

Aldous Huxley (1894–1963)
***The Human Situation*, lectures at Santa Barbara, 1959.**

Lecture 3 – *More Nature in Art*, 2nd of March, 1959¹

Ladies and Gentlemen, In my last lecture two weeks ago, I presented the factual side of the situation in which man finds himself in relation to his planet. The rather dismal story of the way in which he has ravaged and greatly destroyed the world, the home, in which he makes his travels through the universe. It's a sad and depressing story.

This week, I propose to speak about the events on the other end of the bridge. We've talked about the factual end now, in the last lecture, and in this lecture I want to talk human end, the psychological end, the end of values, cause I feel, as I said in the first lecture, that we must always try to bring together these two generally separate aspects of life—the purely factual and scientific and the purely human value end.

Well, let's begin very very briefly with the practical problems involved. I shan't attempt to describe what can be done, but let us say that we now know enough to repair a good deal of the damage which has already been done to our planet and to prevent further damage from occurring. The actual techniques I feel are outside the province of this lecture, and as I say, the necessary information and knowledge exists.

But as usual, there is a great gap between the ability to do a thing and the likelihood of its being done. All these things are much easier said than done. It's very easy to describe the conservation methods which should be put into effect at once in order to remedy the damage we've done and prevent further damage being accomplished. But it is extraordinarily difficult to carry out what we know we can do.

The difficulties stem from a number of different sources. First of all, there is the fact that in order to implement a satisfactory conservation program, we have to communicate with immense numbers of human beings. After all, there are in the world, I don't know how many hundreds of millions of peasant farmers and workers who, if conservation is to be carried out effectively, must in some way all be influenced to work along the lines which we know they should work along.

And this, obviously, is one of the major problems in any vast population—is simply to establish relations with these people. And when relations have been established, to persuade them to give up old traditional methods in favor of better modern methods.

Well this is the first difficulty in the way of doing what we know we have to do. The second difficulty, of course, lies in the fact that these vast numbers which are already here are increasing at a tremendously rapid speed. And this, as I shall go into—as I shall discuss in the following lecture, represents one of the major problems of our own time and the immediate future: The problem of how to cope with the enumerable difficulties which this very, very rapid increase of population is imposing upon us. Not

1 This and the accompanying 17 lectures were given at the University of California, Santa Barbara (UCSB) in the spring and fall semesters of 1959 titled *The Human Situation*. Huxley was the first person to have received an honorary doctorate degree from UCSB. For further details on the organizing process around these lectures, see lectures IX – *Art, Artist and Society* and XVIII – *The Natural History of Visions*. Thanks to Yoni Osteen and Steve Mendoza for making this transcript available. Please contact the editor, Hans Frederik Ross Nielsen, for any suggestions, corrections or improvements: hf1985@gmail.com.

least among these difficulties are the difficulties in relation to an inadequate program of conservation.

Then there is a fact which, of course, is connected with the rapid growth of population, which is simply this: That the more heavy the pressure of population upon resources, the more urgent becomes the need of man to produce food, and the greater the temptation to mine the soil, to use exploitive methods. He simply has to live for the next year, and he must do his best to extract his living from the soil, which has often been already damaged and is in a precarious condition.

The Germans have a good and expressive term for this kind of exploitative agriculture, exploitative economy. They call it “Raubwirtschaft”, robber economy. And this is precisely what this economy; it is a robbing economy, which in the circumstances is extremely difficult to avoid. We are being forced to rob. And it is—only if we can establish proper communications with the enumerable people who are responsible, ultimately, for the use and abuse of the soil, can we avoid this thing.

Then we have to consider a simple psychological fact: That it's extremely difficult for human beings to follow a course which, though it may be manifestly helpful in the long run, yet in the short run imposes hardships upon them. This is one of the most difficult problems which we shall come up against, I think, in several other contexts. How are you by democratic means going to persuade people to adopt measures which are excellent in the long run but which may cause them discomfort in the short run?

This arises, for example, in the question of the unification of Europe, and in general the imposition of a system of international law, and it arises very strongly too, in this context of conservation. How are you going to persuade people to hold off from exploiting the soil when they desperately need food and when this need is increasing year by year? And this is not merely a question of organization and capital; it's a question of getting people to accept certain ideas. And the trouble is that it looks as though it is going to be exceedingly difficult to get the countless millions of people who require to be indoctrinated, it is going to be very difficult to get them to act upon what we know is the scientifically best method of doing things without considerable totalitarian control and coercion. The only alternative, of course, is persuasion and education, and unfortunately these democratic methods take time, and there is exceedingly little time because of the rapidity of the increase in the population.

Nevertheless, I think we have to think—seeing that we are committed to the Democratic idea—we have to think in terms of education and persuasion. And for this reason, we have to think about the climate, the mental climate, within which a proper approach to the planet on which we live can be made.

Now this involves, it seems to me, a reconsideration of the problem of ethics, a reconsideration of the problem of the general philosophy of life, and also it involves problems of artistic expression and artistic sensibility.

Well, let's begin with the ethical problem. What should be—what ought to be our relation, the relation of the human race, with the world upon which it lives? I would say that the most obvious fact emerg—the most obvious consideration emerging from the facts which we brought out in the last lecture is this: That the golden rule holds good not only for man's dealings with other men, but also in regard to his dealings with lower animals and with—even with the inanimate world. The rule “do as you would be done by”, “do unto others as you would they would do unto you”—applies not merely to man, but to nature in general. If we want to be treated well by nature, we have to treat nature

well. And as a matter of plain fact, we discover that if we harm nature or destroy nature, nature will do us harm and will destroy us. There is a perfectly clear utilitarian basis for this ethical point of view.

And it is worth pointing out at this moment, that this kind of ethical point of view, in which nature is regarded as having rights and we are regarded as having duties towards nature, is not within our Western tradition. Within the theological scholastic tradition of the middle ages, which I suppose still remains orthodox in the more conservative churches, we have, what seems to me, a very shocking formulation which is that animals possess no souls and therefore have no rights, and we have no duties towards them and animals consequently may be treated as things.

Now I feel personally that this is a most undesirable doctrine and also a most unrealistic one, because not merely have we no right to treat animals as things, we can go further and say that we have no right to treat things as things. When we see what the result [is] of treating inanimate objects throughout the planet as things which we could exploit to our heart's content, we see that the consequences are disastrous, that we have to treat the planet as though it were a living organism. And with all the love and care and understanding which any living organism deserves. If we do not treat it in this way, then we shall destroy the world on which we live, and in turn this destroyed world will destroy us. The thing is perfectly simple, and we therefore have to adopt this conception of nature having rights and ourselves having duties towards it.

And another helpful idea, I think, is the Greek idea of "hubris". "Hubris" means wanton violence inspired by bumptiousness, arrogance, and the pride of power. The Greeks constantly insisted that the Gods would never put up with an arrogant man who behaved in this way. And the interesting fact is that in Greek thought one could commit hubris, not only towards other human beings, but towards nature.

For example, in the—Aeschylus' tragedy of the Persians, he points out that one of the crimes of Xerxes is that he has committed hubris, committed wanton violence, not only against the Greek people by invading them, but also against nature. To us, the particular crime that he committed would seem rather forgivable; I mean the crime happens to be that he built a bridge of boats across the Hellespont. But the principle seems to me profoundly true and right; that we can commit crimes of violence against nature, and that they are as bad in their way as crimes of wanton violence committed against men.

Now, this idea has not gone on into the Judeo-Christian tradition where the fundamental notion is that the man has dominion over all creation, he is the lord of creation, and he is in some way apart from nature, and that he is free to do what he wants with creation. I feel very strongly that this is a point of view which we need to correct now and which of course is in process of being modified.

The idea of man being apart from nature is actually a fairly recent one. Primitive man never had this idea. Primitive man has always regarded himself as a part of nature, as intimately and fundamentally concerned with and embedded in nature.

And this fundamental idea has been expressed by primitive man in such notions as Totemism, which is the man's relationship to animals, even his identify in a certain way with animals. It has been expressed in the fertility rites which insist on the fact that the human sexual processes are identical with those of nature and that there is a deep-seated connection between the two. And finally, it has expressed itself in the notions of polytheism—the divinity or divineness of natural objects and the pattern of the world.

This, as I say, was the primitive pattern of the world and remnants of this ancient religion, of course, went on for many, many centuries after the acceptance

Christianity. They went on, for example, in the so-called witch cults of Western Europe which were essentially old fertility cults which had survived from very, very ancient times.

And the interesting thing is that this conception which primitive man had of his oneness with nature was abandoned, really, throughout the civilized world during a period which began, I suppose, about the 8th and 7th century BC. And we can see this process in the various countries of the world taking place. The process is seen in India with the rise of Jainism and Buddhism. It is seen in the Near East with the rise of the Hebrew prophets, it's seen in Greece with the rise of Pythagoras and the Orphic religion, and the whole conception, then, changes to an idea that man is in some sense apart from nature and that deity is transcendent and also apart from nature.

Now this has gone on for many centuries, but now there has been a so to speak counter-revolution. In a curious way, we can say that the revolution accomplished by Darwin a hundred years ago (this is the centenary of *The Origin of Species*) was in one sense a revolution away from the traditional Judeo-Christian notion of man's relationship to nature back towards the primitive idea of man's union with nature.

Of course, there was this profound difference between the two. One has to think a bit, I think, in terms of an ascending spiral. Suppose that the position of primitive man is here, then at ninety degrees away, we find the tradition of man being set apart from nature. We go up a little further, and we find ourselves over the position occupied by primitive man, but on a quite a different level. It's no longer on the level of superstition or of intuition; it's on the level of reason and of science, this new conception of man's union with nature and we see the old conceptions transformed into scientific terms. For example, we see the old intuitive feeling for nature transformed into the ideas of ecology. We see a totemism transformed into the science of animal behavior. We see polytheism transformed into the new biological philosophy of organicism – the idea of organisms within a greater organism, which on another level, has many things in common with the old notions.

Well, of course it is perfectly clear when we come to think of it that we are indissolubly one with nature, that we depend completely on the natural environment. After all anybody can make the simple experiment of finding out how much he depends on the natural environment even though he lives in a world of television and automobiles; he merely has to put a clothespin on his nose and tape up his mouth to find out that he can't do without his natural environment for more than about 60 seconds. {hilarity}

And not only are we physically dependent upon the outer environment, but we are psychologically dependent in a very interesting way. This has been shown by experiments conducted in recent years by <Donald O.> Hebb (1904–1985) at McGill <University> in Canada and <John C.> Lilly (1915–2001) at the National Institute of <Mental> Health in Washington, on what is called "limited environment." If we cut off individuals completely from external stimuli, then the most extraordinary things begin happening, mostly very unpleasant things. Curiously horrifying visions and nightmare thoughts invade the mind, and we discover that stimuli from the external world are required just to keep us sane. It's not merely that we need the external world to keep us alive; we need the external world to keep us from not going mad.

And these are very important considerations, so that we then see that we have a direct psychological and physiological dependence upon the world and then when we go into the matter more thoroughly, we find that this dependence is not merely upon our immediate environment, it's upon environments very remote both in space and time. I

mean it's obvious, for example, that our entire life depends upon physical events taking place in the sun. It also is quite clear that for most of us our continued existence depends upon events taking place in distant mountain ranges, taking place in the tropical and polar regions where our weather is made, and this fact, of course, if of extreme importance in our political thinking.

For example, when one has an overpopulated country such as England or most of the Western European countries, which depend for their very existence on events taking place far away completely outside their political jurisdiction, then we have a profoundly difficult political problem. I mean, for example, what is going to happen to Western Europe when the New World has no more exportable surpluses and the professor <Paul B.> Sears (1891–1990) of Yale foresees this will probably happen by 1980². Nobody knows what is going to happen, and we immediately see the appalling way in which in spite of all our enormous technological progress, we are dependent upon purely natural events.

Then, of course, we are immensely dependent on events which took place in very remote period of time. Most of the world is still immensely dependent on coal and also on oil, both of which are the products of events which took place in immensely distant periods of time, so that we find ourselves, as I say, bound up with the world in the most—in the closest possible way.

And this same—the details of this binding up of ourselves with the world and of all parts of the world into a single quasi-organic whole is studied in the science of ecology, which is an extremely recent science. The word was invented by <Ernst> Haeckel (1834-1919) less than a hundred years ago, and it is still a young science which is continually making new and interesting discoveries. The basic facts unveiled by ecology are the—is the fact that the living organisms exist in communities of carefully balanced—no, carefully is the wrong word, but exquisitely balanced, and that this balance can be very easily upset.

It is, of course, all these balances naturally are changing all the time. But at any given moment, if we take a cross-section of developing world events, we are chiefly struck by the fact of cycles, of checks and balances. But of course if we look down the process of world events horizontally, we see a continuous process of unidirectional change. So that we have to visualize then, these fairly permanent systems of balance which are like vortices being carried downstream along the river of time.

But anyhow, this exquisitely equilibrated balancing of life against life is the thing which has emerged from the study of ecology. And again what has become abundantly clear is that man has rushed in where angels fear to tread³ and in ignorance and stupidity and arrogance, has everywhere upset these balances in a very alarming way.

In the previous lecture, I talked a good deal about deforestation and erosion, which are the more conspicuous examples of this upsetting of the balance, but similar examples on a smaller scale abound. And the interesting thing is that we discover, after the balance has been upset, how delicate it was. And we also realize that it is incredibly difficult for us to foresee in advance what our actions—what are going to be the results

2 Cf. Paul B. Sears, "The Inexorable Problem of Space", *Science*, New Series, Vol. 127, No. 3288 (Jan. 3, 1958), pp. 9-16

3 From Alexander Pope, "An Essay on Criticism" (1709): "For fools rush in where angels fear to tread".

of our actions in upsetting these balances of systems where disturbance of any one element will throw the whole system out of gear.

Take a simple and interesting example which took place a few years ago when the forests service attempted to do something on behalf of the special variety of deer which lives in the Kaibab Forest on the north rim of the Grand Canyon. There were only a few thousand of the deer left, and they thought, poor things, they were being persecuted by too many mountain lions so that men were sent out to slaughter great numbers of mountain lions. Well, the result was that the deer in a few years went from four thousand to nearly a hundred thousand, that they ate up the entire range in the Kaibab Forest. They then began getting frightful epidemics and dying like flies, and finally, only when mountain lions were reintroduced, which killed off the more sickly deer, was a proper stable balance reestablished and gradually the forest recovered from its overgrazing and the deer flourished fairly well.

And this thing has been repeated again and again. The same thing was done, for example, in Scandinavia of killing off hawks because they killed game birds. The game birds multiplied, they got diseases, they became almost extinct. The hawks had to be reintroduced.

The same thing is happening even with crocodiles, a very unsympathetic animal, {hilarity} which had been eliminated to a large extent in Africa and South America. But it's now being found that they had a most valuable influence on fish; that they killed off the enemies of fish and they killed off the weaker and more diseased fish in the fish population, and where they disappeared the fishing is much worse.

And much odder still is the result which is being discovered by the elimination of hippopotami from large areas in Africa. It's been discovered now that the fish population in the lakes and rivers where they live depended to a large extent on nourishment given to the minute animals which came from the excrement of the hippopotami, and that since they've been destroyed, the whole fish population has gone too and that the natives have much less protein to eat and so on and so forth.

So that we realize constantly that in dealing with these extremely delicate ecological balances, we come in in the most clumsy way, without really knowing what we're doing and the balances are often so extraordinarily delicate and so complex that it's almost impossible to foresee the results of what we do.

And of course, not only do we upset the balance by destroying elements, but we upset it by introducing elements. The introduction of the Chinese Crab into the river {tape cuts} Hawaii and the West Indies was a disaster. And a still greater disaster was the introduction, of course, of the rabbit into Australia and into Patagonia and into other parts of the world.

And it's interesting, the only place where the introduction of the rabbit didn't result in a disaster was it's introduction into Ceylon where fortunately they were kept down by poisonous snakes. So that again we see that because we don't happen to like poisonous snakes, that poisonous snakes may be extremely useful to us and will do us much more harm—much more good than harm.

So all this shows how immensely careful we must be in relation to the world; that it's only by a kind of combination of love and knowledge that we can get on in the world. And it's only on this condition that we can dominate nature. I mean, we are the lords of creation. We must remember that man is a paradoxical creature; he is an animal, he is one with nature, but he is a completely unique animal inasmuch as he can become conscious of his position and inasmuch as he can influence nature in a most enormous and sometimes terrifying way. And whether we like it or not, it is quite clear that

henceforward we have to take responsibility for what is happening on our planet because if we don't take responsibility, if we don't use our knowledge and our affection towards nature, we shall destroy the ground on which we are living, and thus finish off our species.

Now, let's come back to this fact that we have returned with Darwinism towards the primitive position but on a higher level. We now recognize our oneness with nature and try to act upon it in a rational way. And I think it's worth making a digression here, and pointing out that the modern conception of nature has a great deal in common with the traditional views of the Chinese.

This is a very interesting fact; that the Chinese way of thinking about nature has always been very different from that of Western man since at least sixth century BC. The Chinese, you see, have never thought as European philosophers have thought, in terms of substance. The European philosophers have always asked "what is so and so and so and so?" The Chinese have never asked this question, they've always asked "what are the relations between so and so and so and so?"

And it's very interesting. This change from thinking about substance to thinking about relationship is of course quite characteristic of modern science. In a non-scientific intuitive way, the Chinese did anticipate in many respects the modern scientific thought. And not only did they think in terms of relations, they thought too not in terms of mechanical law. They thought in terms of pre-established harmonies of mutual action and reaction within so to speak of fields of force. This notion goes back to great antiquity in China. It goes back to the foundation of Taoist philosophy, probably in the 6th century BC. And already in Zhuang Zhou (369-286 BC) in the 4th century BC we see a very clear formulation of a philosophy which is extremely close to a modern organicist philosophy.

The Chinese idea was that things are what they are and act upon one another in the way they do act in virtue of their position within a system of patterns. They spoke about individual patterns being subsumed in the great pattern, and the Tao, this fundamental Chinese idea, has been likened by modern thinkers such as <Joseph> Needham (1900-1995) to a kind of cosmic field of force, which is a field of force not only in this physical world, but in the spiritual world too. And that things take their—are what they are and act as they act simply because of their position in the cosmic pattern.

And for this reason they haven't been bothered with the—with this idea of mechanical causation which is extremely difficult to apply to biological entities, and have been able to think in these organic terms from very early times.

Strangely enough this organic, organismic conception of life was carried over to Europe and had a profound influence on an extremely important European philosopher, who was Leibniz (1646-1716). Leibniz, in the 18th century, became extremely interested in the translations which the Jesuit fathers brought back from China of Chinese philosophy, especially of Zhu Xi (1130-1200) whose 12th century Neo-Confucian philosopher who had combined the notions of Taoism with those of Confucianism, and there is no question at all but that Chinese thought had exercised considerable influence in molding his philosophy and Leibniz' philosophy has had a profound influence on such modern organicist philosophers as Whitehead (1861-1947), for example, or Needham, or <Ludwig von> Bertalanffy (1901-1972), or <Jan> Smuts (1870-1950), or <C.> Lloyd Morgan (1852-1936). So that it's very interesting to see that this remote still non-scientific view of the world has yet contributed a great deal to our modern way of thinking, especially in biological fields.

Well, an ethic and a philosophy are very important in creating a suitable mental atmosphere in which we can act in the right way towards our natural surroundings. But we need more than an ethic and more than a philosophy; we need an aesthetic, we need the organized sensibility which polarizes our feelings and thoughts in an artistic way towards the world.

And this to me is something which is moving and important. I'm an old and unregenerate Wordsworthian, and I regard William Wordsworth (1770–1850) as among the four or five greatest English poets and a man who has contributed insights of enormous importance. And—insights in regard to what should be our relationship towards the world.

Wordsworth's whole idea was that man and nature were, of course, closely interlinked and that morality went right back into our relations with the world and that in a certain sense our religion, our sense of the divine could be most powerfully mediated through our relations with the given world of nature.

He says, for example, you will remember the well known quotation:

One impulse from a vernal wood
can⁴ teach you more of man,
of moral evil and of good,
than all the sages can.

And he speaks elsewhere, I think it's in *The Excursion* (1814) of being wrapped in the “still communion that transcends the imperfect offices of prayer and praise.”

He felt very strongly this spiritual relationship of man with nature and felt it's importance, felt also that in nature man could discover his own deepest mind. That in relationship with nature he could discover his spontaneity, he could rediscover his immediate and unsophisticated experience of life.

And in this—again this is an interesting thing. The way that this really quite recent development in European poetry and also in art as we shall see in a moment, has a close relationship with the literature and art of the Far East. We find, for example, in the Chinese poetry and Chinese landscape painting, and in Japanese landscape painting and poetry, curious echoes and—well they're not echoes because they precede—they are prophetic images of the Wordsworthian attitude towards nature.

In that strange art form of Japan called the Haiku which is tiny poems in seventeen syllables, we find again and again, expressed in this strangely abbreviated and elusive way, the Wordsworthian conceptions of man's relation to nature.

For example, there is something which even in translation has a kind of moving quality. The poem by <Matsuo> Bashō (1644–1694), which just goes like this:

Ahh, hanging bridge.
Ivy ropes—
entwine existences.

4 The actual poem, “The Tables Turned” (1798) uses the word “may” here.

This idea, you see, of this bridge of living substance which links man so with the material world outside him, which is not a whole immaterial world, because as Wordsworth says, there is in his memorable words in *Tintern Abbey* (1798):

a sense sublime
Of something far more deeply interfused,
Whose dwelling is the light of setting suns,
And the round ocean, and the living air,
And the blue sky, and in the mind of man;

This idea preceded—which is characteristic of the 19th century in the West—was commonplace in the Far East many centuries before it was with us. And we see this, for example, in the rise of landscape painting in China which took place independently—landscape painting virtually without figures, which took place at least a thousand years in China before it did in Europe.

And we see, there is something, I think profoundly religious in the best landscape painting inasmuch as it seems to explore and to express those deep areas of the human mind which in a strange way are just as impersonal as the given objects outside of us.

I mean, these—it seems to me that there is a layer of the unconscious which is beyond the personal unconscious which is just as much given, just as much not immediately connected with “me” as the external world. And certainly I feel this in the best Chinese landscape paintings and in the best European landscape paintings: Their value is not merely that they present us with images of the external world, but they present us in the most powerful way with images of our own mind, with images of this deep fundamental essence of the mind from which—from mind at large, from Mind with a capital ‘M’, from which the individual mind takes its source.

And this nature-mysticism it’s been called—it’s rather an unfortunate term, but I don’t think we can invent any other—was of course in the 19th century a thing of extraordinary importance. And I think was a thing of—it represented a very wholesome reaction to the ravages of the industrial revolution, which covered the whole world with an incredible hideousness and led to the enormous expansion of cities and the foisting upon man of a new kind of environment, not a natural environment, but a technological environment.

And this—the Wordsworthian reaction, which was after all followed, imitated, and continued by many other poets, was a thing which I feel to have been enormously healthy and valuable. We find it in this country in <Walt> Whitman (1819–1892), above all I think in certain of the short essays in *Specimen Days* (1882) which have a kind of quietness about them which much of his poetry does not have. I mean, one feels so much with Whitman’s poetry that he was addressing a very large audience, but in the little essays of *Specimen Days* describing his life in the country after his stroke, we have the impression that he was talking to himself and there are little descriptions there of sitting by a pond and watching kingfishers or deriving a sense of life by holding onto the sapling of an ash or sitting under an oak tree, which are wonderfully beautiful and one

can see the enormous value—religious value, which this attitude towards nature had in this bustling spreading world of modern technology.

Well, in the present world, I must say this is a fact which disquiets me, that this prevailing nature mysticism of the 19th century, both in landscape painting and in poetry, seems to a great extent to have evaporated. It is as though contemporary artists had to a large extent resigned themselves to this new kind of technological environment and were not paying much more attention to the given environment of nature around them.

Anyhow, we have seen in painting a retreat from landscape painting into non-representational painting, into these abstract forms which are supposed to be symbolic and expressive of events in the mind, but which to my mind are a good deal less expressive than the landscapes in terms of which, say the Song painters⁵, or in terms of which <John> Constable (1776–1837) or <J. M. W.> Turner (baptized 1775–1851) or the Impressionists expressed the states of their mind.

We see that, and I think we see in poetry something of the same thing. I personally find a great deal of contemporary poetry is too abstract for my tastes. There is a great tendency to use abstract phraseology to escape from the concrete factual description of natural things into these kind of abstract descriptions very often related to some aspect of our technological civilization.

And for my own part, I'm old-fashioned enough to feel that I would like another reaction towards this nature poetry and nature mysticism, nature landscape painting of an earlier day. It can't be the same thing of course, we can never repeat what happened in the past, but the general tendency, it seems to me, is a tendency of health and genuine religious feeling which—my own view is we could very well do with more of at the present time.

Well, let me just bring this to a close. What we see then is that practically we are in a position to patch up the damage we've done and to prevent more damage being done. In practice, it's going to be exceedingly difficult to do this because there are many factors which militate against it.

And we need the right kind of mental atmosphere in which it will seem natural to people to do what we ought to do in relation to our planet. We need an extension of our present system of ethics. We need a kind of what I would call a realistic idealism, which will harmonize man with nature and which will take account of all the facts. And we need, finally, not only a good ethic and a good philosophy, we need also a good art which will give us the terms in which we can feel as well as think about this problem. An art, which I regret to say, I don't think exists at the present time, cause we've reacted away from the previous manifestation of it in the 19th century, but which I do feel very strongly deserves to come back. It deserves to receive all the attention of a young talent at the present time.

Thank you.

5 The painters of the Song Dynasty (960-1127), during which Chinese monumental landscape painting developed and flourished. See http://www.metmuseum.org/toah/hd/nsong/hd_nsong.htm