however, I am I cannot help finding evrything most interesting. I had to realize/how far/from rendering the pertinent facts of my own paper on Classic Art, in philosophical terms . My termino logy seemed so simple so earthy to me, yet it is not the one in common use and therefore not easily understandable. Yet when I say: In order to understand modern art we must cast off all the strange notions of the artist as a genius, a prophet, a redeemer, I should have been he readily understood. And also: it is the emptiness of all space relations which constitute the core of Classic Art, etc., etc., and finally my insistance that all "art work" should be undertaken for the higher glory of God makes it clear how much I agree with you. And it was Fiedler who, more than 80 years ago in his last fragment said, that the subjectobject relation may be a necessary crutch for establishing scientific method, but in all in order other human endeavors where truth of revealed, it maks neither sense nor has it any value; on the contrary and Suzuki makes that very clear too. Not being a child of my age or society I may bluntly add that I consider Picasso an able experimenter but in no ways an artist. And I also wish that the terms beauty and creativity should be banned for at least a generation from that glib use of which you speak. Even in your paper, so clear and candid, that word beauty stands there as an opaque spot. It would be better not to use it at all. If we would make a clear and valid distinction between aesthetic and artistic values we would not need that word. It belongs to a much higher

Dear Father Louis: I have read your paper twice and have read it carefully. I believe

it a very good paper. Of course you speak of things so close to my mind and heart that

I am sorry I cannot dedicate the book on chinese characters to you for it has been inscribed by a freind of mine. But you can keep it as long as you want, and I hope it will be of some use to you.

level, and should not be used so carelessly.