

Indiana's Changing Landscape*

RALPH M. KRIEBEL, (deceased) Soil Conservation Service

It has been announced that this is to be a philosophical discussion of the landscape assets of Indiana. I want to state in the beginning that I do not pose as a philosopher, for I know full well that I do not have the knowledge of general principles which is the attribute of philosophers. It is with diffidence that I address this society of accomplished scientists because I have a realization of my shortcomings. I have had to learn what I know about soils during the last few years and the job is still far from being well done. "In nature's infinite book of secrets little can I read." There is so much that I do not know.

I am primarily a biologist and hence have been learning of the things about me by observing living things, including man. My remarks will be tempered by the view of my environment through the glasses of a natural scientist. I have drawn some conclusions about the world in general from my more or less intimate knowledge of some small parts of it. I trust they may be correct and worthwhile. I believe one can learn a great deal of the general from studying the specific, whereas, it is impossible to know the specific by studying the general. For that reason our philosophers are usually our most impractical of men, while very simple folk may have a great deal of wisdom. I want you to be prepared to listen to some generalities, for I am compelled to talk somewhat in general terms. I think there is a place for generalists. They too, hit a mark occasionally.

I said I was no philosopher but, in my amateurish way, I do want to delve a little into the fields of natural philosophy and moral philosophy. I would like to enumerate some facts about Indiana's landscape, simply as facts, and also deal with their values. Natural philosophy (including the physical and psychological sciences) informs us about our environment and ourselves, shows us our resources and our powers, what we can do and how to do it. Moral philosophy asks the deeper and more significant question: What *shall* we do? Since we find ourselves able to steer our lives so as to change the proportion of good or bad, of light and shade, it makes a moral problem. Insofar as our relation to our landscape is concerned we must know what to choose and from what to refrain. What shall we work for in Indiana and what against?

* Address delivered before the Indiana Soil Science Society, Lafayette, November 18, 1942. Presented to the Botany Section and by request of that section published as a memorial to Mr. Kriebel.

Landscape Defined

Before going any further I want to define my use of the term "Landscape". I believe that most of us have a good conception of what is meant by landscape as the word is ordinarily used to describe a stretch of natural country as seen from a single point, as from a hill or other vantage point. I want to use the word as it is used in soil geography to include the sum total of the characteristics that distinguish a certain area on the earth's surface from other areas. I will talk about the whole landscape of Indiana as it might be seen from a very distant point. A mind's-eye view, if you please. I would like to have you see the whole state in perspective.

If we view Indiana in perspective we will see a picture representing natural scenery the characteristics of which are the result not only of natural forces but a human occupancy and use of land. Included would be such features as rock formations, plants, animals, soil types, hills, valleys, streams, cultivated fields, roads, buildings, strip mines, lakes and drainage ditches. These and other factors would give the landscape its distinguishing pattern. In other words, my use of the word includes the complex pattern of an extensive area including all of Indiana rather than to restrict it to its narrower definitions as, for example, the hills of Brown County or the forested Plainfield sand of the Kankakee River Valley. My use of the word included the cultural features which are excluded from the term "natural landscape".

Since the pattern of the various landscapes in Indiana that make the total is due to the contributions of natural forces and upon the manipulation by humans, I want to consider the forces of nature which have brought it about and by which it maintains its existence. I also want to discuss the effect of man on it. As a biologist, I am reluctant to separate man from the landscape, for I think he is as much a part of it as any other living organism. I do so only because I think I'll be better understood. It is the effect of man on landscape which I want to discuss in more detail for he is the cause of changes which would not have come about without his aid and which would be unable to maintain themselves without his constant intervention.

Forces That Make Landscape

The forces which bring about landscape are numerous and complex. They are the forces of geology, climate and biology. The natural landscape takes on a particular pattern in response to events of the past. Because of different rock formations, changes in climate, and plant and animal life, Indiana has many physiographic and ecologic areas. Due to these great forces, we have such landscapes as those of the unglaciated area, Illinoian Plain, Wabash Valley, Kankakee area, and the lake area, and the dune area. The soils are different because of the variable factors that make soil, such as parent material, climate, biological activity, age and slope. There is a number of possible combinations of the climatic,

biological and geological forces in this state and as a result there is a great number of types of soil which yet can be grouped conveniently into larger groups that have a common property of being useful to the development of human society but not all of them having the same degree of usefulness.

All living things largely depend upon soil for nutrients. Since life depends upon the soil it is limited to those forms and numbers that can be maintained by the nutrient supply delivered by the soil. The supply of nutrients in the soil and their quality depend on climate. Not weather, as we know it from day to day and year to year, but the sum total of the weather over great ages. Climate is the great force which has made Indiana landscape. In the climate at work on the different rocks is hidden the secret of understanding how soils can be of nutrient value for life. We talk much about weather but we fail to comprehend the great force of climate. It is the force to which the limestones and the sandstones in the hills of Indiana must succumb and by which they are changed to the "sluggish clod which the rude swain turns with his share and treads upon". Climate as it breaks down our rocks has made some parts of Indiana good; other parts it has made poor as it moves the nutrients from the rocks to the sea. The soil is the resting place—a stopping off place on its journey.

The ecological array, of the plants and the animals here before the advent of man, was present as a result of the nutrient quality of the soil. Indiana was mostly forested because in the forest vegetation, in all the varieties, were the colors by which the Creator had painted the picture of the nutrient qualities of the soil. Possibly the plants were mostly of a woody nature because of the ratio between calcium, phosphorous, potassium, and the like as they were weathered from the rocks. At any rate, the forces of nature were such as to make a woody vegetation in contrast to a more proteinaceous one. On the canvas which we may call Indiana, is laid out the pattern by which the life forms (including man) which depend on vegetation can guide their own distribution, if they are to live healthily on the land.

We know quite well what the landscape in Indiana was when white man first came. Large areas were covered with forest, grassland, and swampland. Rich and varied were the natural resources. There was a harmony of life, and the forces of nature were not much disturbed by the Indians. In the rocks we find the soul of history, the whole area throbbled with life and the joy of it all was ours to share.

It is because of the nutrient quality of the soil that Indiana has such scenic areas as the hills of Brown County and such fertile farms in other parts. It is because of things that happened in the dim past that this state is a part of the world's greatest breadbasket and is fated with nine other states in the American middle west to supply sixty percent of the food for our country and our allies in this war. Indiana fortunately is located at the eastern end of the great prairies where there is great nutritive wealth. The state is fortunate because of its location, its surface space and the things that are present in that space.

The Pyramid of Life

I said that when white man came to Indiana there was a harmony of life; that there was a balance of nature. The "balance of nature" is an image that we apply to land because when our mind deals with any concept that is hard to visualize, it substitutes some familiar objects which have similarities. To me, a biologist, the balance or weighing scale, with its attribute of oscillating when balance is disturbed has never been quite satisfactory. I never see life in balance or in a static condition. Life was dynamic before we came. It is always moving. If it was in balance two hundred years ago in Indiana it was upset long ago, and the only way to get it back to that condition is to turn it back to the natural forces—"to the Indians" as the saying goes.

During recent years, because of my study and my work with Indiana soils, plants, and animals, I have learned to think of life as being pyramidal in nature. It is the image used by ecologists and presents a more accurate one of living things. It gives us an insight into the biological mechanisms. When understood, it serves as a fusion point for scientists, economists, philosophers and all laymen. It gives us a tolerance for values over and above dollars and cents. It shows that there is utility in some apparently insignificant things.

I want to offer a brief sketch of the pyramid of life in this state, and then point out or enumerate some of the changes which were made in its structure during the years since civilized man came.

In the first place I think it is necessary to know that all life derives its energy from the sun. I am able to stand here and address you because of sun energy. The source of my sun energy came to me, indirectly, through the green plant which, as far as we know, is the only organism able to utilize sunlight for the synthesis of digestible compounds for living things to eat. Everything we had to eat here this evening is the product of the green leaf, with the exception perhaps of the salt and water. The plants get their mineral nutrients such as calcium, phosphorus, potassium, magnesium, zinc, iron, sulphur and copper from the soil where it was made available to them from the rocks by the forces of climate. The carbon and part of the oxygen they derive from the air. The green leaf synthesizes them so that insects, birds, beasts and man can use them to build their bodies. If there is a sufficiency of plant nutrients in the proper solution, there will be more plants and in turn there will be more animals, because of the many plants for them to live on.

I suppose back in the days when the glaciers receded from this state the pyramid of life was not very high, but as more and more plants were evolved it was elaborated. Where there was little soil, there was little life, for there is no life without soil.

I conceive the pyramid of life to be something like this: At the base of the pyramid is the soil. On the soil grow plants of many different kinds, and large numbers of particular kinds. On the plants live a layer of insects—millions and millions of them. Then there is a layer of animals that eat the insects, such as the birds, rodents, toads, frogs,

snakes, fish and salamanders. There is a layer of animals which eat plants only, as do the elk, bison and the deer. Then there is a group of animals that eat both plants and animals. At the top are the flesh eating animals—or the carnivorous organisms, called predators.

Each layer depends upon those below. The individuals in each layer are not similar, except in what they eat. Each layer decreases in abundance from top down. For every animal that eats other animals there are many which it can eat. They in turn are dependent on large numbers of insects which live on innumerable plants. This line of dependency is called a food chain. We are dependent on these food chains the same as non-humans. At first this seems inextricably complex, but when studied, it becomes apparent how orderly the structure is.

The energy from the sun, which is absorbed by the plant, flows through a circuit of life almost like the sap flows in a tree. It flows high if the cooperations and competitions function properly. Food chains are the living channels which conduct energy upward. As the plants and animals die and decay they are returned to the soil, and again infused into living things. "Corruption is the mother of life." This applies to the life in our lakes, streams and rivers just the same as it does to organisms on drier areas.

This circuit of energy is not a closed affair. There may be loss in decay or additions by absorption. Energy may be stored as it is in the forests, soils, and muck beds. But when a change occurs in one part of the circuit other parts must adjust themselves to it. This is possible with or without detrimental effects. Nature itself has made many changes as the pyramid of life was developed. These natural changes apparently had the effect of elevating the pyramid higher and higher as nutrients were made available.

When civilized man came with his newly invented tools and techniques he cut a large part of the total pyramid to the soil line and used the soil for agriculture. Rightly so, for we could not eat the forests, and there were not enough native animals to live on. We substituted farm crops for the native plants and domesticated animals for the wild ones. Because of transportation facilities we brought in many new plants and animals; others that were already present we moved to new habitats. Some of the organisms which we brought in were very useful, others went out of bounds as pests and diseases.

Great changes have come about in the pyramid of life. Agriculture, because of over-drawing on the soil resources, or by too drastic changes of domestic plants and animals for native ones, has altered the energy circuit to such an extent that at places the pyramid is low compared to what it was before the state was used for farming and industrial purposes. The stored energy in the soils when the land was cleared for agriculture gave a false idea as to the depletion of plant nutrients. Land was often believed to be inexhaustible. Yet many soils in this state, because they were depleted of their stores, are washing and blowing away. The reaction of land to the alteration of the pyramid of life was not foreseen. It was not appreciated that the pyramid of life in one part of Indiana had greater capacity to withstand manipulation than in other

parts. Because of its elasticity the corn belt can have a higher pyramid of agricultural life, than can the Illinoian plain of Scott County.

If we look at the pyramid of life as an energy circuit it shows us that (1) land is not only soil, but a fountain of energy flowing through a circuit of soils, plants and animals, (2) native plants and animals kept the energy circuit open; domestic plants and animals may or may not, (3) man-made changes are different from the natural forces and result in consequences which were not intended.

As far as Indiana landscape is concerned we need to consider two things: Can the landscape adjust itself to civilized man's doings? Can we do something about it?

The Effect of Man

Let's look at some of the changes which have been made by man in the pyramid of life during the last one hundred and twenty years.

The first thing of major importance that man did was the deforesting of areas for lumber and for soil for cultivation. As the need for more and more land was felt, he drained many areas. All the land which was cleared and drained was cultivated, fertilized and uniformly planted to useful crops. He keeps it for such purposes only by constant efforts because should he leave it alone the forces of nature in all probability would gradually bring the plants and animals back which were here originally, provided they were not completely exterminated. If all civilized folk would leave the state it would, in the long run, revert to forest, prairie, and marsh.

In the clearing and cultivating processes many living communities were sacrificed. Many plants and animals were forced out and replaced by others such as our farm crops and animals which have more usefulness. Only such wild plants and animals as were thought to be useful were tolerated. Others were ignored or fought, depending on how useful they were thought to be. Utility was always the criterion of what action to take. It was known that plants and animals compared and cooperated but they were regarded as separate and distinct. The loss of certain elements in the landscape was not believed to be serious. Little good was seen in the collective total of things.

A study of the plants and the animals in Lawrence County which I conducted some years ago, convinced me that some of the changes are indeed profound. Man transplanted plants and animals, intentionally and unintentionally. Inadvertently he introduced such plants as cheat, and bluegrass, and such insects and pests as the Japanese beetle, corn borer cabbage worm and chestnut blight. Mr. C. C. Deam in his "Flora of Indiana" reveals that of the approximately nineteen hundred species of plants which are now a definite part of our landscape, three hundred and two have been introduced since about 1820.

As a result of man's manipulation many changes have been brought about in the composition of the animal life. Forced out or back are such species as the turkey, pileated woodpecker, grouse, ducks, elk, deer, bison, and bear. Instead we have our domesticated farm animals, and such wild ones as the Hungarian partridge, ring-necked pheasant, English

sparrow, and starling. The effect of man has also caused an increase of such species as bob-white quail, meadowlark, cotton-tail rabbit, woodchuck, crow, Colorado beetle, and chinch bug.

Man has also built many houses, barns, bridges and other structures. Many of them are clustered in towns and cities. He has built highways, yards, parks and pools. Human habitations have attracted a host of doorway weeds that grow near homesteads and animals that are closely associated with civilization, for example, barn swallows, chimney swifts, night hawks, pigeons, bluebirds, martins, bedbugs, bats, cockroaches, crickets, silverfish, house flies, mice, and rats.

He altered many waters and the aquatic life, by drainage, sewerage and industrial waste. He cleared and straightened streams and built power dams. Drainage ditches form a network over that part of the state which was once a deciduous swamp forest and is now the cornscape. Not only have the surface waters and the pyramid of life therein been profoundly changed but so have been the subterranean waters. We are somewhat in the same status as Ohio, where Dr. Stout, State Geologist, produced evidence that Ohio's water table had receded an average of $19\frac{1}{2}$ feet in 20 years and that the sweet-water (potable water) table is today limited to a very thin upper crust. Indianapolis, like Cincinnati, is becoming concerned by the gradual falling of the underground water table. Below the potable water is brine.

Man has greatly accelerated soil erosion and depleted soil fertility. Scars on the land caused by sheet, gully and wind erosion are evident in nearly all parts of Indiana. On an area equal to 7% of the state, three-fourths or all of the topsoil is gone. On an area equal to one-third of the state, from one-fourth to three-fourths is removed. This means that about $1\frac{1}{2}$ million acres have been so severely damaged that they are of little further use as agricultural land at present price levels. Even on our most fertile farming areas of gently rolling land, erosion is taking its toll. On level land we face declining soil fertility.

To sum up, man has been instrumental in bringing about great changes in the Indiana landscape. Primeval forest, virgin soils, and prairie grassland have given way to open fields. So great have been the changes that over most areas the natural phenomena in general are completely secondary, approachable from the agricultural or the economic rather than from the biological. Few acres have escaped the influence of man. At many places high productivity and intense agriculture have placed such a premium on every square foot of soil that landowners have been moved to do things which by hindsight we now believe were ill-advised.

I am calling attention to only some of the many changes effected by man. There are many others. Some of them are changes for the good as evidenced by many beautiful farms, highways, towns, parks, lakes, and woodlands. Other changes are definitely for the worse.

Evidences of a Stricken Landscape

In this grand state, so richly endowed by nature, there are far too many visible evidences of waste, unjustifiable destruction, exploitation,

and misuse of many of the features of its landscape: soil erosion, land exhaustion, vanished plants and animals, polluted waters and distressed people. Further evidences are decadent rural communities, blighted areas, city slums, submarginal and abandoned farms, stranded industrial towns and communities, unsightly objects disfiguring the landscape beauty, commercialization of scenic and natural areas, and unwise land use.

Even though they were once prosperous agricultural districts, there are places where the fields lie with topsoil gone and slopes gashed with gullies; grown up with poverty grass, broomsedge, sassafras, blackberries and persimmon sprouts. The inevitable poverty that accompanies such soil wastage is reflected in dilapidated barns and discouraged looking folk in unpainted houses. The wooded areas, too often, are wantonly cut over, burned and grazed.

Our cities are good only in business activity and too often quite poor in human living values. They are usually crowded, have unsightly suburbs and in or near them piles of trash consisting of a hundred and one discarded artifacts of civilized man.

The incontestible truth is that even though Indiana is still a young and growing state, evidences of decay have already begun to appear in both the urban and the rural landscape.

What We Can Do About It

After enumerating the evidences of derangement in the Indiana landscape one could say with Hamlet, "The time is out of joint. O cursed spite that ever I was born to set it right!" But we need not despair. There are many things which we can do to alter things for the better, if we will. The first task facing us is to get some new ideas into the collective thinking process of the populace.

When we talk about saving landscape we imply that it is a resource that is exhaustible and that something can be done about it; that it is controllable. To do so the following ideas should be transplanted and nurtured:

First, civilization rests squarely upon the physical and biological resources of our landscape. There are two fundamental sources of the goods and energy which man uses in the business of securing the sort of living he desires. On the one hand there is the soil, and power produced by wind and falling water; on the other hand, there are the quarry, mine and oil well. The resources of the mineral kingdom are non-renewable. In contrast the products of the soil—plants and animals—are renewable. We use them but we do not need to use them up.

Second, our greatness springs primarily from the landscape rather than from institutions. The greatness of this state is due to the greatness of the North American Continent. It is not great only because of "the American way of life", the Republican party or the New Deal. These institutions have permitted people to make use of their opportunities but no one can make an object if he does not have the where-with-all to make it. The where-with-all comes from the landscape. A pair of shoes can not be made unless the material is at hand, just as no rubber tire

can be made without rubber. No matter how much brain and mental power may be present, the landscape resources are fundamental in greatness. The people on the island of Bermuda may be very smart but Bermuda can never be what the United States is because of the lack of a number of classes of landscape assets.

Third, it is possible to preserve the physical basis of our social order through a program of conservation. This would mean a diversified program that ramifies into all the resources both renewable and non-renewable. It would involve the taking care of our soil, coal, mineral and water supply. It would involve substitution of inexhaustible or replaceable resources wherever possible, and fuller use through community, state and national planning. We are facing just such a program today in the rationing of food and rubber. Rationing is a program of conservation. Such programs can be applied elsewhere.

As far as the conservation of landscape is concerned, intelligent land use policy is the bed rock answer. The fruition of such ideas would result in biotic farming. The problem must start with the man on the land. He must be induced to keep the land in order. But the landowner cannot change his ways until his teachers, bankers, governors, editors, and neighbors change their idea of what land is for. Man controlling the pyramid of life stands in ultimate significance, for the character of the landscape is determined in a part by his enterprises. More people should realize that the landscape, like our body, should have a certain wholeness. If a part is lost it is crippled. Few realize that soil water, plants, and animals are like an engine subject to derangement.

The great task is the job of education. Many people think the way is to get hold of the schools. But here too, unless every one is back of what the children are taught, they cannot hear what is said because what is done speaks so plainly. We will have to carry the lessons right out to busy and skeptical grown-ups. It will be no easy job.

The mental process is important. It is in our minds that the changes need to be made first. We need a wholesome respect for the outdoors; an intolerance for a denuded and disorderly landscape. We need to get rid of the psychological heritage of a lazy willingness to tolerate gullied areas, over-cut and gameless acres. We are too careless about the appearance of our surroundings. We get used to untidy areas. Gradual ravishment of the landscape is too commonplace to arouse concern. Year to year changes are often so nearly imperceptible as to pass unnoticed even though profound. A shingle blowing off the roof is permitted to reach ten. We then say, "It's too bad but it can't be helped". We think too much in terms of cash returns of a year instead of the civilization of a century. Somehow we must learn to substitute scientific and biotic agriculture for an unintelligent use of land; good forestry for reckless timber slashing.

It is important to understand that the energy to control our landscape is essentially a product of that landscape for it supports the belief that man is not a detached manipulator, free to do what he will in the world in which he finds himself. Instead he is a part of the very landscape to which he belongs. He is a block in the pyramid of life.

Modification of the landscape was inevitable. This is an agricultural state and therefore agricultural enterprises take priority. The development of a farming community, however, is no valid excuse for the loss of interesting and necessary parts of the environment, which could just as well be retained by simple management. The decline of soil fertility and the loss of native plants and animals does not have to follow as an inevitable corollary of progress. It only denotes an indifferent or a bunglesome handling of a heritage.

My thesis is that we can live with nature far more harmoniously than we have been doing. But we must make compromises; we must reverse or modify our old idea that the landscape owes us everything while we owe it nothing. The very least we can do is to study, recognize, and obey natural laws. I contend that there is no such thing as wasteland. If you have the biotic point of view you see significance in the meanest plant and animal. Every nook and corner has a value. In this state each little area should be made to produce its share of the income either directly as a cash crop, feed crop, pasture, as fuel, timber, or other forest products, or indirectly as game cover or game feed, as recreational ground, wind protection or as an aesthetic background, which will make the state more attractive and, therefore, more valuable. There is utility in the total landscape.

Since man must make the use of land pay he must also be very certain that he knows what we mean by "making it pay". If in the process he loses the essential part of his landscape he does not make it pay. That which is biologically correct is also economically the most profitable. Our technologies must have as their primary objective the fertility of the soil and the stability of the plants and animals, and secondly, the objective of yield and profit.

In answer to the question, "Can we afford to conserve our landscape?" our answer would have to be, "Yes we can afford it". Not only can we afford it for economic and biological reasons but for recreational and aesthetic reasons. Man needs more than bread and butter; he needs certain emotional luxuries which are to be had from his landscape. It involves the question of man's respect for his civilization which has a spiritual and a material aspect.

I think we will have to admit that whatever man's nature must be, those qualities which are finest are profoundly affected by the physical things which appear to him. That means that he must have an ethical feeling of responsibility toward his landscape. He must assume responsibilities for conditions which help determine his behavior and that of his fellows. It is a way of life for city and country folk and when you try to persuade people to change it, it takes courage.

Great changes toward conservation thinking have come about in recent years. But the changes have not been enough. And now in time of war when emphasis is on destruction, the changes will be slower. For example, with the great emphasis on food production, when every ship load of food taken away carries with it tons of calcium, potassium, phosphorus, nitrogen, etc., all taken from the valuable topsoil in our

landscape, we must ask the questions: "Are we replacing what is taken away?" "What ship ever brings back our vital nutrients?"

Something tells me that we will keep on hurting Indiana landscape during this war. We certainly will if what is taken away is not replaced. The fields and woodlands will suffer some more for there is too great a demand for agricultural products and for lumber and too little emphasis placed on replacing nutrients. Indiana landscape, because of its richness, will have to furnish a lot. We beat down so much land during the first World War. We should have learned the lesson of the value of fertilization—to put back what should only be borrowed. If by hindsight we know some things are wrong we should not continue to do the same wrong. That is immoral. We may have to sacrifice a part of our landscape in order to win this war. But we should be most careful not to lose one bit more than is necessary. The pyramid of life should be kept as lofty as it is within our power to keep it. Indiana's landscape has great potentialities. We must heed the words from Proverbs. "There is a way which seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof is the way of death". We must be sure to take the right way lest our destruction of the landscape lead to death.

The Call to Earth

What I am trying to say is that we should understand our environment and try to keep it in a healthy condition. Land is all of one body. We must keep our land so. We all live on, or from, the land. It is the source of our sustenance, our inspiration, our enjoyment. The life in every community sings a song. The discords of abuse, of course, have marréd many parts of our landscapes. Lumbering, fire, drainage and agricultural enterprises have hurt the plants, animals, and the soils.

If the landscape is utilized, it should be well managed. The man who builds a machine may know the craftsman's satisfaction of a job well done but the man who manages the landscape becomes a partner with God in a creative act. We cannot build soils, plants, and animals. We can only preside at the mystery of their growth.

To understand but faintly what we are, what our machine-age civilization with its objectives of yield and profit has been doing to nature and her resources, one should study his environment. We must live with nature and be able to read the story she is trying to write for shortsighted, puny man. It is the everyday organisms and life's complexities, its vital interrelations, its unbelievable symbiotic systems that matter. In every community almost all problems are still unresolved. There are countless lovely things to make life a blessed privilege. But we must be alive and acutely sensitive to perceive and feel and appreciate them. They are to be had in the immediate landscape. There "like the spring choir of the marshes, rises the triumphant canticle of life's beauty". Understand it. Manage it. Live and enjoy it.