

Not MLA

forte

Double space
why are these
effective devices?

~~Humanity is challenged~~ by Alexander Popes', *An Essay on Man*. Pope ~~is~~ suggesting^s that we as humans do not know where to put ourselves on the Great Chain of Being. He implies that we debate whether we are Gods or beasts of the earth by using a manifestation of literary devices such as heroic couplets, parallelism, repetition, and oxymoron. Do we have too much knowledge or do we have too much weakness? Pope leans toward humans being beast by saying, "Born to die, and reasoning but to err." Pope continues to call humans jest and riddle, in which he is saying humans are a joke. When Pope says, "We are darkly wise, and rudely great," he says that humans have knowledge and yet they use it in evil ways, and also that humans are great, but it is greatness acquired by fear. *you have a lot of ideas in the opening & that humans*

helps bring
sarcasm
with this
word

Mark Twain and E.O Wilson show strong support to Popes argument in their essays, "The Lowest Animal," and, "Is War Inevitable?" Mark Twain has found in his experiments that the earl is a creature that eats its prey but continues destroys whatever it does not need. The anaconda on the other hand does eat its prey, but has no further need to continue harming any other animal. By describing the earl, Twain describes humans by saying we have a need to destroy what does not harm us and have no deplorable feelings after doing so. Twain supports Popes', "humans are the riddle of the world," line when he says, "In the course of my experiments I convinced myself that among the animals man is the only one that harbors insults and injuries, broods over them, waits till a chance offers, then takes revenge." Why is it that we are the only creatures that have the interminable feeling to get back at someone or something that has done us wrong? Mark Twain seems to challenge the Pope when he says, "In truth, man is incurably foolish," but instead he supports Pope. Pope argues that we as humans have too much knowledge, but Twain ~~is~~ saying^s that even with all of the knowledge in the world, we still do not know how to use it, which puts us in the category of fools, which is equivalent to being a joke, as Pope says in his poem. In agreement to Pope, Twain says, "I consider that the strongest count against his intelligence is the fact that with that record back of him he blandly sets himself up as the head animal of the lot: whereas by his own standards he is the bottom one," because he agrees with Pope's line, "Great lord of all things, yet prey to all. Twain is also aware that we as humans think ourselves so high, yet humans are actually the weakest creatures. Being prey to all means humans are at the bottom of the food chain, which also includes the argument that humans are foolish creatures. In agreement to the fact that humans are foolish creatures born to sin, E.O Wilson supports Pope in his essay, "Is War Inevitable?" Humans are foolish creatures that do not see wrong in having wars because, "War is the strong life; it is life in extremist; war taxes are the only ones men never hesitate to pay, as the budgets of all nations show us," as Wilson says to support the fact that humans have not yet realized that their atrocious ways are completely irrational. Why is it that we have had so many wars in the past? Wilson's answer to that question is, "Our bloody nature," in agreement to Pope's answer to that question. Pope says in his essay that humans are, "rudely great," implying that humans do not achieve greatness from kind acts.

is Twain
being
sarcastic?

Complex
idea here
take time
to edit
it

you're striving to synthesize, but some organization & focus & conciseness might help

and bravery and honesty, or anything of that nature. They achieve greatness because, "Modern man inherits all the innate pugnacity and all the love and glory of his ancestors." They don't achieve greatness from their own acts, they receive glory from what their ancestors did, which was force themselves into power by being powerful warlords and winning great wars in the past. Humans are aware that they can solve each of their conflicts without having war, but it is the bloodlust that is inside humans that induces them to start war and postulate power. Wilson displays the foolishness of humans by saying, "Showing war's irrationality and horror is of no effect on him. The horrors make the fascination." Humans think that they get all of their glory from their acts of war, when really they are blind to the fact that humans are frightened by their acts of violence, therefore they put soldiers above them because they fear power, which is an example our foolishness and weakness. The acts of war are equivalent to the acts of the earl in Mark Twain's experiment because, "Whenever there is an enemy, animate or inanimate, there must be a victory," says Wilson. As an earl seeks for senseless killing, so do humans. As long as there is enemy, we seek to start trouble and violence, as Pope implies in his poem, "Born to die, and reasoning but to err." Is it reasonable for the earl to kill seventy-two of the buffalo, just to consume part of one of them? Is it reasonable for humans to kill hundreds and thousands of other humans just because they're their enemies, and there must be a victory? These questions arise from Pope's argument that humans are the riddle of the world.

Synthesis

John Horgan's essay, *No, War Is Not Inevitable*, was written in response to E.O. Wilson's, *Is War Inevitable?* But challenges Pope's, *Essay on Man*. Horgan uses his study of chimpanzees to argue that humans have no biological curse, but in Pope's essay, he says, "The proper study of mankind is man," not chimpanzee. Even though chimpanzees are our, "closest genetic relatives," Horgan says in his essay, they are not on our level of intelligence. Humans have knowledge and technology, while chimpanzees do not, and with technology comes power. In addition, on the Great Chain of Being, humans are placed above animals because animals have everything that humans have except reason. In Pope's essay he says, "Born to die, and reasoning but to err." If the chimpanzees do not have reasoning, they cannot have a reason to make mistakes and do wrong like humans can. If chimpanzees were given the reason to err, then chimpanzees would have a pugnacity to fight over what they hunted for and gathered.

could this be the central focus of this essay

Alexander Pope has an exceeding knowledge of humanity and, has studied the ups and downs of humans. Pope's poem deeply covers a majority of human nature, and though most of his challenger's arguments opposed his, Pope's stood the strongest. Pope is correct about humans being the riddle of the world because there are still many questions about human's nature. Why are we sinful and bloodthirsty creatures? Why do we achieve glory by fear and violence and aggressiveness? Is violence really our nature? Or is it there another reason we feel the need to be sinful? Even though humans may not know the answer to the question, humans are truly the riddle of the earth.

effective use of rhetorical questions