

This is a free online .pdf version of the (first form of the) chapter "*The Intent of Painting and Dance, and the Future of Art*" from the book, "Dances of Mindfulness", published in 2018 (in connection to Avenuege event June 15<sup>th</sup> 2018), by S.R. Weber, with ISBN 978-82-996977-9-8, published by The Avenuege Library by Yoga4d:VRGM together with dance art. You can reproduce this text when kept whole and unabridged, with at most light grammatical editing, on condition that the reference [www.avenuege.com](http://www.avenuege.com) is included as well as author's name, S.R. Weber.

[The Q & A form is often preferred by this author, since it allows a conversational style in which the themes are somewhat less dogmatically touched, and in which a more musical note can be achieved. The emphasis is on each text rather as a 'jam session' in which the original flow is maintained and, as with impressionistic art, any after-editing is kept at a minimum and spelling issues and all such are handled with tolerance as long as meaning comes through, in order to protect the soul of the text.]

Q: Considering such as the last decades of mainstream art, including painting and dance, some would perhaps say that the voice of wholeness--as we have talked about earlier--is scarcely heard. Instead, there seem to be a cultivation of fragmentation and of the machine concept.

A: I think there has been a development. No doubt much is as you say: people are talking up something that is rather worthless, making of it something that can be bought and sold again on a market which is resembling something of the worst we see as for stock trading. At the same time, there has been a growth of diversity of approaches. Not all is bleak. There is both capital and genuine interest connected to real wholeness, as found both in painting and in many forms of ballet and here and there in some other forms of dance.

Q: Nevertheless, the glorification of the mechanical and also of decay, and mere empty concepts referring to some social chatter as if it were art is going on strongly.

A: Quite. There is no denial of that. Now in this regard, --regardless of how it is at the present, which we may find annoying or lamentable or pleasing--I think it is of some value to look much ahead, and ask about the intent of art. And, without getting stuck into moralism, but with a sincere interest of relating art to what we sense is the right type of worldview, we could perhaps work out some sentiments, some phrases, some arguments which could help art in the future and strengthen as it were the 'immune system' of art, so it doesn't get infected by the virus of enthusiasm about disease nor about the mechanical view nor social references--and such stuff is perhaps most of what has been going on in the name of art has been for quite a number of decades.

Q: Yes, exactly. Would you say it is a form of a culture in which, on purpose, the opposite of light is cultivated? That art is a form of what some would call "satanism"?

A: To some, perhaps. But the concept of satanism is really quite simple--rather ridiculous. The starting-point is a childish hope that God takes care of everyone's little pleasures at all time; and when it doesn't seem that God does so, then God becomes accused of being self-centered and some other divine power is sought, that is more giving in terms of support of the ego, and less demanding in terms of moral duties. And in particular, God is accused of being boring, whereas a demon is invoked to justify free sexuality and total recklessness relative to moral standards. All that is certainly dominating the psyche of some people, but it is conditioned on a very shallow idea of God, life and the universe. Anyone with a more nuanced view of all this wouldn't bother to consider satanism worthy of intellectual depth and they would find that the freedom they want either is already provided, and is completely in line with a more Zeus-like God idea, or it's at odds with the society they are living in, and then this society, rather than God, should be blamed; and there is no true power in any satan figure for God is sovereign. That is a simple intuition.

Q: What is here subjective and what is here objective? When many people believe in a thing, doesn't that sort of makes it part of society and in that sense objective?

A: Well, yes, a shared illusion is objectively a shared illusion; and human society may be shaped according to subjective stuff. Human society is, of course, part of objective reality, but that doesn't mean that what human society, as for a majority or a minority, re-affirms as the fact about the universe has anything to do with the universe. The myths may resonate with something of the universe, but not by virtue of a plurality of people reiterating these myths.

Q: But if you judge whether a myth has something to do with the universe by your own intuition, doesn't that in some sense make it "subjective"?

A: Only in the sense that it has to do with you as a subject. But in the sense of illusion, no. Not if you have a real intuition. That is indeed the only time that the mind can really have any realistic chance of touching something objective--when it has a glimpse, beyond its own ego, beyond desires and hopes and fears, of something utterly beyond one's little life. So the quest of the mystic inner silence, or, as the medieval thinker Meister Eckhardt phrased it centuries ago, the quest of, or into, "the cloud of unknowing", is also the quest into God, or reality, or the essence of reality. This has little to do with the chattering of the masses. But if the chattering of the masses one day happen to reflect reality, that's of course a good thing, and it would mean a sort of meeting between some form of subjectivity, or intersubjectivity, and the objective. And indeed that is something of what

art can bring about, with luck.

Q: When art doesn't do this, is this due to some kind of overuse of "Occam's Razor" in how the results of science are being talked about?

A: Well, that's a complicated issue. I certainly see that mainstream science and mainstream art may share in their vast embracing of fragmentation. And "Occam's Razor" is a phrase that usually covers some of the methods, or principles, or assumptions, used to distinguish between better and worse scientific theories in mainstream science --and, I agree that it may be at the core of much misplaced arrogance against entirely interesting theories. It's a long story. Though I do not talk much about this so-called "razor" in the Beauty of Ballerinas book from 2017, I mention it, and, while mentioning it, I also bring a number of arguments in favour of doing science in a very different way.

Q: Could you summarise what you have against Occam's Razor in new words? And then we go over to talk about art, as visual art, and as ballet and dance and so on, afterwards?

A: Yes. Well, as a starting-point, let's playfully bring in how the fictitious character Sherlock Holmes solves his cases. He observes, and then he deduces things, and from these deductions he create alternative theories. From these theories he is led into additional investigations and observations, which lead him to discard some of these and

settle with, usually, one theory. Even if it is an improbable one, he sticks to it if the other theories are pretty much excluded. Of course this is fiction, and so success is easy there; but when the same author, Mr Doyle, set out to employ these methods himself, in real life, about spiritual phenomena, he didn't nearly get any similar success. Rather, he was led astray by fake photos of fairies and such. Much as we sympathize with his intent, his idea of the scientific method seemed a little immature.

As for theorizing over the universe, the facts are few, and the number of theories that may account for them many. To some extent the books of various religions may also be said to offer some theories, and, when rephrased in a reflective metaphysical way, they may be more compatible with physics than that which perhaps is commonly realized.

Some theories lead us to expect certain additional results. This, as you know, they call 'predictions'. So mainstream science credits such as Heisenberg's Uncertainty Principle, which is part of the bundle of equations they loosely call 'quantum theory', with having had success in making 'predictions' that led to investigations that seemed to confirm it, at least somewhat. When an approach to pilot wave theories such as by de Broglie (after he had read D. Bohm's hidden variable interpretation of quantum theory) accounts for the same phenomena without leading to 'new predictions', then mainstream science may dismiss the theory as rather uninteresting. The idea of 'new predictions' however may overly credit a theory that had successful predictions

just because it came first. And so scientists really must look for other criteria as well. Certainly, there is no reason why the first theory may be the best one. It may be that the 21st theory is the best. This may be obvious when a thousand years of additional measurements have been performed, but how do we right now land on the best theory?

Q: Yes. That's where Occam's Razor comes in. It says, doesn't it, 'cut away everything unnecessary--let the simplest theory win'. At least, that seems to be the gist of what a philosopher of this name, Occam, suggested.

A: Yes. Now consider this: nothing is more complex than to decide which theory is most simple.

Q: Hah! I can see the point, but couldn't one just list the assumptions for a theory, and see which one has the shortest list, and the snappiest sentences?

A: Let's imagine that we do list up all the assumptions for three or four theories that account for the same measurements. These lists are entirely shaped out of our language context and worldview background and the phrases are made according to what we are familiar with. For instance, before Goedel made his famous incompleteness theorem, and before computers came about, to say of such and such that it is 'nonalgorithmic' required many more words than to one who is acquainted with these results. And so we can say for every one of the key phrases and

indeed for the structuring of the whole list of assumptions associated with every one of the theories. Simplicity can easily be totally subjective.

Worse, simplicity can cover up prejudice. It may be emotionally complicated for a hotheaded mainstream person whose profession is to fulfill a scientific job to accept certain interpretations of certain measurements. And so a theory that gives these interpretation no credibility may to this person feel to be much more simple than a theory that leaves the door open to alternative interpretations of a kind that directly is in contrast to this scientist's worldview. And so, when interviewed, the scientist may say that it is according to "scientific method" that we have such and such view of the origins of life, and that everything else borders on irrationality or worse.

To change such prejudice seems to me to require a complete re-education, and that takes several years of hard work--not merely an occasional round of 'group dialogue' or some other feeble activity like that.

You see? Occam's Razor is the perfect instrument for the worst kind of arrogance to assert itself. It is true it may be used against foggy-headed, weakly reasoned out theories as well. But it may so easily ditch truth in favour of prejudice, and proudly so. It's an arrogant type of concept of method to invoke in any case, what with the word "razor" in it--when we are talking of something so sensitive instruments as our minds, and how we decide things.

See also how the author of Sherlock Holmes books, when wanting to argue in favour of a spiritual point of view,

couldn't bring himself to see fake material as fake material--this happened when he published the book on fairies--the originators of the photos later said that they had manipulated the photos--and it seems he was led astray in some other cases as well (ectoplasm). He seemed to be feverently inclined to find some evidence here or there in favour of a theory that he doggedly believed in, and, while the theory--that life isn't merely matter, but that there is a life force and beings beyond the level that can be measured, and all that--may be right, his eagerness to find facts let him have an arrogant attitude to alternative theories or at least alternative assumptions as regard definite measurements. That these could be fake was overruled by his mind. In his quest for simplicity of a certain kind--viz., the simplicity of matching what could be facts to what he has a worldview--he arrogantly debunks the sceptical attitude as to these measurements. That's a kind of Occam's Razor, too.

Indeed, it is the very tendency of the human ego to select all sorts of things that fits it, that makes it into such an error to have 'simplicity'--or some other convenient, fast word or phrase like that--as the principle of decision as for which theories are good,--which maps, in other words, cover the territories or domains they presume to cover.

So, in *The Beauty of Ballerinas*, I say that it is only after a great deal of contact with all the nuances of all the phenomena involved that one can meaningfully look for the 'simplest' theory. Now this is then something entirely different than the practise typically associated with

"Occam's Razor". The latter method or principle is used as an excuse to avoid getting entangled into in-depth studies of phenomena which could contradict existing paradigms. So Occam's Razor as method is often nothing but a paradigm of theories defending itself against change.

Q: Let Occam's Razor be dismissed, then. What, then, is the way to select a good theory when we have many to account for the same set of measurements?

A: First of all, we must admit to the immensity of the challenge of perceiving anything at all, and most of all the universe as a whole. This is a gigantic quest. Every theory and even everything we call 'measurement' are as if nodes in a vast, living network of thinking-perceiving and to hope that we can, in our minds, connect to something of reality may be meaningful but it is only meaningful if we together realize that it is enormously complicated. That's number one: it isn't easy. And I can give you several quotes and references also to great thinkers on the theory of science in support of this--but let's just agree, you and me, it isn't easy.

Q: We agree.

A: Good. Next, let's then agree, if we can, that we may easily bias our selection according to personal prejudices and that this bias must be fought within ourselves if we are going to have hope of coming, together, towards the truly best theory in any situation.

Q: Also agree. Bias, the tendency of selecting emotionally rather than rationally, is the egoism that everybody has.

A: Then, let's consider also that all measurements--when we sum them up, using that word, 'measurements'--may have within them a little or possibly a lot of hidden or overt bias, further complicating the whole quest. In other words --we must be willing to look afresh at measurements as we experiment with various grand theories to account for them, in a process that somehow spirals onwards.

Q: I can see that. Measurements aren't just given in a cut'n'dried form. They may be an expression, in part, of what we want to see.

A: Yes, yes. Then, given all this complexity, we must then allow time, and mental space, energy, all that, for the enquiry--it cannot be solved at a single conference or any such thing. Nor can be it automatically regarded as something to be solved by different individuals building up vast theories and publishing them in conflict with one another. It is a quest, a gigantic quest, like building a gigantic kind of societal construction--to make a good theory. This theory, as it begins to emancipate, may change. It may not be any one of the original candidates, or it may be one of them, but then it may not be quite what we think it is--because each mind is full of ideas and these color how we think about the very same sets of sentences.

Q: Yes, I can see that.

A: So, when the theory is selected, is it selected according to 'simplicity'? But that's just a word that indicates, at best, a kind of esthetical judgement, an artistic evaluation--what is necessary and what is not, --the painting may have many lines and yet it couldn't be one less line in the painting, they were all necessary-- you follow? So simplicity, beauty, ease of being, ease of thinking about it, and with it, wholeness, intuitiveness, a sense of light--all these esthetical judgements go into the process. Which is to say, we do not select according to a formula. We let the innermost self of ourselves, of, we can say, the silence in our minds, have a say. And so, you see, you must put the theories into your meditation, and be quiet about them. It's not up to the ego to pick any one out. That's not what it is about. It's about coming to a sense of gut giving its quiet nod to one theory, that it is, or may be, better than all the others.

Q: You are saying, in effect, that instead of Occam's Razor, you must use intuition.

A: Yes, --only that's a word that for some may sound like a formula, but I don't intend it to be a formula at all.

Q: Granted. Is this then what you call the "neo-popperian" approach to science?

A: It's part of it. Certainly. This trust in intuition, you see, is shared with many of those who worked with what they called "pure mathematics"--they saw it as an appeal to reaching togetherness by virtue of personal intuition. That doesn't mean that they got it right, and, in particular, intuitions into infinity do differ. But it is a belief very many people have had as to mathematics in its classical sense. Now we are saying that this idea that numbers are something we can have intuition over, is interesting, all the more so if some features of some of type of number algorithms can be imagined to underlie some of the structure of matter. This needn't be in the way Pythagoras said, but the ancient greeks certainly touched on the matter. So, this type of intuition may be right relative to the selecting of theories. But where do we draw the line as for the use of intuition? Some theories, when they are experienced as simple and often confirmed, are called 'facts', and in a sense provide input in the form of 'measurements' to other, new theories we make. So once you accept to use intuition to select some theories rather than some other theories, then you're in practise also accepting to use intuition as a source of additional measurements, in addition to sensory experiments. And now that requires a whole lot of training and thinking into how to move beyond bias and come to real intuitions, beyond desires, fears and so on. But then we are led onto a new way of thinking about science as a whole, and this is neo-popperianism, because it goes beyond the approach of Karl R. Popper, but builds on him and others as well. And super-model theory is, we can say,

the personal result of working in the neo-popperian way for just about decades on the questions of the universal processes and flows of energy and beyond.

Q: Well, that's quite a different take on it all than the quick atheist "Occam's Razor" method, isn't it?

A: It is. Now, let's go to the questions of art and dance again, and the intent of all this, and why it seems to be so easy for contemporary art to fall into the groove of glorifying decay and machine. Why is this a danger, and how can we say something about it that, at any point in the future, may serve to heal and aid those artists and dancers who are wanting to pursue a more natural, more holistic approach? I think this is a better question than to be too focussed on whatever we have around us, in this or that society, because there's so much that can change in just a few years. For instance, every society has its heroes, and the arts are no exception; but after a mere quarter of a century these heroes may be completely forgotten and new heroes are made. New names. And they may or may not represent something new and genuinely whole, but in any case, there doesn't have to be any continuity in the existence of false forms of art. To use that phrase --which is perhaps in these days not politically correct exactly, so we have to give it a more precise meaning.

Q: Yes, can we speak of false and true relative to art?

A: Now art is different from science in that what it

projects doesn't have in it the presumption that it is going to be a map of any territory. So, in that sense, art has greater freedom. But all the same it is projected for other human beings, in some way or another, to respond to. And in that way, art is a form of behaviour, and in the case of art that is displayed to many, it is a form of behaviour that is highly influential. Since it is influential, then, if we are spiritual enough to regard that actions are right or wrong, then for such big actions as these, they are mighty right or mighty wrong. In that sense, true or false. So, you see, we must explore spirituality at the same time as we explore art.

Q: Is it possible to speak of right and wrong of actions, unless we take a spiritual worldview?

A: No. If we aren't spiritual, then what's left is merely what is the social contracts, written or tacit. Some can try and raise these social contracts up and say that they reflect 'universal human rights' or similar such, but if human society isn't anchored in a realistic sense of the universe as a whole, then it is merely an insignificant detail in the universe, and this detail has no real right in claiming that its little rules are 'universal'.

Q: So in a sense, there isn't any rightness to secular art?

A: The word 'secular', fortunately, is more complicated than that. It may mean, for instance, that society is

ruled in a way that leaves room open for personal religion to exist, as long as this personal religion doesn't lead to conflicts with the governing of society. An artist may in this sense be secular, without being in the slightest in denial of the spiritual; and in this sense, spiritual art can be produced by a 'secular' artist. And so 'secular art' can be spiritually right.

Q: But can we reach a sense of what is spiritual that presumes as little as possible of agreement in worldview?

A: What do you mean?

Q: I mean, spirituality is, is it not, a rather large concept. It can, for some, mean any type of worldview or approach to life that isn't simply atheist. And that includes a very large number of possibilities indeed.

A: You are right. No, I don't think we can completely avoid talking about worldview if we're going to say something about meaningful spirituality. But we can try and appeal to the beginnings of some spirituality that is, as it seems, pointed to in science when summarized the supposed unbiased way we attempt to do in *The Beauty of Ballerinas*, in the super-model theory in particular. For instance, we can suggest that it does seem that there is a real degree of interconnectedness between all processes, including all living processes, and very possibly including also our own brains and beyond. This is one of the things that most critical thinkers of the 20th

century, as I see it, easily agreed upon: that the new physics indicates a need for a concept of wholeness to be taken very seriously indeed, even if it is not exactly the same type of organic wholeness as was pervasive for instance in the writings of Aristoteles. But it may not be all that different, either. So wholeness is one of the very general points of fairly broad agreement amongst those who have been exposed to the best of modern science.

Q: Right. Wholeness. That the idea of local particles and forces playing stupidly on them isn't all that there is.

A: Exactly--except, of course, that the latter idea is popular amongst the many who have had less time to think philosophically about science, but who are in contrast impressed with such as its child, technology--which is, typically, a very mechanical thing, and which leads itself to be taken into support for atheism, which we can also call 'localism'.

Q: Is there anything more we can say than wholeness?

A: If we are going to stay very near to that which a broad philosophizing over results of logic and science in the past century or two suggests, I think that we can add a few concepts. One of them is 'non-algorithmic'. This type of thinking is suggested by the well-known results which we discuss in the aforementioned book connected to Kurt Goedel. But it is also suggested by the HUP, the Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle, which does, informally

and imprecisely, seem to put a premium upon the notion of 'not always having to know', or, put briefly, 'unknowing'. And if something is part of a process of unknowing, then it follows that it isn't a recipe, a formula, and not algorithmic either. So in this sense, it vaguely does seem to support a notion of the non-algorithmic.

Q: Can we also say 'process'? Or 'movement'?

A: Yes. Entangled processes, non-algorithmically unfolding. That kind of stuff is certainly very easy to come to after even a brief contact with all these results.

Q: It still seems a long way from there to argue in favour that such and such action is more right or worthy than another?

A: Yes, but we are getting towards something if we take the leap into trusting that, in this process of flowing wholeness, it seems that through this wholeness, there can be insights, perceptions, intelligence, or, as we can call it, 'intuition'. And that this intuition may be connected also to feelings that, put briefly, life has for one another, and in particular to such holistic feelings as generous love, compassion, radiant admiration for beauty-- as wholeness in form and function and potential--and so on. It takes but a little reflection and a little intuition to go from the general concept of wholeness to all these additional concepts. And that includes mindfulness, or the gathering of the forces of flowing attentiveness at many

levels, as well.

Q: Some teachers who have been preaching awareness or mindfulness have also suggested that the human thought process often is divisive and in the way of this flow. And that thought needs to give attention to its own tendency to fragment life, so that it stays away from doing it.

A: Yes. Thought is immensely flexible. This flexibility means that it can shape all sorts of plans, ideas, concepts, stories, and so on, and these can get wrapped up into emotions, perhaps loads of emotions, and sort of sink much of the mind, take away the mindfulness and the contact with reality, and substitute for it an entirely subjective process that but at few points, such as at questions of money or fame, have any reality touch. I will go further and say that for most over twenty-five years of age, they have little contact with reality except in this way. And so in order to explore what art does to us, we should also take into consideration what children want as art and how they respond to it--perhaps more honestly--and how those who are above twenty-five years of age can be more as children relative to these questions, children who have plastic brains, and who haven't yet got stuck in a groove.

Q: Could we say, then, that an action that supports a child's mindfulness in a positive manner is more likely to be right? I mean, to try to reach an as neutral expression as possible about what is right?

A: It's a tempting thought, and certainly it can be right on occasions, but what is or what isn't supporting a child's mindfulness in a positive manner certainly isn't something that adults need to agree upon in the least. No, I think we need to have in our minds a sense of reverence for the vastness of cosmos and also, noticeably, for the personal capacity in each and every human being, young as old, to touch on intuitions into what all this is about--even if just in glimpses. This reverence, this wonder, will itself do much to dampen the prejudices and arrogant attitudes that easily can form in the minds of those to whom some form of art is, for the time being, a profession, a way of earning a livelihood. If we can share in this reverence and share in the sense of the majestic opportunity combined with the great complexity involved in getting good intuitions, then we have a common ground.

Q: Well, why then is this sceptical wonder about the universe, this reverence, so unusual--at least at times? Why does that which we call 'art' so easily become a breeding of mechanical notions and a wallowing around in themes connected to conflict and illness, or centered around trivial ideas of what's neat or socially recognisable--having a social reference?

A: One answer is that it is the human ego expressing itself. This ego isn't simple: and it is to some extent constantly reinventing itself so as to avoid easy detection. Essentially, the motive level--the highest

goals each person have typically lead to a lot of disappointments, a general level of frustration. Then art is perhaps looked to as a tranquilizer, just as an angry person may put on very hard and rough music very loud in order to soften himself or herself. A sort of shadow-boxing.

Q: What are these or this highest goal?

A: For a truly young person, it may change several times pr year--but for someone who has got into a pattern, it may take months and months to change it. Most people who have got stuck in a highest goal has a goal that somehow connects to a fighting of the pain of loneliness. Perhaps they want a flock around them--the guru-goal. Perhaps the lone person wants a partner. And the goal can be deduced by others who notice what this person does and where this person has energy and emotion, and so on. These goals make the person's emotions centered around the troubles of getting there, and this prevents the light and genuine generosity of the person of coming forth.

Q: Is there a right highest goal?

A: If you push your intuitions far, and you sense that there's a reality to life on subtler levels than what we can see, and that life has an intelligent, person-like source, then obviously it would make sense to have as a goal to serve no less than this, directly.

Now that is easily said, but such a goal may be very

hard to attain to for someone who for years have been stuck in a self-centered goal. You can see it on their faces. The self-centered goal is not a beautifying factor. So it would require daily hard work, daily self-commanding we might say, for months and months for a person to as it were re-direct his or her own 'spaceship in life' as the level of the highest goal. But when it is done, that person would find a meaning in dedication that has its own joy, regardless of whether it gives money, popularity or any flock around oneself.

If this is done without sticking to any narrow bible text, nor to any text by any St. Augustine or Martin Luther or any Advaita Vedanta or Rumi or anything else, then it would be a genuine light. And I do think that the intuitions would lead one to explore a little of the ancient greek myths around the Zeus concept, which became the Roman 'deus' concept and which was made into the unhappy, sterile God of the early roman christian church. Zeus, who created the muses, was everything of the Christian God but not the petty moralist, nor the denier of sexuality; and so we see that, in Greece, the ancient religion is again blossoming, at least to some extent.

All this comes naturally if you explore reality through your own intuitions, not leaning on any text by Homer or Krishnamurti or whomever. What it requires is to have the guts to kick all traditions in the ass; to be loyal to something infinitely greater than the past, namely the present, the Now, and how it contains seeds of all the future, and many more levels beyond your human thought.

And this is, as said, requiring a willingness to be

reverent about the universe, about Cosmos as a living whole, beyond the known, and--it follows--we must be creatively dissatisfied with the gurus, the shamans, the bodhisattvas, the lamas, the imams, the rabbis, all the priests and popes and similar characters. But also, we must be creatively dissatisfied with human society and its chatter about its own little concerns, its own petty little rankings and worries and machines. You cannot both love the littleness of thought and also love the vastness of cosmos. The littleness of thought must be seen for what it is; we must endeavour to have a cosmic intent pervading our daily lives, for a portion of every day.

Q: Suppose we do share in such an approach, or such an attitude to life, or belief somehow. What then can we say about what painting and dance must be?

A: Something that accords with this. In particular, that which Nature has produced as to the shape of the human being in her natural, young, rather new form, must be considered something beyond thought-processes, and something worthy of being a pointer to the wholeness that all human beings, no matter age, seek. So to find the essence of this form, the most beautifully athletically disciplined form in which the functions of this form can effortlessly express itself, whether we call it ballet or something else, must be part of the action of art on society--for someone who is thus inclined. To remind ourselves of these natural wholenesses--natural in the sense of being not at all the construct of mere human

thought--and to point to these wholenesses, rather than seek to implant some new 'cool' idea instead of them, is a way in which art can be true.

Q: Will all humanity get to it?

A: Obviously. Of course. Certainly. I'm an optimist. It'll only take a million years or so.