

WOLMER WOOD,

MARLOW, COMMON,

MARLOW, BUCKS.

July 16th 1936.

My dear Philip

The note in "Apollo" is rather silly, but Furst, who presumably wrote it, is a bit of an ass and does not know any better. I have known him a good many years — he used to be manager for the Hanfstaengl firm — and I know that he is a good deal of a crank about the modern stuff. I suppose he has to be, as "Apollo" is a sort of dealers' magazine.

I have recast your note and I hope it reads all right — I have kept it to the main issue, that the representation of nature is the necessary foundation of art and that art "at bottom" is representative and not abstract. This, I think, is really the only point worth

noticing and the only one
that it is worth while to
~~contend~~ argue about. What
Furst calls "symbols of nature"
— I suppose he means abstractions
which are founded upon natural
facts — could not come into
existence until after the natural
facts had been studied and
understood.

I am surprised that Furst,
being a modernist crank,
admits that you have "an extremely
efficient technique", because
if your technique is efficient
what ought he to say about the
"abstract" painters whom he
professes to admire? It would
seem that he admits that their
technique — which is so unlike
yours — is inefficient. You
ought to consider yourself
complimented; if Furst meant
to attack you in the note he has
certainly missed his aim.

I hope you and Lucy are well — how did
your lunch with the Archbishop go off?

Our love to you both

always yours

M.L.B.