

# Leopold of an advantage that may not even

[Literature](#), [Play](#)



Leopold starts his argument by pointing out that humans try to place monetary significance on the environment, which usually doesn't have any monetary worth (as cited in Timmons, 2016). According to Leopold, whenever some part of the environment is damaged, or in danger of being damaged, humans attempt to think of reasons why it is monetarily appealing (as cited in Timmons, 2016). For example, in the early 1900s, Leopold points out that songbird numbers were dwindling (as cited in Timmons, 2016).

Leopold discusses how scientists claimed bugs would prove to be an immense problem if there were no songbirds around (as cited in Timmons, 2016). Leopold emphasizes that the problem was thought of in monetary terms only (as cited in Timmons, 2016). Leopold makes his position clear when he plainly states, after this description of the songbirds problem, that the songbirds should have been helped without economic considerations (as cited in Timmons, 2016). Leopold states that animals are part of a collective and no human should massacre animals because of an advantage that may not even be genuine (as cited in Timmons, 2016). As Leopold emphasizes, even certain environmental areas, like "marshes" should not be thought of only in connection to economic worth (as cited in Timmons, 2016 p. 699).

Essentially, Leopold makes it clear that economic considerations should not determine how humans act towards the planet at all (as cited in Timmons, 2016). Leopold does not specifically discuss whether financial concerns should be deemed as more important than issues relating to nature (as cited in Timmons, 2016). Leopold only reinforces the notion that the environment, in general, is more important than economic worth (as cited in Timmons, 2016). According to Leopold, while economic concerns are not necessarily

more important than environmental concerns, people can help create economic growth by helping the environment (as cited in Timmons, 2016). Leopold analyzes economic considerations in relation to the environment (as cited in Timmons, 2016).

Similarly, relativism analyzes ethicality in relation to certain guidelines (Hettche, 2010). For instance, in cultural relativism, ethicality is measured in relation to local society (Hettche, 2010). Relativism can also include analysis of ethicality that is connected to the personal thought processes of a person, which is called subjectivism (Hettche, 2010). Leopold also discusses the land pyramid and how every part of the environment is connected with one another (as cited in Timmons, 2016). While economic concerns may not be more important than environmental concerns, according to Leopold the land pyramid demonstrates that, by using economic means to protect the environment, those who depend on the land pyramid could benefit greatly (as cited in Timmons, 2016). Another example of Leopold's insistence that economic concerns are not as important as environmental concerns is demonstrated by his realization that, although helping the environment does depend on economic considerations, money and the economy does not dictate what humans do with every piece of the environment (as cited in Timmons, 2016).

Further, yet another example Leopold provides pertains to the minor role money plays in how humans treat the environment (as cited in Timmons, 2016). As Leopold states, what happens to the environment is not a result of economic considerations, but rather of the preferences the people whose

the environment have (as cited in Timmons, 2016). The normative question could be relevant to this discussion (Hettche, 2011). The normative question pertains to why an individual should engage in ethical behavior (Hettche, 2011).

Similarly, Leopold's argument does as well (as cited in Timmons, 2016). The normative question asks why ethicality is important when it is possible to behave in ways that most people would agree are abhorrent and not be penalized for such behavior (Hettche, 2011). Similarly, Leopold explains why humans should preserve the environment, even though there is not always a clear incentive to do so (as cited in Timmons, 2016). Leopold's argument pertains more specifically to the environment and the economic worth that the environment may or may not have (as cited in Timmons, 2016).

What can be inferred from this argument is the notion that different people could have different opinions about the environment and, to persuade others of his or her opinion, an individual might use propositional arguments and thus offer statements to support his or her ideas (Pendlebury, 2013). This individual would likely do so in order to advocate for a certain conclusion in relation to the environment (Pendlebury, 2013). In Leopold's personal view, his conclusion pertains to the economy and the factors that are related to it (as cited in Timmons, 2016).

Leopold argues that the economy and its related factors are important because they dictate how much or how little humans can conceivably do with the environment, but the environment itself will always be very important (as cited in Timmons, 2016).