

A. L. BALDRY, Esq.,
Wolmer Wood,
Marlow Common, Marlow, Bucks.

28nd July, 1936.

My dear friend,

I thank you very much for making the adjustments to my reply to "Apollo" in just the right spirit, and I am enclosing a very amusing reply which I have just received from Furst. Please let me have it back with your comments after perusal. He is still trying to be very clever and no doubt thinks that he is able to bamboozle me!

I send you a reproduction of the picture of the King - the first official portrait of him - it is really lamentable. I am also sending "The Times" critique. That such things can be taken seriously at all! And admitted! Pictures made after photographs - making notes of the colours.

But Furst in any case has the right reply, and he did congratulate me on my Silver Medal of which he must have heard somehow, as I did not mention it myself.

The luncheon with the Archbishop of Canterbury went off very well indeed. The atmosphere was such that from a psychological point of view I was able to observe that he felt almost slightly apologetic. He was extremely delightful, and I am very keen to do something exceptional of him. He has consented to let me paint him in the vestments in which he will ~~appear~~ the King. It is a very great moral satisfaction to me. He also decided to come and sit here and the first sitting will take place on the 31st and the sittings will be continued in October, when he returns from Scotland. We must arrange for you to come up and I will show you the sketch for the portrait.

We are having a luncheon party to-morrow for the Queen of Roumania - to try to pay something for her very generous hospitality which I enjoyed in Bucharest, and before and after the luncheon she is sitting for another sketch in Roumanian costume. I will be busy here until the 10th of August and will then go down to Wentworth, where Lucy is going on Saturday. I am longing for a peaceful time.

Will you please return the "Mail" and "Times" cuttings when you write?

When I said that art from its earliest beginnings has concerned itself primarily with the representation of nature, I stated a fact that surely ought to be obvious to every intelligent student of art history. Art in its origin was purely illustrative and upon a gradually built up foundation of accurate representation it based securely its symbolical and abstract developments. Art to-day, however, symbolical and abstract it aspires to become, needs just this same foundation and if it is not concerned primarily with the representation of nature - with, that is to say, correctness of vision and accuracy of statement - its efforts to express itself by abstract devices must inevitably make it ridiculous. The painter of "abstract" pictures, who has no practical knowledge of nature and no trained ability to realise what he sees, is in the same unhappy position as a writer who is trying to give rein to his imagination without having had any contact with the world or possessing any command of language. The stuff that such people produce is not art and to thrust it upon the public is an offence against good taste and ordinary common sense, for it is only by establishing the right relationship between the representation of nature and the expression of intellectual abstractions that true artistic creation is made possible.