

Product of my environment

[Environment](#), [Ecology](#)



Xavier Rodriguez Expos 101 Assignment # 3 F. D. Professor: Debra Keates
10/22/12 " What Means the World to You" What is important to someone varies from person to person. These things can be displayed in different forms and approached in various ways. This is seen within O'Brien, Stout and Fraser's essays. O'Brien understands what inspires human connection and he manipulates the truth of his story in order to capture the attention and respect of others. He justifies his decision to distort his story based on the impact it has on the reader.

For every author, O'Brien argues that the aim is to get one's point(s) across; to bring attention to what matters the most to them. Regardless the category, this is done by expressing one's objective with feeling and a sense of importance. In Caroline Fraser's, " Rewilding North America," she uses convincing evidence to prove to the reader that reserves and corridors promote the well-being of wildlife and humans alike. Similarly, Martha Stout has a biased opinion.

Stout sets out to demonstrate to readers in " When I Woke Up on Tuesday Morning, It Was Friday" that counseling is important for clients who have experienced trauma by sharing individual client stories. The way people define truth and the information they provide can determine how others will evaluate the story. There are different ways to connect to a reader. The writer's objective and the audience both influence these decisions. O'Brien's storytelling method may involve embellishments that bend the truth rather than adhere to it.

Had he authored either Fraser or Stout's essays, the objective may have been the same, but the style would likely have been quite different. Within

their respective essays, Fraser and Stout's definitions of truth can be observed and interpreted. Both authors cite massive research projects, specific cases and general statistics to communicate their theory. It would appear, that unlike O'Brien, both Fraser and Stout are more concerned with providing support for their story and/or objective. O'Brien did not bother with ensuring that his facts were correct, but rather that the message was clear.

Facts and evidence, however, are very important components of Fraser and Stout's "truths". Fraser relies on scientific evidence to gain attention from her audience. While O'Brien may not disapprove of this method, he may see it as unnecessary. As she writes "In the United States, for example, deer-vehicle collisions alone occur up to one and a half million times each year, costing some two hundred lives and \$8.8 billion annually; collisions also imperil the survival of twenty-one endangered and threatened species"(123).

Another example of Fraser's tendency to provide explicit scientific evidence is when she describes Fraser writes about the Banff Project scientists and their impact on the concept of Rewilding as they collected "footage from cameras mounted on the underpasses [which show] bears and mountain lions approaching the wire cautiously, sniffing, and peering around" (123). The animals questioned the underpass at first, just as any creature would do when coming upon something unfamiliar. Shortly thereafter, "most of them burst over or under the wires, galloping off" (123).

O'Brien would say that Fraser's method of getting attention to her theory would be a great approach, however, if all that evidence is needed then his way to get through to people would not be relatable because to his own because he believes in simplicities and getting through to people with

tantalizing and basic approaches such as emotions to capture the attention of people and his ability to tell a story and his way of articulating the facts or details. Regarding O'Brien's argument that a piece of writing or a story should create an emotional connection, Fraser's writing falls short.

Fraser does make some attempts to build a feeling of empathy for the animals whose lives are positively impacted, as she writes " in 1993, Pluie lost her collar, which was found with a bullet hole in it. The wolf herself was shot dead two years later, along with her mate and several pups" (112). Even still as she integrates statistics and hard facts when she wrote " in the last 15 years or so, 27-percent of the known wolf deaths have been from the railway, and 60-percent were on the highway. Just 5-percent were natural... The Bow Valley used to have three packs.

Now it has one. In 1996, three of the four pups born to this pack were lost to the highway. The next year, none of the five pups born survived, and we know at least one was hit on the railway. During 1998, the pack had no pups and was down to three members" (112). In this segment, Fraser uses a specific story to draw in the reader and build a connection. However, these moments are too few and far between, as Fraser spends a good deal of the essay providing long descriptions of scientific theory and jargon relevant to her field.

For example, Fraser spends five pages outlining the development of the term " ecosystem", " equilibrium theory" and the consequent theory supporting the use of corridors and reserves, which she is generally supporting throughout her essay. Further she has a tendency to provide irrelevant and ridiculous amounts of detail, which loses the reader's interest. For example,
<https://assignbuster.com/product-of-my-environment/>

Fraser writes, “ Conservation biology is a small world:” and she elaborates, “ Michael Soule sat on the committee at the University of Michigan that supervised Newmark’s dissertation. The study percolated in Soule’s mind as went to his next job, at UC Santa Cruz.

Sitting in his kitchen one day, Soule was talking to his friend Arne Naess, the Norwegian philosopher who founded ‘ deep ecology’... ” While these details may be an attempt to grab the reader’s attention, they have the opposite effect. O’Brien might describe Fraser’s approach as dry and fruitless. The author’s have various styles they attempt to use to get across to their audience, as is their technique. When compared to Fraser, Stout’s approach would be more favorable to O’Brien because there is less technicality used, less use of attempt to convince the reader that her topic of dissociation is fact and is somewhat curable.

She uses interconnections to demonstrate her therapist to client bond. The method that she uses is relaxed and simple yet effective by exposing the way dissociation is triggered, and how it happens to everyone whether or not the individual realizes it or not. “ Sometimes dissociation can occur when we are simply confused or frustrated or nervous, whether we recognize it or not” (Stout 384). After her clients get an understanding they begin to feel and get a better sense of the things that matter to them and are more important them by working to get a grasp on the things which are simpler to connect with.

Stout convinces people that her evidence is true by walking through alongside her patients in defining lost memories and times and situations and fills in the gaps necessary in order to help her clients feel closure,

happy(satisfaction) and free. Allowing them to function with a more clear mind. She sees the way people are deeper than what is seen on the surface and have the ability to do the same things as anyone else can. Stout says, " All human beings have the capacity to dissociate psychologically, though most of us are unaware of this, and consider " out of body" episodes to be far beyond the boundaries of our normal experience.

In fact, dissociative experiences happen to everyone and most of these events are quite ordinary" (388). Due to dissociation being an occurrence that is not identified with ease, the majority of society does not recognize that we all in fact dissociate. When it comes to straightforwardness, a person can be sincere but not report the truth due to naivety or in order to try to get a deeper meaning. O'Brien states, " In any war story but especially a true one, it's difficult to separate what happened from what seemed to happen" (71). The truth is not out in the open and is hidden. This in turn plays on the accuracy of an experience.

When retelling an experience, the sequence of events has to be objective or have an unbiased view. Often unbiased or objective views can be lost. O'Brien uses the statement " true war story" throughout his essay. The use of the word " true" causes the essay to have a biased view Stout's ability to be effective and connect with the reader is kept at a strong tempo when she gives strong interesting and powersfl insights How effective is Stout at connecting with the reader? If she is effective, find an example of a time in which she is. In Stout's essay, she writes how " we can go somewhere else.

The part of consciousness that we nearly always conceive as the ' self' cannot be there for a few moments, for a few hours and in heinous

<https://assignbuster.com/product-of-my-environment/>

circumstances for much longer” (p 388). Everyone has moments where they go somewhere else in their own heads to cope or protect themselves from a situation, being distracted by something, mentally escaping into a film at a movie theater, or getting lost in a day dream are all little examples of how ordinary and everyday individuals dissociate. Add something about use of language. How does O’Brien use language? How about Fraser? Stout? What might O’Brien think of their uses of language? Examples: O’Brien use metaphors? artsy, elaborate descriptions? Fraser: scientific language? dry at times? Stout: personal anecdotes? also vivid descriptions? ” Both authors illustrate the problems that animals and humans face and the ways they go about coming to conclusions and solving situations and problems. The role that language plays in determining truth to O’Brien, is the studies and usage of the manmade effects have on animals and what gets into the minds of humans. Fraser and Stouts style of writing differ from O’Brien’s by one (Stout) using counseling and the other (Fraser) using convincing evidence.

Stout uses counseling as a means to support her assessments of her clients individual case. As Fraser uses convincing evidence in order to support her promotion of resources and corridors as being beneficial to both animal and humas. Fraser motivates people to act In “ Rewilding North America,” by writing about the development of the concept of rewilding, a conservation method designed to save species from extinction by restoring “ connectivity” in nature, “ holding out the hope and promise that [through this project] humanity could heal the environmental damage that had already been done” (119).

Her evidence is adequate proposed solution to a problem must be tangible and realistic. Rewilding encompasses both aspects exactly. Another reason why rewilding has a better chance for success is the fact that it is natural. The combination of these three aspects makes rewilding the favorable and more effective solution to eliminating animal suffering. Animals roamed planet Earth for nearly 600 million years prior to the appearance of the genus Homo. During all that time, many creatures and species came and went. By and large they evolved, disappeared and became extinct all due to nature, geography, environment and natural events.

Animal extinction is a natural process, but nonetheless the rate has heightened because of man's interaction with animals. Humans tend to cause our wild animal neighbors much more trouble than they do to us, as each day we invade thousands of acres of their territories while destroying their homes. These crises occurring in nature beg for humans to do something to eliminate or lessen the foreseen calamities. Caroline Fraser, in the essay "Rewilding North America" provides what can be appreciated as a balance between the latter two potential solutions.

She explains the concept of rewilding, a large-scale conservation method aimed to restore and provide connectivity between animals and humans. The idea of rewilding is a marriage between synthetic biology and interspecies empathy because it constructively encompasses aspects from both approaches. Rewilding is a feasible solution to eliminate animal suffering that is not only natural but also is a tangible and realistic one, in comparison to the ideas of Stout and O'Brien. Rewilding is an appropriate solution to the problem of species extinction because it is primarily a natural process.

Rewilding, like most natural processes, does not affect animal's lives in any significant negative way. Fraser writes about Banff Project scientists and their impact on the concept of Rewilding. They collected " footage from cameras mounted on the underpasses [which show] bears and mountain lions approaching the wire cautiously, sniffing, and peering around" (123). The animals questioned the underpass at first, just as any creature would do when coming upon something unfamiliar. Shortly thereafter, " most of them burst over or under the wires, galloping off" (123).

O'Brien would say that Fraser's method of getting attention to her theory would be a great approach, however, if all that evidence is needed then his way to get through to people would not be relateable because to his own because he believes in simplisties and getting through to people with tantalizing and basic approaches such as emotions to capture the attention of people and his ability to tell a story and his way of articulating the facts or details. One patient in particular, named Julia, is a successful producer of documentary films.

As a child, Julia underwent child abuse and was skillfully able to remove herself from the horrific situations. The trauma Julia experienced as a child causes her to dissociate now as an adult yet, she carries her life as anyone else would. " I met her when I she was thirty-two, and an intellectual force to be reckoned with. A conversation with her reminds me of the New York Review of Books, except that she is funnier, and also a living breathing human being who wears amethyst jewelry to contrast with her electric auburn hair" (Stout 385).

From the description given by Stout in her essay, Julia does not fit into the category that society has placed her in. She overrides the stereotypes and labels because she is not any different from what society perceives as “normal.” She is intelligent and successful; everything society wants her to be but for some reason she is perceived otherwise. Patients like Julia commonly experience dissociation more severely because of the traumatic experiences they have been through. Why should someone who dissociates, and receives therapeutic assistance to confront their issues, be perceived in society as being different from someone who does not?

Dissociation should not negatively categorize its victims, but rather serve as a common ground between people because all people dissociate. “We can go somewhere else. The part of consciousness that we nearly always conceive as the ‘self’ can not be there for a few moments, for a few hours, and in heinous circumstances, for much longer” (Stout 388). Everyone has moments where they go somewhere else in their own head to cope or protect themselves from a situation. Being distracted by something, mentally escaping into a film at a theatre, or getting lost in a day dream are all minuet examples of how ordinary, everyday individuals dissociate.

Dissociation is an obstacle that Stout’s patients encounter on a day to day basis, and, unfortunately, classifies them in society to be “abnormal.” Society has a picture of what “normal” is supposed to be; but what makes one individual more “normal” than the next? While Stout’s patients are looked upon negatively as being strange because they dissociate; they are no different from a man who enjoys a film at a theatre. “This perfectly ordinary man is dissociated from reality. Effectively, he is in a trance.

We might label his perceptions as psychotic, except for the fact that when the movie is over, he will return to his usual mental status almost instantly. He will see the credits. He will notice that he has spilled some popcorn, although he will not remember doing so" (Stout 388). Someone who society would categorize as a "normal man," experiences an example of what Stout's patients bear regularly. The film watcher is in no contrast with Julia, or any of Stout's other patients; therefore, society has misinterpreted what is considered the norm.

Stout's essay would be evaluated using O'Brien's definition of truth by agreeing in the ways that there are many times that people allow their minds to drift and take over. Imagination is what O'Brien uses and the imagination of these characters are what allow them to face and deal with their traumatic experiences and allows them to take stances in their places that may or may not be realistic. She uses language by its literal form in human communication with her clients, talking and assessing what they lack and how they is a solution through language and rehearsal processes assist in one having an ability to adapt to normality.

This is like O'Brien's as he is most effective with speaking and using language and mind as his tools to paint pictures to the stories he makes. These two are more natural and effective and simplistic yet powerful. When Fraser's compared to the author's approaches she takes more of a scientific stance as to where she provides evidence and actual facts from her discoveries. Stout says, "I believe that most of us cannot know what we would do, trapped in a situation that required such a seemingly no-win decision" (382).

Stout's patients are wrongfully perceived as "insane", yet no one has bothered to put themselves in their position. Dissociation experienced at the caliber that Stout's patients do, is normal to them. What society perceives as "normal," and what Stout's patients perceive as normal, is identical because Stout's patients see themselves that way. Dissociative episodes are what they have been experiencing for most of their lives; therefore, it is what they see as the norm and society should not reprimand them for that. "A True war story is never moral.

It does not instruct, nor encourage virtue, nor suggest models of proper human behavior, nor restrain men from doing the things they have always done. If a story seems moral, do not believe it" (347). In short, it gives you a view of how to take in the war story. It differs from the usual happy and uplifting war story and gives a realist and somber approach to reading a war story. The following will explain the importance of this passage and how it relates to the short story. Reason why he wouldn't agree with Fraser. "True war stories do not generalise. They do not indulge in abstraction or analysis;

For example: war is hell. As a moral declaration the old truism seems perfectly true, and yet because it abstracts, because it generalizes, I can't believe it with my stomach. Nothing turns inside. It comes down to gut instinct. A true war story, if told truly, makes the stomach believe" (O'Brien, p. 274). * In "Rewilding North America", Fraser mentions a man named Harvey Locke, and how he said "I choose those words, 'Yellowstone to Yukon,' because they're deep symbols in people's brains. If I say those words in Stuttgart, Germany, in Toronto, in New York, or in Tokyo, everybody knows what I'm talking about" (Fraser 121).

He was talking about the title of his catch phrase because it would grab the attention of people who shared a common interest. He knew that there were people who would be interested in “ Y2Y” because they shared a common concern that mattered to them when it involved rewilding animals. Similarly, in her essay, Martha Stout writes about a conversation she was having with a woman named “ Julia” and how she had asked, “ do other people remember those things, about their teachers, and going to their graduation, and learning to drive and so on? (Stout 387). Meaning the way other people think about situations that have occurred in their pasts. Things that were at some point so important, things that mattered to them, at least in those years of age and time. The process that pertains to what matters comes in all forms. In Fraser’s excerpt she was talking about the sciences and how the topic of concern would have the ability to bring awareness to her idea of restoration.

There are other ways like in Stouts, she being the psychologist who works with clients, discusses and rehearses situations alongside her clients in order to recover what was supposed to be significant and have some level of importance at one stage in her client’s life. In these cases the process of restoration. There are unlimited topics of discussions which coincide with interpersonal relationships like the ones that Tim O’Brien attempts to establish by using war as the main topic, something that has long time been a concern of people.

Something that he knows will draw people in and make them invest their time and feelings into what matters to him. However, each individual designs their stories from past and present experiences differently. There is a diverse level of severity and truth. Things that really happened and things that could

have happened and how story tellers fill in those gaps, is completely up to their discretion. In “ how to tell a true war story,” O’Brien writes, “ you can tell a true war story by the questions you ask.

Somebody tells a story, let’s say, and afterward you ask, ‘ is it true? ’ and if the answer matters, then you’ve got your answer” (p276). In O’Brien’s story he writes a letter to his fallen friends relative. In it he goes into great detail that is both deep and disturbing. He mentions both the ways “ Lemon” was a person he has deep love for and the gruesome ways his life ended. The truth came out towards the end after what mattered to him was not reciprocated by Lemons sister, which left a gap, a place of question to the person who leaves the questioner questioning.

This then makes him give up in a sense, as if he were to break down which ironically is done mainly by his own accord because there was never a simple response to his letter of make believe. There are many things that happen in all our lives both good and bad and these things contribute to who we are, the ways we communicate and how we communicate, how we present ourselves and go about every day life. These things make us aim to make what matters to us a factor and a reality when it comes to achieving.

What matters in each individuals life of course varies. There are times when what matters becomes something that is shared by many, creating a movement, like in Fraser’s Rewilding how there was a problem she assisted in shining light into the problem and successfully there was others who began to share the importance of restoring wildlife. In Marta Stout’s story creating an ability to connect the missing parts of her clients’ lives

contributed to a better life. What mattered to her was helping her patients get a grip on their mental stabilities.

Then there are some who some, when thought about can seem selfish because what matters to them is how they feel on account of others and in the process if others get left in question to fulfill what matters. In all the stories there was something of importance to the writer, something that mattered at some point enough to write about it. Sometimes those things are not relevant or seem to be when first thought about, but then many stories are designed to the knowledge of the person whose captivated your attention and sometimes afterward you might ask, ' is it true? and if the answer matters, then you've got your answer" so O'Brien says. As long as the things that are being exchanged consist with a level of importance it does not matter how real or how fake it may be. What matters is the lessons learned, the communication and the processes that go into exchanging. As long as you know what you believe and know, truth will always be left for your decision to what is and is not true.