

R. F. Squirru
Arenales 1299
Buenos Aires

Dear Sir Herbert;

Let me start by thanking you for your prompt and beautiful reply to my letter questioning some of your theoretical implications about art and morality. If I call it beautiful I not only mean the splendor formae of the schellastics but the honesty of thought it conveys.

And here, allow me to be carried back to what you well say is a question that could endlessly be debated; not that I believe endlessness to be the object of these considerations, but that possibly the subjects really worth debating are those endlessly debatable. Although we may never reach water-tight conclusions, because of their very nature they'll make us give our maximum effort of thought and concentration; in much the same way it is highly improbable that any painter could convey the image of Christ and yet that subject has proved the summit of what many a painter could give of his better self ~~from~~ ^{from} Piero to Velazquez and from Velazquez to Rouault.

Your desire to clarify your point of view has definitely been successful, but even then a few factors remain that I'm sure you'll forgive me if I bring ~~them~~ to your notice.

You appear to draw a distinction between moral judgement and moral sensibility roughly corresponding to the concepts of character ^{and personality} derived from Keats's letters. Moral sensibility, you say, is innate, instinctive; moral judgement objective, impersonal, BASED ON EXTERNAL CODES. And I point out: Is moral judgement "based on external codes" or are external codes based on moral judgement? And further, is not moral judgement based on moral sensibility?