```
[Text from a letter with annex to James J. Sweeney, gedateerd: 'may 24 [1943]'.]
[brief:]
                                       may 24 //
353 East 56 St.//
                               [rechterbovenhoek diagonaal ondersteboven:]
                               I think the destructive element /
                               is too much neglected in art. //
Dear Mr. Sweeney, //
  To complete our conversation, the /
folling could be usefull to your work. //
 You know that the intention of Cubism /
- in any case in the beginning - was /
to express volume. The three-di-/
mensial space (natural) remained thus /
established. [verwijzingsteken:] X This was opposed to /
my conception of abstraction which is /
that this space just has to be destroy- /
ed. In consequence I came to destroy /
volume using the plane. Then the /
problème was to destroy the plane /
also. This I did by means of lines /
cutting the planes. But still the /
plane remained too much in tact. //
  So I came to make only lines and /
brought the color in these. Now the /
only probleme is to destroy these /
lines also through (+ mutual) opposition. //
Perhaps I express my self not clear in this /
but it can (- give you) explain you why I left /
the cubist influence. Best wishes from /
                               Mondrian. //
[linkermarge verticaal:]
[verwijzingsteken:] X It shows again that Cubism "au fond" remained natural /
```

and was only an abstraction but not abstract. ///

## [bijlage; eerste bladzijde]

```
First aim: universal expression /
Plastic exigence to this:/
equivalence of vertical and /
horizontal expression. /
This is not in fig. A. /
vertical predomines, Gothic /
expression result. //
[schets A]
Second aim: concreet universal /
                    expression. /
In fig B. there is equivalence of /
horizontal and vertical expression, /
but thus the whole is of more /
universal expression than fig. A. /
But this expression is vague, /
for the vertical and horizontal is \langle -\left[xx\right] \rangle /
confused. The structure is as lost. /
In latest picture, the structure /
and the means of expression are /
concreet and in mutual equivalence. ///
```

```
[bijlage; tweede bladzijde]

Period fig C. was necessery /
to approche concreet structure //

[schets C]

In A color is vague. /
In B there is only black /
and white. /

This brings too far from reality. /
In \( + \text{ C. and} \) latest picture colors are /
primary: concreet. ///
```

```
[bijlage; derde bladzijde]
Many appreciate in my /
former work (+ just) what I did /
not want to express but /
established by uncapacity /
to express what I wanted: /
dynamic movement in /
equilibrium. /
Continious struggle for this
brought me nearer. //
In his later works Doesburg tryed /
to destroy static expression by /
diagonal position of his lines. /
[figure]
But in this way /
the feeling of physic /
equilibrium which /
is necessary to enjoy /
a work of art is lost. /
Relationship with architecture, of vertical and horizontal position, /
is broken. //
⟨+ The picture⟩ Hung in this /
position, /
[figure]
only the limitation of /
the picture is in lines of 45°, not the /
```

this way produced. ///

picture. The advantage is the longer lines in /

```
[bijlage; vierde bladzijde:]
Importent to discerne two /
sorts of equilibrium: /
1 static balance. /
2 dynamic equilibrium. /
        For this reason it is under-/
standable that some oppose /
against equilibrium in art, /
some others defend it. //
The great struggle for artists /
is to annihile static equi-/
librium in the way of conti-/
nious opposition of the /
means of expression. //
It is always in human's na-/
ture to love static balance. /
This \langle of course balance \rightarrow balance of course\rangle is /
necessery to existence in /
time. //
But vitality in the (+ continual) sucession /
of time destroys always this /
balance. //
⟨+ Abstract⟩ Art is ⟨+ a concreet⟩ expression of this vitality.///
```