars a thousand, the birch two dollars;

###### Money factor

##### Our biases are indeed a sensitive index to our affections, our tastes, our loyalties, our generosities, and our manner of wasting weekends.

#### Birch

##### Planted pine himself, while birch planted itself

###### If pine was natural seedling he’d like pine even more.

##### Birch is abundant while pine is scarce

###### Bias for underdog

##### Birch only lives for half as long as pine

###### Legacy

##### Pine shelters and birch feeds grouse

###### Bed more important than board

##### Loves all trees, but loves pines

## *Preserving Wildness*

### *Thesis: The argument over the proper relation of humanity to nature.*

### *Describes both sides of the conflict*

#### The argument over the proper relation of humanity to nature is becoming, as the sixties used to say, polarized.

#### At the other extreme are the nature conquerors, who have no patience with an old-fashioned outdoor farm, let alone a wilderness.

#### If I had to choose, I would join the nature extremists against the technology extremists, but this choice seems poor, even assuming that it is possible.

### *II. States his assumptions*

#### The middle, of course, is always rather roomy and bewildering territory, and so I should state plainly the assumptions that define the ground on which I indent to stand:

##### We live in a wilderness, in which we and our works occupy a tiny space and play a tiny part. We exist under its dispensation and by its tolerance.

##### This wilderness, the universe, is somewhat hospitable to us, but it is also absolutely dangerous to us (it is going to kill us, sooner or later), and we are absolutely dependent upon it.

##### That we depend upon what we are endangered by is a problem not solvable by “problem solving.” It does not have what the nature romantic or the technocrat would regard a solution. We are not going back to the Garden of Eden, nor are we going to manufacture an Industrial Paradise.

##### There does exist a possibility that we can live more or less in harmony with our native wilderness; I am betting my life that such a harmony is possible. But I do not believe that it can be achieved simply or easily or that it can ever be perfect, and I am certain that it can never be made, once and for all, but is the forever unfinished lifework of our species.

##### It is not possible (at least, not for very long) for humans to intend their own good specifically or exclusively. We cannot intend our good, in the long run, without intending the good of our place—which means, ultimately, the good of the world.

##### To use or not to use nature is not a choice that is available to us; we can live only at the expense of other lives. Our choice has rather to do with how and how much to use. This is not a choice that can be decided satisfactorily in principle or in theory; it is a choice intransigently impractical. That is, it must be worked out in local practice because, by necessity, the practice will vary somewhat from one locality to another. There is, thus, no practical way that we can intend the good of the world; practice can only be local.

##### If there is no escape from the human use of nature, then human good cannot be simply synonymous with natural good.

#### What these assumptions describe, of course, is the human predicament. It is a spiritual predicament, for it requires us to be properly humble and grateful; time and again, it asks us to be still and wait. But it is also a practical problem, for it requires us to do things.

### *III. Call to action*

#### In going to work on this problem it is a mistake to proceed on the basis of an assumed division or divisibility between nature and humanity, or wildness and domesticity.

##### The indivisibility of wildness and domesticity, even within the fabric of human life itself, is easy enough to demonstrate.

##### The same is true of a healthy human economy as it branches upward out of the soil.

##### Breeders of domestic animals, likewise, know that, when a breeding program is too much governed by human intention, by economic considerations, or by fashion, uselessness is the result.

### *IV. Our cultures dominance upon nature*

#### To be divided against nature, against wildness, then, is a human disaster because it is to be divided against ourselves.

#### But to say that we are not divided and not dividable from nature is not to say that there is no difference between us and the other creatures.

#### But humans differ most from other creatures in the extent to which they must be made what they are—that is, in the extent to which they are artifacts of their culture.

#### In the recovery of culture and nature is the knowledge of how to farm well, how to preserve, harvest and replenish the forests, how to make, build, and use, return and restore.

#### Harmony is one phase, the good phase, of the inescapable dialogue between culture and nature. The awareness that we are slowly growing into now is that the earthly wildness that we are so complexly dependent upon is at our mercy.

### *V. Our economy doesn’t positively reward good use of nature.*

#### To me, this means simply that we are not safe in assuming that we can preserve wildness by making wilderness preserves.

#### Conservation is going to prove increasingly futile and increasingly meaningless if its proscriptions are not answered positively by an economy that rewards and enforces good use.

#### Our present economy, by contrast, does not account for affection at all, which is to say that it does not account for value.

#### Now that the practical processes of industrial civilization have become so threatening to humanity and to nature, it is easy for us, or for some of us, to see that practicality needs to be made subject to spiritual values and spiritual measures.

#### “The dignity of toil is undermined its necessity is gone,” Kathleen Raine says, and she is right.

### *VI. The Reason to Preserve Nature*

#### And so, though I am trying to unspecialize the idea and the job of preserving wildness, I am not against wilderness preservation.

#### The reason to preserve wilderness is that we need it.

#### We need wilderness also because wildness—nature—is one of our indispensable studies.

##### What is here?

##### What will nature permit us to do here?

##### What will nature help us to do here?

#### The second and third questions are obviously the ones that would define agendas of practical research and of work.

#### But the second and third questions are ruled by the first.

#### However, to say that wilderness and wildness are indispensable to us, indivisible from us, is not to say that we can find sufficient standards for our life and work in nature.

#### Clearly, if we want to argue for the existence of the world as we know it, we will have to find some way of qualifying and supplementing this relentless criterion of “natural.”

### *VII. Hope In Finding Solution*

#### We are creatures obviously subordinate to nature, dependent upon a wild world that we did not make.

#### Humans differ from earthworms, thrushes, and hawks in their capacity to do more—in modern times, a great deal more—in their own behalf than is necessary.

#### We have no way to work at this question, it seems to me, except by perceiving that, in order to have the world, we must share it, both with each other and with other creatures, which is immediately complicated by the further perception that, in order to live in the world, we must use it somewhat at the expense of other creatures.

#### But in the recognition of the difficulty of our situation is a kind of relief, for it makes us give up the hope that a solution can be found in a simple preference for humanity over nature or nature over humanity.

### *VIII. Population*

#### As undertake this work, perhaps the greatest immediate danger lies in our dislike of ourselves as a species.

#### For these reasons, there is great danger in the perception that “there are too many people,” whatever truth may be in, for this is a premise from which it is too likely that somebody, sooner or later, will proceed to a determination of who are the surplus.

#### I would argue that, at least for us in the United States, the conclusion that “there are too many people” is premature, not because I know that there are not too many people, but because I do not think we are prepared to come to such a conclusion.

#### The “population problem,” initially, should be examined as a problem, not of quantity, but of pattern.

#### The population issue thus leads directly to the issue of proportion and scale.

### *IX. Conclusion*

#### When we propose that humans should learn to behave properly with respect to nature so as to place their domestic economy harmoniously upon and within the sustaining and surrounding wilderness, then we make possible a sort of landscape criticism.

#### Looking at the monocultures of industrial civilization, we yearn with a kind of homesickness for the humaneness and the naturalness of a highly diversified, multipurpose landscape, democratically divided, with many margins.

# This is a previous version Leopold.

## *In his essay “Axe in Hand”, Aldo Leopold suggests that his axe and shovel are the natural bias he shares with different species of plants on his land. 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 and equal”. Doing so, allows him to consciously explain his preference of pine over birch trees. Which in the end leads to the Throughout his essay with factual evidence that is not only immune to perception, but clearly leads the reader through a very persuasive argument that suggests his bias is generally better for the land.*

### *The wielder of an axe has as many biases as there are species of trees on his farm.*

### *He goes on to persuade the reader given more evidence of how his bias for aspen, the tamarack, and the ancient cottonwood all benefit the tree.*

### *His biases are more numerous than neighbors.*

### *His plant biases are in part traditional, or passed down from previous generations.*

### *Our plant biases reflect not only vocations but avocations, with a delicate allocation of priority as between industry and indolence.*

### *Our biases are indeed a sensitive index to our affections, our tastes, our loyalties, our generosities, and our manner of wasting weekends.*

# Misc Notes

Leopold makes a model of the environment.

The divine functions of this are

After reading

In “Axe in Hand”, Aldo Leopold suggests that there are givers and takers. (quote)

Using this basic principle, Leopold delves deeply in an effort to understand the cause of his biases. of not only his but his ancestors.

His attempt to explain his biases fails at first. But then leads the leader into a similar situation that fails.

Leave out quotations in final paragraph.