

A. HASANALI & CO.

IMPORTERS & STOCKISTS OF GLASSWARE,
ENAMELWARE, LAMPWARE, HURRICANE LANTERNS ETC.

136, CHUCKLA STREET,
BOMBAY 3.

18th September 53

My dear Dayal:

I like your letter - No criticism is educative or inspiring as the painter is not in or by criticism but above it in that he "paints" while the other "criticises", that is to say, in your own words, the critic "searches for values after one has painted". — But this search for value is outside of the painting i.e. the critic "attributes" value to a painting whereas the painting is itself a "value".

That is where criticism comes in. Is painting a value or not? If the artist is the sole judge of that one has no more to say. It is the end of all criticism.

But the Critic comes into the picture when he "decides" whether a painting is a value or not. The decision is a free choice, it is taken freely, that is to say, it does not seek to confirm or contest the painting on the "basis of values" but evaluates it as a value. In this a critic can only uphold,

(2)

or condemn. If he upholds he does not go beyond it. If he condemns he sets up an anti-value on the basis of which he "devalues" the painting i.e. strips it of all value.

The critic therefore assumes a role - His role is to evaluate but evaluation is on the basis of value + if a painting is "absolute value", one cannot evaluate absolutely. Therefore the critic fails. The painter triumphs.

A critic therefore has to be also a "creator": This when a critic is ~~a~~ creator or a creator critic that he can evaluate absolutely. He can "confer" value because he creates value, - So much for the role of the critic.

Now for the drawing - you say I judge the face + the figure by different criteria. - I do not. When I say one judges the face by expression I mean the face is a trap. It assumes an expression. It's a mirror which devalues value or the pretence of a value + shows up the artist - That's why I asked you, if you could not make your face "expressive".

I do not know about the "Pectoralis Major" or the Pectoralis Minor nor have I seen the Venus of Willendorf - I maintain

A. HASANALI & CO.

IMPORTERS & STOCKISTS OF GLASSWARE,
ENAMELWARE, LAMPWARE, HURRICANE LANTERNS ETC.

(3)

136, CHUCKLA STREET.
BOMBAY 3.

that the Dandooles is external to the man —
perhaps a serpent would not have been — I do
not know. I do not judge your drawing
by the composition, I assume it. — when I
say the Dandooles completes the drawing I
mean you have sacrificed the drawing to
the composition.

you talk about "texture". Is not texture
a part of the same figure, is it not at
the very basis of proportion + form?
you admonish me for applying a different
criterion to the face + the figure, why
then do you want me to apply a different
criterion to the texture?

you say you do not believe painting is
the "cessation of all conveying". you say "in
this conveying" which a painting is we salvage
what the world would otherwise have lost.
— A painting never conveys. It "imparts".
A painting does not "seek" to convey because
it does not "need" to seek. A painting is
fratuitous, completely + absolutely, + the world
never loses — It only "gains".

(u)

Your last words have a tragic pathos.

No doubt your work is solitary + therefore
loses strength. If I could have judged
it on the basis of your other work, I
would have assigned it a "place". It
would have been a "step" in the evolution
of your art. But the evolution is not
yet. You may evolve + then the solitary
work will gain significance in the light
of your evolution but the significance
is not yet + I can only judge it in its
solitariness. For evolution is a great comfort.
+ one can from the ladder of evolution
look back + explain everything. But
solitariness is perpetual smog.