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Queer Patrimony: George Platt Lynes’s Portraits of E. M. Forster

By WENDY MOFFAT

THE “EVENT”

For an hour and a half on the afternoon of June 1, 1949, E. M. Forster and his partner Bob Buckingham posed for a series of portraits in the Manhattan studio of the photographer George Platt Lynes. It took me five years to write this sentence. Before I could interpret the cultural meaning of these pictures, I first had to learn that these very different images of Forster and Buckingham taken by Lynes—now scattered in disparate archives and private collections around the world—had been created on a single occasion. Like many events in gay history, the photographic session on this afternoon in 1949 does not exactly exist as an event: that is, until now it has not had the coherent and articulable status of evidence. Through interviews with the few living friends of Forster and Lynes, and long meanders in archives, I came to understand that the photographs were the trace-record of “an event” rather than objects in themselves. Since the photographs have been scattered, the glass plates lost, the written record of the encounter sparse, and all the principals long dead, we can understand why an important moment has been constituted until now as silence, or as nothingness. Not nothingness, exactly—more like a fractured, pre-evidentiary state. I would like to explore how this event and its reconstruction are emblematic of some practical and theoretical problems in queer archival work. Though it has never been written about, the session has an important position in Forster’s life and in the broader history of gay self-representation.

Our first premise in queer archival work, then, is to understand that the constitutive property of the existence of evidence is itself something we must work to discover. Queer theorist Neil Bartlett argues that fractured condition is itself the form and genre of evidence in gay history. He writes:

WENDY MOFFAT is an associate professor of English at Dickinson College. Her biography of E. M. Forster will be published next year by Farrar, Straus & Giroux. In September 2007, she was a Beinecke Fellow.

Not to be quoted without permission.
The scrapbook is the true form of our history, since it records what we remember, and embodies in its omissions both how we remember and how we forget our lives. (99)

In other words, gay history reflects and embodies the cultural conditions of gay life. This applies in the case of Lynes. The contents of his studio—all his prints and plates, all his paintings and possessions—were broken up when he died young, just six years after he took these photographs of Forster. His patrimony was divided between members of his family and friends and lovers, with predictable quarrels and misunderstandings, especially about who owned the rights to print and duplicate the images after his death. It's a perfect Barthian scenario: the inevitable devolution of authorial control—with the special twist accorded to gay men, who don't have access to the stabilizing power of inheritance laws. Interrupted and adulterated in this way, Lynes's work did not achieve the status of œuvre, in contrast—for example—to the situation of Edward Weston, his contemporary, whose life and work were celebrated in a recent exhibition at the Huntington Library.1 I was leading a curious divided existence there for a time: during the hours when the reading room was open, I pieced together scraps of letters from Christopher Isherwood and Forster and Lincoln Kirstein to make sense of Lynes's work at this session, and when the library closed for lunch, I walked across the garden to the Huntington Gallery to look at Weston's photographs, presented as they were created, as a complete body of work—organized and intact.

As if the status of gay cultural activity weren't complicated enough, in her brilliant book Picturing Ourselves Linda Haverty Rugg reminds us that the medium of photographic portraiture itself multiplies interpretive possibilities. These parallel and intensify those I have just presented on the status of gay evidence:

The photographic situation... offers the autobiographer a representative image for an autobiographical act of looking at oneself, as well as a metaphor for the intrusive act of reading and interpreting that takes place after the publication of the autobiography... [1]t is useful to remember... the double consciousness attendant at the reception of photographs. (5)

Rugg's work on photography and autobiography is the clearest and most persuasive map we have through the thicket of theoretical problems of authority and representation in this field. I rely particularly on two (of many) of Rugg's theoretical insights: the concept of authorship
of a photograph; and the idea of the photographic image as having a special status in time.

First, Rugg’s understanding of the mutuality of authorship in photography is an important advance: she views any literary portrait as “the product of [both] the photographic self and the photographer.” (3) Thus she grants to both authors and readers the status of “theoreticians” in the creation and interpretation of photographic selves, and she recognizes that the interpretive disparities of such images in the eyes of different audiences are a condition of photography itself. Every photographic portrait of an artist is thus a portrait of two artists, and we must always consider the ways in which subjects of photographs “maintain . . . authorship of [the] self-image.” (3)

Rugg’s second theoretical insight derives from her conviction that a portrait photograph is a metaphorical cenotaph, a monument that is an empty tomb. She argues that while “it seems that photographs provide evidence of a living body” (5) they are a special order of sign, (12) one that “indicate[s] both an absence (of the body) and a presence (of life).” (27) She means by this both the subject’s life and the viewer’s life. For in their second life as viewed artifacts, as emblems of emptiness, Rugg argues, photographs represent a kind of desire on the part of their viewers for “relevance as well as referentiality.” (27) We hope “the photograph will open a window on the past and the past will return our look.” (27) Rugg’s metaphor of the cenotaph explains why a photograph is both a thing and a magnet for a variety of interpretive acts; simultaneously a picture and a mirror.4

Rugg’s reading offers us two stable axes to orient ourselves in the vertiginous space of this particular photographic event: the awareness of multiple authors, multiple selves in a photograph, and the cultural movement of a photograph in time. To understand what we see, Rugg argues, “photographs must be read through the culture that creates and consumes them.” (12) Modernism is just far away enough from us as a moment, and gay cultural studies sufficiently clear as a lens through which to view historical events, that we can begin to understand this June 1949 session in fruitful and self-aware ways.

How I “Created” the Session

One may as well begin with a picture of Bob Buckingham. My encounter with this image was a generative moment for me. (fig. 1) I first
saw this portrait in Forster's personal album at Kings College. In some ineffable way, it embodied Bob Buckingham's vitality so that I began to understand—in a way that reading words had not afforded me—why he was so dear and important to Forster. (I admit that some of my resistance to this idea came from embedded assumptions that Buckingham was too "ordinary"—he was a working-class policeman—to be as worthy as the Great Man.) I was looking at the photograph album in
Kings because I had resigned myself to the fact that I would not meet my research goals on this particular visit to Cambridge. I spent my last afternoon looking at the photo albums. The portrait of Buckingham was so much better than the snapshots beside it that it compelled me to turn it over and read the artist's studio stamp on the back. This single moment cascaded onward associatively, from the (then unknown to me) name and address of Lynes's studio, to the study of Lynes, to personal interviews, and explorations in subjects well beyond my plans.

Bardette argues that "there is never any intention" in "assembled [gay] history" and warns scholars of gay life not to see "too neat a pattern" in the scrapbook of events before them. He wants us to stay queer, to let history "surprise . . . you with its events and choices." (99–100) I can't really discern how much of the insight from this initial gaze at Buckingham derives from my desire for coherence, and how much from my openness to surprise. Perhaps they are, paradoxically, the same impulse. I have to acknowledge this queer moment in which I felt I had listened to Forster's heart, and my listening was rewarded. Following the association of friendships, and listening for the secondary, the unrecorded, the possibilities of doubled or suppressed meanings has taken me to the places I needed to go to recognize the photographic session as "an event"—and thus to begin to interpret its meaning. The fragments—the photos themselves and the written record that illuminates them—were geographically and temporally very removed: from Kings College to the Beinecke at Yale, from the Kinsey Institute to the Huntington Library, from sitting rooms in Hampstead and Los Angeles, to New England and New York. What I am showing you is a representative selection of one of each kind of all the images that Lynes chose to print from his work that day. I probably know more about this event and its contexts than anyone alive, but I realize that some of my conclusions are speculative, and there must be more to know.

Indeed, I have come to believe that the various critical debates in the reception of Forster's life and work—from whether his being gay "mattered," to whether he was "sufficiently queer"—stem from the metaphor that we never have the whole session. The session demonstrates how Forster's photographic self was fractured (or formed) into various selves—literally and figuratively—from the very moment of its artistic birth. Lynes took pictures of Forster alone and with Buckingham in four types of poses. It didn't take the scattering of the glass plates to create an unstable persona for Forster, or for Lynes.
My unwitting assumptions about the truth and referentiality of photography complicated matters for a time. That a photo “stands for itself” unconsciously erased the possibility of “the event” that constituted the making of that photograph. Rugg’s figuration of multiple authors and readers embedded in the creation of a photograph sprung open a door in my consciousness. You’ll have to accept the peculiar fact that before there was an event—the Lynes portrait session—I saw ample evidence of that event without knowing it. Six years ago I “looked through” one Lynes portrait of Forster in a sitting room in Hampstead. In retrospect, I realized that I had seen these photos before a number of times, but seen through them to what I thought was the “real” Forster: the man, and not the process of creating the image. I thought there was a body in the tomb. Only as the Forsters began to multiply did I realize there was a second authorial hand, and something bigger to see. From there I was able to discern the trail of the different “selves”—that there was a story too in the various paths toward fragmentation these images took as they were embedded in time. This is the story of where the pictures went, and the meanings of their path into the present moment.

THE RANGE OF SELVES: PORTRAITS OF WHICH ARTIST?

Which Forster would you like? Or should I describe the chameleon range of Forsters? During this ninety-minute sitting, Lynes took four sets of photographs, turning from one to another staged setup in his studio, and relying on evocative props recycled from his commercial work in fashion photography. No one can tell precisely the order of the setups that day in the studio. Lynes’s friend Donald Windham has written the best description of the dazzling balance of speed and spontaneity of Lynes’s working method. The first photographs were glamorous full-length portraits of Bob Buckingham alone; the second, a series of literary portraits of Forster sitting on what appears to be a stone throne; the third, a gay domestic portrait of Forster and Buckingham together; and the last a single portrait of Forster about which I will write later. Buckingham and Forster both came dressed for a formal occasion: in bespoke pinstripe suits and ties. In two of these settings, each man was shaped into his best public self (with some thought given to the possible double readings that the self might present); in the other two, we are invited to see a more private self. In the case of Forster alone, Lynes established four personas, some of which overlap in a single image: the
to the domestic partner, the great author, the lonely but resolute old man.

To give you a taste of the contexts of gay cultural readings of these images, I'll treat them quickly in my assigned order. The Buckingham portraits — of which I have chosen one example (fig. 1) — show him sitting on a whitewashed wooden balustrade of the sort found on the porches of primitive beach houses. This setting “erases itself”: the contrast of the white background to Buckingham’s dark conservative suit, and the absorption of the white wood into the white background makes it hard to see the railing unless you look closely. But once you do see it, it’s hard to escape the context of Lynes’s other work and the work of his close gay friends that it invokes. The fence mimics the outdoor setting of photos taken by Lynes, Paul Cadmus, and Isherwood’s lover Bill Caskey at their Fire Island rental house during these years, the PAJAMA photos of Cadmus and Margaret and Jared French in Fire Island, Nantucket, and Provincetown, as well as paintings set on Fire Island by Cadmus and George Tooker. All of these Lynes knew well. Did Buckingham, a married man whose status as Forster’s partner was debated in this circle, recognize the allusion? Did he collude in this portrait of himself as a gay man? (fig. 2)

The “literary lion” portraits of Forster fit best into Lynes’s genre of extraordinary iconic photographs of writers of the day. Lynes is justifiably celebrated as a great portraitist: think of his iconic images of Marianne Moore, Thomas Mann, André Gide, Dorothy Parker, and Christopher Isherwood. In these dramatic, beautifully lit photographs, Lynes manages both to make his subjects their most glamorous selves, and their essential selves. The Forster portrait plays with the idea of his eminence as a seventy-year-old, established modern writer. It shows him sitting on what appears to be a stone carved “throne,” with his gold signet ring demonstratively visible. (This prop, probably developed for fashion shoots, figures in other portraits of Lynes’s friends as early as 1944.) In several of the poses, he holds his glasses cupped in his palm; in several others a piece of rolled-up paper. Acutely shy, he does not address the camera directly. It’s hard to ignore a startled cowlick. The photo reveals a bit of Forster’s gentleness; maybe he chooses to be wistful instead of commanding.

Of the series, this is the portrait that most depends on conventional symbols of authority, and the most austere. Its afterlife reflects its canonical position. It became his most comfortable public version of his self in
later life. The "great man" portrait turned up—I realized retrospectively—in the home of one of Forster's dearest heterosexual family friends. He gave it to her as a gift. It also was the first of the portraits to become a work of art rather than a mere representation: this image is in the permanent collection of the Art Institute of Chicago.

Lynes reused the flat stone throne as a kind of plinth for the double
portraits of Forster and Buckingham, in this case printing the glass plate in such stark exposure that it appears the two men are hovering alone in an empty white space (fig. 3). These photographs echo the composition of a set of double portraits taken fifteen years earlier in London, which Forster commissioned and which he showed scrupulous interest in retouching and refining. (fig. 4) I can only suggest a sketch of a reading of these portraits in this brief space. Recent work by David Deitcher, John Ison, and James Gardiner on the iconography of gay domestic portraiture is a useful context for understanding these portraits. They—and Deborah Willis in her work on African-American domestic photographs—address how both gay and minority domestic portraits rely on and play off of normative depictions of domesticity. The David Hockney double gay portraits, which dominated his work in the 1980s, are a direct descendant of the conceptual work laid down by Lynes. Christopher
Figure 4. Courtesy of Kings College.
Isherwood, a dear friend of Forster’s who knew Lynes and his circle, posed for one of Hockney’s portraits with his partner, Don Bachardy.

It is likely that the physical position of the men, with Buckingham above Forster, is a conscious echo of the earlier portraits that Forster kept in his special album at Kings. Perhaps this portrait's composition also spoke to some aspect of the psychic life of the relationship between Forster and Buckingham; for example, to Forster’s sense of wanting to erase his “great man” status in the company of Buckingham by becoming subordinate, or to Forster’s sense of himself as the more emotionally vulnerable and weaker of the pair. Buckingham was a policeman, married, father to a son; Lincoln Kirstein characterized him as dynamic, attractive, and protective of Forster.10 The Lynes circle assumed that they were both sexual partners and life partners: Glenway Wescott thought they were “perfect for each other.”11 Which is the more intimate portrait: the earlier one in which the couple squarely face the camera, or the later, in which Buckingham rests his arm on Forster’s shoulder, his leg against Forster’s arm? Are these portraits statements of fidelity as well as affection? On this trip, Forster told the Frenches that “I believe in reciprocal dishonesty.”12 Did the photograph embody or belie their fidelity? Has the relationship changed? Are they read the same way by straight and by gay audiences? Forster’s long friendship with Bob’s wife May and his permanence as a member of the Buckingham family defy characterization into any fixed social form. It’s a significant lacuna that I don’t know if the Buckinghams kept a copy of this portrait in their home; this copy was in Lynes’s personal collection, given to Yale.

Clearly Forster cherished his time alone with Buckingham, and sought to record it in letters and photographs.13 Indeed, after a solo visit to America in 1947, he deliberately brought Buckingham on his return two years later, insuring that the cost of his trip too would be borne by the sponsoring lectures. As on the first trip, Forster financed his travel with public performances, but spent the bulk of his time staying very informally at the homes of his American friends. Buckingham came to embrace the circle of gay visual artists, writers, and actors whom he befriended in America in his own right. He and his wife both carried on correspondence with several of them after Forster’s death in 1970.

LYNES’S USE OF AUTHORITY

These are emotionally quite revealing pictures. To arrive here, both authors must trust each other. Though notoriously shy, Forster was
made comfortable both by Lynes's self-effacing working method, and by Lynes's bona fides as a lover and close friend of several of Forster's closest American friends. Forster and Buckingham came to the studio that Wednesday after a Memorial Day weekend spent at the New Jersey country house of the writer Glenway Wescott and his lover Monroe Wheeler, who worked for the Museum of Modern Art. In his public position as president of the American Academy of Arts and Letters, Wescott persuaded the academy to invite Forster to give the Blashfield Lecture, but his private agenda was to find money for "Mr. Forster's policeman," and to eagerly join the circle of his friends who had come to know Forster two years earlier. No doubt Wescott and Wheeler suggested that Lynes take these pictures, as he had often done for other friends, including the painters Paul Cadmus, George Tooker, and Jared French. Lynes had lived for several years in an increasingly uneasy ménage à trois with Wescott and Wheeler before leaving to live on his own, but the three remained close friends.

Everyone in the studio that day, and everyone who drew Forster to Lynes—everyone who knew Lynes, and everyone with whom Forster stayed on this second trip to America in 1949—was gay. Within this world, they were comfortably demonstrative. Despite the fact that Lynes most likely met Forster for the first time that afternoon, the circumstances of the session could not have been more familiar. Lynes's physical beauty and his extraordinary charm disarmed many of his photographic subjects. His studio embodied a stylized artificiality. Forster and Lynes's friend Donald Windham describes it at this time:

The large, empty working space, as bare as an unused warehouse except for props and lighting equipment, had no windows. There was a skylight, but it was closed over. In the studio, all of his photographs were made by artificial light. (27)

Lynes was famous for his theatrical lighting arrangements and innovative fashion photography. He employed several assistants, and devoted his technical skills to creating evocative effects. Windham notes how this business seemed to erase the photographer himself:

He stood at his elegant Deardorf 8 × 10 camera... his attention seemingly centered on the directions he was giving assistants about the lighting. As he did this, he adjusted the camera lens and inserted the glass plates into the mahogany plate holder. The subject whom he was photographing appeared
to be to him of the least concern. When Lynes photographed me ... I was
waiting, listening to him telling his assistants to conceal a lamp behind a
prop to adjust a spot or bowl, and wondering when he would get around to
directing me beyond casually suggesting that I try looking right or left, when
he announced that the sitting was over. (27)

We may think that Lynes's use of authorial power was manipulative,
but most of his subjects did not find it to be so. Instead they were be-
mused, or seduced by it.14 The emotional frankness of the portraits, and
the intimacy of his homoerotic work, demonstrate a persuasive invitation
to participate in the shaping of what Windham calls a "speaking
likeness."

But who is speaking in the last photograph I'll present? Of all the
portraits from this session, this one (fig. 5) poses the most intriguing
questions about authority. The image stands apart from the others in
several ways. It is the unique print in this pose, which suggests that it
may have been taken surreptitiously, as Windham's was. No evidence
suggests that Forster ever saw a print of it. It was not disseminated by
Lynes to his friends, as some other images were.16 Late in his life, des-
perate for money, Lynes sold it along with a batch of his most explicit
homoerotic nudes to the sexologist Alfred Kinsey, ostensibly for
research purposes. Kinsey was Wescott's friend (and for a brief time,
his sexual partner) in the 1950s, and had met Forster during a dinner
party just days before the session; these facts may explain why Lynes
thought Kinsey would be interested in the portrait.17

The photo shows Forster at the very verge of Lynes's unadorned stu-
dio wall, like an actor waiting backstage. He is grasping the same piece
of paper in his hand that he holds in several of the throne pictures. Un-
like ANY of the other portraits, Forster is looking directly at the cam-
era. We cannot know how deliberate Forster's self-representation here
is, but we can understand the portrait's truth, for us and for Lynes. He
printed it because he saw something in Forster standing alone resolute,
something that Forster couldn't or wouldn't see in himself. This por-
trait yields the widest range of tonal readings in the people I've shown it
to. It captures some of the sense that Isherwood had of Forster, fa-
mously described in Down There on a Visit, that Forster was really a
tough humanist, and the sanest man that he had ever known. It cap-
tures his owlishness and his vulnerability. Though Forster and Bucking-
ham went to Lynes to celebrate their partnership, this portrait reveals
the side of Forster most valued by his American friends: an old pioneer of sexuality, and a lone individual.

Even the minutest “facts” in this event open onto gay cultural associations, like Chinese boxes. The question is where to stop. Forster stopped with the throne portrait for his straight friends. The Lynes portrait of Forster—shown to the fewest people—goes the furthest in capturing Forster’s queerness.
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1 A brief chronology of the days around this session demonstrates how fractured the evidence is, physically. Seesawing back and forth between public events and two wholly separate gay groups of friends—dates: Kinsey meets Forster, May 25, 1949, at a party at Wheeler's (Wescott Perrin letters); EMF presents Blasfield lecture to American Academy and National Institute of Arts and Letters, May 17 (NYC); May 28, EMF writes to Jerry French on Stone Blossom letterhead; May 30, letter to Archibald MacLeish from St. Luke's Place (NYC) where he is living at Cadmus's apartment-cum-studio. June 1st, afternoon session (Lynes daybook, Yale); June 6, Bethayres, Pa, with Tom Coley to stay with Coley's mother on the way to Washington, D.C. (letters to Coley); June 8, Mrs. Verweyes (DC); June 10, St. Luke's Place letter to Cadmus (Kings); also letters from 410 Park Ave (Wheeler's apartment); June 11, Clinton N.Y., President Root's residence at Hamilton College for an honorary degree—Hamilton was Roehrig's alma mater.; June 13 back at St. Luke's Place. I am grateful to my student researcher, Sara Hoover, for pulling this together into coherent form.

2 The Huntington exhibit was Edward Weston: A Legacy: Photographic Masterworks, June 28–October 5, 2003, Huntington Library, San Marino, Calif. In recent years, Lynes's status has grown, but a proper biography and assessment of him as an artist is yet to be written.

3 Rugg quotes the great Marxist art critic John Berger: “Why complicate in this way an experience which we have many times every day—the experience of looking at a photograph? Because the simplicity with which we usually treat the experience is wasteful and confusing. We think of photographs as works of art, as evidence of a particular truth, as likenesses, as news items. Every photograph is in fact a means of testing, confirming, and constructing a total view of reality. Hence the crucial role of photography in ideological struggle. Hence the necessity of our understanding a weapon which we can use and which can be used against us.” (“Understanding Photography,” quoted in Rugg, 15).

4 Neil Bartlett understands an inherent danger in the retrospective quality of recuperation of gay social history. It is in part a function of the critic's desire for coherence. Bartlett articulates the sense in study of gay culture that retrospection can be overly determinative, that interpretation itself cuts off possibilities. He writes of his research on the lead-up to the Wilde trials: "It now looks, as I re-read, as if the quotations [I wrote down] somehow lead to the crucial events of 1895. They become more explicit, the voices louder and clearer and more imprudent, as if demanding that the crisis occur. . . . In a similar way, my diary entries for the past few years seem to lead up to the man I am now. But in neither case can there have been any intention. A diary lies if it gives too neat a pattern to its assembled history, if it never surprises you with its events and choices. So why do we keep diaries? So we can look them up later and see what happened, and maybe say what it meant, and for whom (59–100).

5 This view was held by many in Forster's circle. Lincoln Kirstein remarks on Bob's charisma to Isherwood in letter at the Huntington, January 16, 1965; and Forster himself writes to Paul Cadmus in a letter dated April 21, 1949—i.e., before the session: "I want to talk with you about pictures, my portrait, art, when we meet. I wish you would have
done Bob as I first knew him 20 years ago" (Kings).

6 "The next time some man asks me what it feels like, I'll bind all these fragments together and lend them to him for a night, and then ask him if he felt the same way reading them as I did. All I can do is lay them out, preserve them as a witness. I always thought that we were invisible, that our invisibility was a fact; now I lay down my pieces of evidence one by one, in defiance of all those who are ignorant of our culture" (100).

Notice how in this passage Bartlett is both a reader convinced of the invisibility of the evidence of gay culture, and a critic presenting that evidence to others.

7 I had not at that time read Glenn Williamson's excellent article: "Making Meaning: Photographic Materiality in the Library and the Art Museum" in Photographs, Objects, Histories (London: Routledge, 2004), 63-78.

8 Contrast to the casual and self-effacing demeanor described by Robert Giroux on Forster's impromptu visit to his publisher.

9 In Kings College Modern Archive, Forster's own notes to the photographer on retouching and printing remain in pencil on the back of the prints.

The tradition of cultural readings of photography—beginning—acknowledge. Deitcher, for example, fits into the newly emerging tradition of gay portraiture that in some sense is retrospective and recuperative too. Chris White's sourcebook in 19th-century homosexuality or George Chauncey's work in gay New York looks at gay culture from the informed position of now—also Deborah Willis and other's work on the distinctive sub-community of black American life.

10 Huntington letters.


13 After his mother's death in 1945, Forster burned a mass of family memorabilia, and reorganized his photographs into three albums, only the first of which concerned his family life and ancestors.

14 Lyne's daybook at Yale is the only written record of the session. Beinecke, Yale.

15 KCC archive catalog identifies one of these earlier double portraits thus:

*EMF & Bob Buckingham photographed by Spencer Edmiston, [? 1934]* 27/547. Professional studio portrait of EMF & Bob Buckingham. EMF, seated, 3/4 length, looking towards the camera, wearing a dark suit, ribbed V necked pullover, dark tie, white shirt & handkerchief in breast-pocket. BB sitting on the arm of EMF's chair, to the right, wearing a pale suit, flocked V necked pullover, matching tie & shirt in small check, also looking towards the camera. There is a paneled door behind, painted a light colour, [? 1934] Location: London; Photographer: Spencer Edmiston, Upper Montagu Street, London; Mounted on card, 16.2 x 10.3 (photograph 14.4 x 10)

16 Windham comments that he and Lyne's had a dispute about airbrushing his teeth to perfection: "To which I objected; and about which Lyne conceded there were two viewpoints on the subject."