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A Natural Approach to Environmentalism

Environmentalism is strongly tied to several features of society. The construct of Earth as Mother Nature and the role of the planet on social aspects of human life has induced a humane, personal outlook on the environment. Politics have only inflamed this connection between humans and nature by imposing a burden onto humanity to "fix what we have broken". While it is necessary to account for the impact of humanity on the environment and corresponding issues (such as climatology), the approach that is commonly used to support this cause is flawed: humanity as a whole must acknowledge that they do not own the planet (Stanford). The popular outlook on environmentalism is paradoxically unsound in that humans will continue to abuse nature until they collectively dismiss this idea that they own it, but the only reason for humans to clean up their so-called mess (helping the environment) is because of their emotional connection to it (which is linked to the notion of ownership). A more objective approach, as introduced by Richard Powers in ​*The Overstory​*, is that humans must perceive nature as a separate entity from humanity, a divine existence by which we are blessed to be surrounded. Powers argues that “we won’t be well until we realize that [the environment’s resources are not ours]”, signifying their existence is not bounded by the human requirement. It has its own set of species-specific consciousness and intelligence that humans cannot perceive (Markovits). They are separate entities that have their signature characters to play. In the novel *the overstory,* the trees are considered a living thing, that we so frequently take for granted. Their living aspect is what people refuse to acknowledge. Two of the characters in the novel – Neelay and Patricia – have shown to take great interest in portraying the specific intricacies of living life as a scientific prodigy. While Ray and Dorothy are seemed to understand the nature of trees as the separate entities discrete from the worldly expectations (Stanford). Power writes *“things planted around the house in all these years gone are contributed towards making meaning, as simply as they make sugar and wood from nothing, from the sun, rain, and sir. Alas! The humans don’t listen.”* This symbolizes the fact that although human and nonhuman coexist with one another, they should not be considered property because they are not deemed worthy of acknowledgment and appreciation. Another incident in a book quotes “The tree in your backyard as well as you have the same origin. Many years ago, you two were separated. Despite a massive expedition in distinct directions, both of you share the same set of genes”. Powers is depicting his thoughts of equality for both human and nonhuman entities. He clearly emphasizes that both have a common ancestor. One should neither be perceived superiority over another nor it should be declared as its own (Markovits). He further adds “*In sunlight, water travels through the xylem and scatters out of the billion-minute pores on the base of leaves, a numerous mass a day vanishing from the tree’s casual pinnacle into the moist Iowa surroundings.”* The way he incredibly transforms the science into poetry is itself embodiment of his emotional feelings for the nonhuman nature, yet he is not in favor of perceiving it as its own. Further characterizing human nature more closely related to the nonhuman nature, he writes “She never forgot how she never had the endurance for nature. No play, no progress, no striking expectations, and doubts. Branching, tangled, messy plots”. This excerpt from the book shows how human nature is the same that of trees. Complex, unraveling and chaotic (Markovits).

The way our species lost the presence of such ancient, ancestral, knowledge when it tried to control nature by farming is very tragic (Markovits). Power and ownership myths followed suit, ruled the beast and the area, continued and multiplied. Don't listen to the wind on the flower, the native nativity is a devil worshiper. Forget their love for the wilderness and nature. It's a broken, tainted, dark world. Look to your heavenly lord, do as you delight with the trees and wait until you die to ride the great elevator to excellence. The native people, as you claim, will look seven generations and try to bequeath from their ancestors what they inherited. All we're looking at is a balance of the banks.

However, humans are considered as self-centered species of a nature that are prone to declaring useful entities as their own. The human self-centeredness neither benefits human nor nonhuman because it is unsafe and unreasonable. As a consequence of our emotions clouded by this self-centeredness, humans fail to acknowledge their dependence on nature. It disrupts the perceptions of human nature and its association with the nonhuman kind (*Nature in the Active Voice – AHR*). When the human and nonhuman are perceived as different, hyperactive separation is articulated in rejecting both the mind and nature-like aspects of nature and a human respectively. At the point when we hyperseparate ourselves from nature and diminish it reasonably, we not just lose the capacity to relate to seeing the non-human circle in moral terms, yet besides, get our very own misguided feeling character and area that incorporates a fanciful feeling of organization and self-sufficiency. So human-focused reasonable systems are an immediate risk to the nonhuman, but at the same time are a circuitous prudential peril to self, to people, particularly in a circumstance where we press limits (*Nature in the Active Voice – AHR*).

According to the powers, this disappointment lies behind numerous ecological disasters, both human and nonhuman (Stanford). The powerlessness or refusal to perceive the way nonhuman add to or bolster our lives urges us to keep them from assets. It has equity angles since we will not give different species a lot of the earth, and it has moral viewpoints since we bomb them in care, thought and consideration. This implies our 'profound' human-focused moral disappointments and our 'shallow' prudential disappointments are intently and intelligently connected.
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