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I am excited to be the coordinator for this working group during the 2014-2017 triennial period. My assistant coordinators, Karen Henningsen, and Helia Marcal have been a great help so far and I am looking forward to working with them. I would also like to introduce Ayesha Fuentes who will be contributing to the newsletter a column about her conservation work in Asia. Thank you Karen, Helia, and Ayesha for all the work you’ve done for this Working Group!

In general, I realize that I don’t really know what the membership of this working group wants from ICOM, how can we improve the experience of our members? I would love to hear from members about what they like about the Working Group and if there are areas where we can improve the Working Group.

We have a facebook group, please join: https://www.facebook.com/groups/793885717355477/

We do not yet have a twitter or linkedin group, I am curious to hear if the members of this working group would prefer one of the other, or both, or neither?

The Triennial Programme, is available at http://www.icom-cc.org/156/Triennial

Thank you to all of the authors who contributed to this newsletter, I have enjoyed reading your thoughts about history and theory and sharing this information with our members.

Rose Cull

ICOM-CC Directory Board and Coordinators Meeting report
Paris, 16-18 March 2015

7 of the 9 members of the ICOM-CC Directory Board met with 21 working group coordinators (or assistants) in Paris for the triennial planning meeting. The meeting began with presentation from the coordinators of the Triennial Programme.

One important task that was given to the coordinators at this meeting was to compile information about the history of their working group. Examples of information that needs to be collected about the Theory and History of Conservation Working Group includes:

• Newsletters
• List of Interim Meetings
• Working Group Publications
• Photos (including date, caption, identification, photographer)
• Modifications to Working Group structure or name

This information could be shared with me at roseemilycull@gmail.com or directly to historyproject@icom-cc.org For more information about this project or to donate to this project see the website at: http://www.icom-cc.org/250/about-icom-cc/history-of-icom-cc

The other major development from this meeting was the renaming of the Ethnographic Collections Working Group to the Objects from Indigenous and World Cultures Working Group.
Regional Report - Bhutan

This series of contributions is meant to highlight issues in the theory and history of conservation related to the management of cultural heritage in parts of Asia. The author is a recent graduate of the UCLA/Getty MA Program in the Conservation of Archaeological and Ethnographic Materials and also has an MA in Art History from Tufts University; her research focuses on Buddhist material culture with an emphasis on South and Central Asia and the use of human remains. She has worked with foreign and local conservators in Cambodia, China, and Sri Lanka. She currently lives and works in Thimphu, Bhutan.

Traveling and working in Asia, a person sees many expressions of Buddhism. Regional variations are aesthetic and material but also liturgical, historical and political. In my conservation training at the UCLA/Getty MA Program in the Conservation of Archaeological and Ethnographic Materials, there was a strong emphasis on consultation and incorporating the intentions or function of an object’s original use into its handling and treatment. A similar emphasis on representing an object’s religious or cultural context can be seen in many displays of ethnographic collections in North American and Europe. However, how do we, as conservators and heritage professionals, treat an object as ‘Buddhist”? What is the significance of its religious affiliation? Working with various collections in South and Southeast Asia, I have seen a variety of Buddhist objects on display and in active use at the museums of Cambodia and pilgrimage sites of Sri Lanka (both Theravada communities), as well as the monasteries of Bhutan (Vajrayāna, or Tibetan Buddhist). These represent three very different settings for Buddhist objects and their handling as cultural heritage.
In Cambodia, for example, the greater part of preservation investment is made in archaeological monuments that showcase the history of Buddhism’s adoption by the Khmer people and their rulers some thousand years ago. Because of their turbulent past century, the care of these objects — the restoration and repatriation of archaeological materials, the management of sites like Angkor Wat (originally dedicated to Viśnu, now an active Buddhist temple and UNESCO World Heritage Site) — has unique challenges. These include the training of a generation of heritage professionals, management of international aid from several sources, and navigating a complex and frequently corrupt political and administrative situation. Cambodia’s Khmer majority may be Buddhist but the development of sites and collections is more often colored by a complicated history of foreign intervention, political violence and poverty than religious affiliation.

At the same time in Sri Lanka, recent history heavily influences the appropriation of resources for and interpretation of Buddhist pilgrimage sites and associated objects. Buddhism came to the island nation relatively early (3rd c. BCE) and in recent years has become part of a narrative of Sri Lankan nationalism that preference the Sinhalese (Buddhist) majority over non-Buddhist minorities and militant separatists (most notably the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Elam or LTTE, who were defeated in 2009 by the Sri Lankan Army). Accusations of human rights abuses by both sides in the nearly 30 year civil war remain largely un-investigated and the government has resisted international demands to do so. At the same time, Buddhist archaeological and pilgrimage sites are militarized and everywhere there are new ‘historic’ sites commemorating the destruction of Buddhist monuments and communities during the war. As in Cambodia, Buddhism, as a source paradigm for any object’s original function or context, is muddled in Sri Lanka by current events.

Finally, I’ve been working in Bhutan with government conservators whose primary role is to restore paintings and ritual objects that continue to play active roles at the country’s 2000+ religious centers. My colleagues have been trained as conservators but also as traditional craftsmen and the emphasis on preserving the function of the object means that treatments are often restorative. Education about imported conservation or ‘world heritage’ values remains a challenge in an active religious environment that honors renewal or replacement of objects and monuments as an act of devotion. It has been a privilege to watch my colleagues as they navigate these sometimes conflicting ideas and work to create a uniquely Bhutanese concept of conservation that incorporates historical practices as well as imported concepts of cultural heritage that contribute to its tourism-dependent economy. Again, though this context is Buddhist, it differs greatly from Cambodia or Sri Lanka for its political, historical, and even geographical uniqueness.

A conservator working in this region or in a museum collection with Buddhist objects can acknowledge an object’s religious origins without reducing its material history to liturgical function or iconographic idiosyncrasies. A palm leaf manuscript might be a Buddhist scripture but it may also represent a historical moment of knowledge transfer or an agent for propaganda. An area of overpaint may illustrate devotional practice or political editorializing. Buddhism is not a monolith, nor are its material traditions inherently distinct based on their religious affiliation and conservators need to be mindful of the complex reality in which this heritage is practiced.

For my first installment of observations from working in Asia, I wanted to begin with this general note because I feel that we as a profession need to invest in the complexity of
regions and material cultures beyond academic and scientifically-buttressed guidelines and practices. Most importantly, I feel we need to be more considerate of how resources are developed and made available to our local colleagues. There are several types of institution for preserving for cultural heritage here in Asia including museums, religious sites, trade schools, and crafts workshops; I look forward to introducing the ICOM-CC community to a few of examples of the amazing people and practices I’ve encountered thus far in future editions of this section of our newsletter.

Reports from Meetings, Conferences and Courses

ICOM-CC 17th Triennial Conference

15-19 September 2014, Melbourne Australia

Review by Isabelle Brajer

As always, one comes away from Triennial Conferences uplifted, filled with ideas for future projects inspired by numerous good presentations, discussions and conversations. These meetings provide excellent opportunities to forge new professional relationships and strengthen existing networks. These are occasions when one’s view of our profession is informed by the truly international character of the organization. We can see what types of challenges other conservation communities are confronted with. For example, the two keynote speakers at the opening session, Professor Ma Xiaolin and Dr. Shao Anding, talked about problems of archaeological excavations carried out under time pressure as large building and infrastructural projects are being implemented at ever greater speed and frequency. It was shocking to see the devastations caused by the recent 7.2 magnitude earthquake in the Philippines. Father Ted Torralba presented the project initiated to rehabilitate the numerous national historical landmarks and important cultural properties damaged during this disaster. Perhaps even more shocking was the plenary session presentation by Nobuyuki Kamba, which focused on the cultural assets damaged by the tsunami of March 11, 2011. This horrific disaster not only destroyed or damaged material objects of great value, but also killed numerous conservation professionals – including the entire staff of a local historical museum – wiping out the knowledge of a generation.

During the plenary session, a panel discussion and open forum took place as a result of a combined initiative of ICOM-CC and IIC, which focused on environmental standards for exhibition and storage in museums. A number of comments from the delegates were noted, among them, the need for emphasizing renewable energy sources for storage spaces. This worthy undertaking, as a joint effort of the two major organizations in our profession, was subsequently presented at the IIC Congress in Hong Kong (22-26 September).

The oral presentations in the individual working groups took place, as always, in simultaneous sessions – this time, in five separate rooms. This is, of course, sometimes frustrating when interesting sessions overlap, or when one must choose one talk over another. It does help that all the individual papers were available on-line prior to the opening of the conference, so the delegates could read the papers prior to the opening, which helped in optimizing choices. The session for the Theory and History of Conservation Working Group took place on Thursday, and comprised five very interesting papers.
The first talk was the only paper focusing on conservation history: *A safe haven: Refugee restorers and the National Gallery*, by Mowenna Blewett. This interesting research concentrated on the situation after the Nazi regime took power in 1933, when many German restorers were affected by legislative and bureaucratic changes. These changes were also applied in Austria after 1938. The paper examined the exclusion, flight and early integration of Helmut Ruhemann and Sebastian Isepp in their country of exile, the UK, in the context of the assistance extended to them by those employed or associated with the National Gallery. The immigrant conservators faced a number of difficulties, one of which was the organized protest aiming at promoting the boycott of their services by British conservators. It was generally acknowledged that the skills of Ruhemann and Isepp placed them in a different category than many of the native conservators.

Joel Taylor included some of his thoughts on intergenerational responsibility, presented at the 2013 interim meeting in Copenhagen, in a larger context in his Melbourne paper: *Recontextualising the ‘conservation versus access’ debate*. This contribution addressed the ‘dilemma’ of conservation versus access, and aimed to provide a structured approach to his deliberations on this seminal issue of conservation. Joel questioned the value of framing such an important matter as a dichotomy, and considered some implications of depicting the relationship as adversarial by deconstructing the dilemma. A more dynamic, nuanced perspective was offered as an alternative. Providing a simple, flexible framework in the form of a table allowed conservation and access to be viewed beyond present activity, and avoided treating the issues as adversarial objectives. The suggested framework is based on Harold Lasswell’s definition of politics: a matter of who gets what, when and how.

Robyn Sloggett’s paper also focused on larger issues in conservation: *What is ‘conservation’? An examination of the continued relevance of ICOM-CC’s The Conservator-Restorer: a Definition of the Profession*. The background for Robyn’s deliberations goes back a few decades, to 1978, when Agnes Ballestrem presented a definition of the profession of the conservator-restorer to the ICCROM Standards and Training Committee meeting. Six years later, the document *ICOM-CC The Conservator-Restorer: a Definition of the Profession* emerged. The definition was important for advocacy, to differentiate conservation from other professions, to guide practice and to frame education and training. It laid a strong foundation to the profession. Since 1984, however, the intellectual and social environment in which conservation operates has changed substantially. There is increased engagement with communities seeking a multiplicity of approaches in line with their own divergent needs. The paper examined the Definition, and concluded that while it remains a robust and effective document, the social contributions of conservation should play a larger role.

Examining conservation through the perspective of psychology, Hélia Pereira Marçal presented her latest research (also building on material presented at the 2013 interim meeting in Copenhagen): *The inevitable subjective nature of conservation: Psychological insights on the process of decision making*. The paper reflected upon the cognitive biases conservators are exposed to, and how such biases influence conservators and affect an artwork’s biography. Cognitive biases, such as ‘defaults’, ‘the asymmetric dominance effect’, and ‘the anchoring effect’ occur in other areas, such as the medical profession, and it was possible to show how these effects may also influence conservators. Decisions taken by ‘default’ might be taken when conservators are confronted by a choice (retouching always done by *tratteggio*). The ‘asymmetric dominance effect’ occurs when more possibilities are presented. People are more
susceptible to choose incorrectly, as they become confused and doubt themselves due to the 
overload of options. The ‘anchoring effect’ is manifested when people do not remember the 
context of their decisions when they have a long line of similar decisions, but repeat the same 
decision without deliberating the particular circumstances of a new situation.

The last paper in the session was an interesting contribution presented by Catherine 
Antomarchi: *The ICCROM Forum on Conservation Science 2013: A collaborative 
partnership for strategic thinking*. Catherine presented the preliminary results from the 
ICCROM Forum on Conservation Science, which took place in October 2013. This initiative 
was organised by ICCROM in partnership with 15 conservation research and training 
institutions spanning Europe, North America, Latin America and Asia. Background research 
undertaken before the Forum examined research trends, strategy development, information 
dissemination, education and training, job opportunities and the impacts of science within 
conservation. These surveys revealed stark inequalities between countries and regions in 
regard to knowledge production and access to scientific information and services, limited 
research opportunities for non-institutional players and a shortage of job openings for young 
conservation scientists. In its conclusions, the Forum stressed the need for the sector to 
embrace all relevant sciences, to place greater emphasis on wider societal issues and to 
undertake strategy development.

The oral presentations were followed by a working group business meeting, during 
which I, as the outgoing coordinator, presented the activities of the triennium. As presented in 
the coordinator’s report: The Theory and History of Conservation Working Group held an 
interim meeting in Copenhagen on May 16-17, 2013, hosted by the National Museum of 
Denmark, and funded by the museum and the Hannelise Højbye Mortensen Fund. It was 
attended by ca. 70 persons, the majority of whom were members of the working group. The 
theme of the meeting – *Conservation: Cultures and Connections* – was broad, and featured 14 
oral presentations and five posters. Essays based on 11 of the talks and summaries of the five 
posters were published in a special issue of the peer reviewed electronic journal *CeROArt* 
(Conservation, Exposition, Restauration d’Objets d’Art) [http://ceroart.revues.org/3508](http://ceroart.revues.org/3508), posted 
online September 11, 2013. The contributions testify to the broad scope of interests of the 
members of the working group, which include conservation professionals from a wide range 
of fields and specialties. The publication includes topics focusing on the issue of cult value in 
its broadest interpretation (religious cult, personality cult, cult of prestige and money, cult of 
authenticity); historical studies of conservators and practices from the turn of the twentieth 
century; value and valuations examined from the broad perspective of tangible and intangible 
cultural heritage; the purpose conservation serves in a given society and how cultural 
differences can affect attitudes and practices; sustainability and fairness, and our duties to 
future generations; the application of analytical tools used in cognitive psychology to 
decision-making in conservation; the application of pragmatic sociological research to 
fundamental questions in conservation; the re-evaluation of the term ‘artist’s intent’ in an 
try to provide a more nuanced rational for decision-making regarding the preservation or 
replacement of materials; and the assessment of the conservation profession from the 
perspective of preservation of function.

Within this triennial period, three newsletters were produced, and can be found on the 
working group’s homepage [http://www.icom-cc.org/10/documents?catId=25&subId=79#.U1TZPuKeFbE](http://www.icom-cc.org/10/documents?catId=25&subId=79#.U1TZPuKeFbE): Newsletter 16, from February 2011; Newsletter 17,
from December 2011; and Newsletter 18, from January 2013. The newsletters contain contributions of the members of the working group reporting on meetings and conferences held outside the ICOM-CC venue, but of interest to members, and reviews of publications.

Over the past three years, the working group also continued to maintain the on-line Forum for the exchange of information and announcements on the website http://www.icom-cc.org/forums/viewforum.php?f=24&sid=096c297761531ff4d5e23ff94fed04e. The membership of the working group has risen steadily over the triennial period, and now includes 156 members.

The business meeting concluded with the presentation of the new coordinator, Rose Emily Cull, and assistant coordinator, Karen Elise Henningsen. Working group members will have the opportunity to meet them in person in Copenhagen, as this venue has been chosen for the next Triennial Conference in 2017.


Glasgow School of Art, Glasgow U.K.
1-2 December 2014

Review by Helia Marcal

Despite the tendency towards the dematerialization of the art object, the doctrines that guide the conservation practice have still not been fully adapted to the contemporary art scene. This is especially critical when applied to artworks that challenge the perennial character usually seen in traditional objects. These artworks may include unconventional materials or technological devices, might be site- and/or time-specific, and often are characterized by an intangible feature that is hard to grasp and even more difficult to preserve. In this context, different notions of authenticity and authorship emerge, mainly in works that have some kind of collaborative, participatory, or social component.

The last meeting of NeCCAR (Network for Conservation of Contemporary Art Research), entitled *Authenticity in Transition: Changing practices in contemporary art making and conservation*, aimed precisely at reflecting upon these themes and upon the ways “shifting concepts of authenticity of process and materiality in contemporary art practice alter or affect the way we interpret, conceive, conserve, collect and curate art” (Hermens and Robertson 2014). This two-day conference had seven oral-presentation panels, one poster panel, two discussion panels, including a round-table with contemporary artists, and three keynote presentations.

Authenticity, as a multiple and relative concept, was at the core of every presentation. With presentations ranging between the conservation of self-contained artworks to the preservation of net art practices, many perspectives about authenticity were discussed in theory and through case studies.

In her opening keynote speech, Jill Sterrett, Director of Collections and Conservation at SFMOMA, spoke about how new conservation spaces, which promote dialog between visitors and the institution, are growing with the museum’s expansion. Her speech set the tone for the following presentations, which explored the preservation technology-based artworks, authenticity and authority in the institutional space, and the role of memory in the preservation of variable works.
In the first presentation, Verbeeck and Broers advised for the importance of semantics in language precision, while discussing the challenges of conserving an artwork/machine that is dependent on its functionality (Cloaca by Wim Delvoye). Ariane Noël de Tilly spoke about the different (re)presentations of Day is Done that occurred after its first, and only, exhibition. Those include various books and several artworks that became autonomous after the exhibition and are now scattered among several museums. J. Shepard discussed several notions of authenticity that emerged when the technology used in Julie Opie’s Suzanne Walking in Leather Skirt started becoming obsolete.

The second panel explored notions of authority and artistic intention in institutional contexts: A. Wielocha discussed authority within a contemporary art collection, placing it between curators and the artists. J. Brown provided a comprehensive talk about the legalities of authenticity and contemporary art, focusing in laws and regulations from the United Kingdom, the European Union and the United States of America. M. Grenda, on the other hand, offered an intimate view inside a small private collection in Warsaw, where artists, collectors and conservators share the decision-making process. Finally, G. Wharton addressed the dichotomy authorship-intentionality, while providing some insights about the artwork’s trajectory within a museum collection, and stating that creation is an on-going process and a consequence of a negotiation between museum staff and the artist.

The third panel explored some ideas about social memory and conservation. M. D’haenes reflected upon actualizations in open-artworks with the example of Nicolas Schöffer’s Cybernetic Tower, while P. Martore explained the difficulties of re-installing Grand muro panoramico vibrante by Jesús Rafael Soto in an institutional context after being outside the public view for about thirty years. C. Baviere provided an extreme example of dematerialization and the role of social memory by presenting the documentation process of an improvised live event from 1975 (C’est Mozart qu’on assassine! by André Riquier).

The conference’s second day started with a keynote speech from H. Hölling. Drawing on Brecht’s idea of interchangeability between object and event, she reflected upon the possibility for an expanded field of conservation that includes curatorial practices. The panels that followed echoed Hölling’s remarks on the relative duration of objects. While the first panel focused specifically on materiality, both the second and the third panel provided several insights into the intangible. J. Hickey started first panel with the issues surrounding acceptable change and ephemerality in the conservation of Robert Rauschenberg’s Black Paintings. S. Stigter compared two versions of Ger van Elk’s C’est moi qui fait la musique, one original, another a digitally manipulated print, while discussing issues of replica and authenticity. D. V. Rogala explored artist’s materials employed in Abstract Expressionist painting, and the correlation between their physical condition and the mix of modern and traditional materials. W. Shank, approached street art in a communication that focused on the issues these socially engaged works promote in various contexts.

The second panel started with A. Dekker and her remarks about several “authentic instances” and multiple authorships in net artworks. M. Jadzinska continued speaking about authorship and, more specifically, about artist’s intention and their consequences in the conservation of two contemporary artworks. This panel ended with L. Calvi, I. Ratti, and R. Dispasquale, which approached the preservation of electro-mechanical devices in two contemporary artworks.

This third panel regarded collaborative authorship. In the first presentation, H. Marçal and A. Nogueira focused on the difficulties of preserving artworks that share authorship
between artists and have a double nature, residing somewhere between visual arts and music. Afterwards, three artists (R. Birrell, C. Ursitti, and N. Bird) engaged in a round-table conversation about their works and the ways they understand their re-installation, re-activation, and conservation. R. Gordon followed this discussion by presenting some remarks about socially engaged artistic projects where communities behave as co-producers, questioning some conservation pillars such as artistic authorship and authority.

In the last panel, T. Doherty and L. H. Shockey, Jr. offered some insights into the collection from Smithsonian American Art Museum, from the challenges they face in terms of materials obsolescence to the introduction of a third party into reinstallations. S. de Roemer followed with several interesting remarks on the relative nature of authenticity, while J. Giebeler, N. Krause, and G. Heydenreich reflected upon a two-day workshop that allowed a discovery of “blind-spots” in conservation reasoning.

R. van de Vall ended the conference with a keynote speech that focused on authenticity and ontologies. In this presentation, allographic and autographic works were differentiated, and an approach based on a shared responsibility, and thus a shared practical embodied skills and understandings was proposed.

The key-themes of this conference were the importance of artist’s intention, the challenging relationship between authorship(s) and authority, the existence of multiple (and sometimes converging) authenticities, the consequences of the conservators/artists duality, and the role of other participants in socially engaged, collaborative artworks. The conference’s general environment allowed for many discussions between students, professionals, and speakers. The dialogue between individuals was very fruitful and each presentation provided new topics for discussion and the interchange of information. With such a broad scope, many aspects of “authenticity in transition” are still worth exploring, and the questions raised in this conference will, undoubtedly, have repercussions in further encounters.

Celebrating the 40th Anniversary of the Winterthur/University of Delaware Program in Art Conservation
Library of Congress
Washington, D.C. U.S.A.

Review by Michelle Sullivan
Graduate Fellow in Paper Conservation
Winterthur/University of Delaware Program in Art Conservation
Graduate Intern in Paper Conservation
National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.

On December 1, 2014, the Library of Congress presented a four-part lecture entitled Celebrating the 40th Anniversary of the Winterthur-University of Delaware Program in Art Conservation (WUDAC). Part of the Library’s Topics in Preservation Series (TOPS), this lecture was the final installment in a series celebrating significant anniversaries of the four graduate programs in the United States that offer a specialization in the conservation of library and archive materials.

The lecture opened with a welcome from Elmer Eusman, Chief of the Conservation Division at the Library of Congress, and was moderated by Andrew Robb, Head of Special
Formats Conservation Section. Presentations were made by the following WUDPAC alumnae, three of who completed graduate-level internships at the Library: Debra Hess Norris ('80), Henry Francis DuPont Chair of Fine Arts and Professor of Art Conservation at the University of Delaware; Lois Olcott Price ('80), Director of Conservation at the Winterthur Museum, Garden & Library and Affiliated Assistant Professor for WUDPAC; Doris Hamburg ('81), Director of Preservation Programs at the National Archives and Records Administration; and Alisha Chipman ('11), Photograph Conservator at the National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C. Together, their presentations summarized the history of WUDPAC, the evolution of its curriculum and initiatives, and a sample of the professional accomplishments of program graduates.

The first speaker, Debra Hess Norris, began with an overview of the Art Conservation Department at the University of Delaware which offers three degrees—a Bachelor’s of Science in Art Conservation; a Master’s of Science and Certificate of Advanced Study in Art Conservation; and a Ph.D. in Preservation Studies—established in 1971, 1974, and 2004 respectively. Annually, WUDPAC receives approximately 100 applications and has produced 364 graduates to date. The remainder of Norris’ presentation focused on the Master’s level program, describing the unique partnership between the University of Delaware and the Winterthur Museum and how broadens students’ perspective of collections care and the conservator’s role within an institution. She reviewed the Master’s level curriculum—two years of coursework, two 8- to 10-week summer internships, and an 11-month internship—and the areas of major and minor concentration available to students. Norris emphasized that the number of core competencies required of students has increased over the years to include outreach and leadership skills, advanced analytical techniques, and preventive conservation to better prepare students and reflect changes within the field of conservation. She concluded by highlighting some of the University’s domestic and international collaborations such as the Middle East Photographic Preservation Initiative (MEPPI), Iraqi Institute for Conservation of Antiquities and Heritage (IICAH), and several programs with Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs). These partnerships, Norris observed, connect students globally and allow faculty to advance research and scholarship.

Lois Olcott Price, the second speaker, was the first WUDPAC student to complete an advanced internship at the Library of Congress. In her presentation, Price walked audience members through the evolution of the Library and Archive Materials major in the Master’s program at the University of Delaware. She noted that while students have elected to emphasize in book conservation over the years, it was the closure of the training conservation program at the University of Texas, Austin in 2008 that lead to the development of the major in its current state. In response to this closure, WUDPAC—along with the conservation programs at Buffalo State College and the Institute of Fine Arts at New York University—received generous support from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation to augment its curriculum and provide an alternative training course for library and archive conservators. Price proceeded to explain the additional requirements of WUDPAC’s Library and Archives concentration. During the first summer, a combination of hands-on and theoretical courses is completed on the history of the book, book structures, and digital stewardship. The second summer comprises a practical internship, additional online coursework, and special opportunities such as the Paper and Book Intensive, the Montefiascone Conservation Project, and Rare Book School. Finally, Price described the “Mellon Cohort” which connects students focusing on book, paper, and photograph conservation from the three programs through
specially-organized, joint workshops on diverse topics ranging from the treatment of parchment to the identification of modern and contemporary print processes.

The final two speakers, Doris Hamburg and Alisha Chipman, also completed graduate-level internships at the Library of Congress. Hamburg spoke first and related her conservation experiences prior to entering WUDPAC, which included an apprenticeship with renowned paper conservator Marilyn Kemp Weidner and an advanced degree in art history. She completed her third-year internship at the Library and stayed on for another 21 years. Lightly, she commented that she grew up at the Library and that “it took [her] a while to finish [her] internship!” Hamburg remarked that when she entered WUDPAC, she never imagined the places her career would take her, from salvaging historical Jewish documents in Iraq to consulting on preservation strategies for the Dead Sea Scrolls!

Bringing the program to a close, Chipman recounted her experience as a relatively recent graduate intern at the Library of Congress working under the supervision of three WUDPAC alumni—Dana Hemmenway (’98), Adrienne Lundgren (’01), and Andrew Robb (’94)—on a range of projects related to the conservation and preservation of photographic materials. She also discussed her work since leaving the Library including recent research on the materials and methods employed in the platinum prints of photographer Paul Strand. This work was recently presented during the Foundation for the American Institute for Conservation (FAIC) Platinum and Palladium Photography Symposium held in Washington, D.C. in October 2014. Chipman revealed that one of the greatest takeaways from her time as WUDPAC student is the principle that, as conservators, we never stop learning. In truth, this notion was an underlying sentiment in all four presentations and an appropriate note on which to conclude!

Call for Papers

**Call for Papers - Processes. The Making of Design and Modern Art Materials, Technologies and Conservation Strategies**

Future Talks 015
Pinakothek of Modern, Munich, Germany
October 28-30, 2015

Deadline: The deadline for submission of abstracts is April 30, 2015. A selection committee will review the abstracts and notify authors by May 15, 2015.

**Call for Papers - COLOURS2015: Bridging Science with Art**

HERCULES Laboratory
Evora University
Evora, Portugal
24-26 September 2015

COLOURS2015 intends to promote a forum between the several disciplines that study colour in its wide perspectives in art (chemistry and physics, physiology, psychology, archaeology, geology, history, history of art, architecture and conservation-restoration).

Conference topics:
- Colour history and symbolism in cultural heritage
- Colour materials and their origin
- Colour deterioration: case studies in conservation and
restoration
Science and technology applied to colour studies
For information on a special issue in Colour Research and Application journal and e-Conservation journal see http://www.colours2015.uevora.pt/publications.html
For more information on the conference see http://www.colours2015.uevora.pt

Call for Papers - Western Association for Art Conservation Annual Meeting
Asilomar Conference Grounds and State Park, Pacific Grove (Monterey Bay) California
September 30 - October 2, 2015
Papers related to the topic of California art and history are especially welcome, as this will be the unofficial theme of the meeting.
Questions and proposals can be submitted to: Catherine Coueignoux president@waac-us.org
Please submit an abstract no later than August 1, 2015.
Please see the Annual Meeting website for more info: http://cool.conservation-us.org/waac/meeting/

Call for Papers – "Embracing Cultural Materials Conservation in the Tropics"
Asia Pacific Tropical Climate Conservation Art Research Network (APTCCARN)
Conservation Center
Cheng Shiu University
Taiwan
25-27 November 2015
Call for papers: Due 1 June 2015
The organising committee now welcomes abstracts (maximum 250 words) for papers on the above themes. Paper presentations will be submitted as fully written papers to be published as a peer reviewed publication in 2016. All intending presenters are required to download and complete a proposal form from the APTCCARN website at http://www.aptccarn.com

and submit to Nicole Tse ptccarn-enquiry@unimelb.edu.au For further information see the conference website http://2015aptccarn.csu.edu.tw

Call for Papers – "The Explicit Material: On the Intersections of Cultures of Curation and Conservation"

College Art Association Annual Conference
Washington DC
February 3-6, 2016
This session aims to explore the relationships between curatorial and conservation philosophies across a range of institutions, focusing on the ways in which these apparently divergent fields shape thinking about-and the practices of-collecting, exhibiting, and caring for objects. The "explicit material" approach (Latin "explicare:" "to unfold," "unravel, "explain," or to make visible) advances a way of thinking about the materiality of objects as they enter our collections and undergo a transformation from their previous context(s) to a museological one.
Please, send an abstract (1-2 pages, double spaced), a letter of interest, and current CV by May 8, 2015 to organizers

Hanna B. Holling hanna.hoelling@bgc.bard.edu and
Francesca Bewer francesca_bewer@harvard.edu

CAA individual membership is required of all participants. For general guidelines for speakers, see: http://www.collegeart.org/pdf/2016CallforParticipation.pdf

Call for Papers -- IIC Congress: Saving the Now: Crossing Boundaries to Conserve Contemporary Works

Los Angeles 12-16 September 2016

We are looking for new and original, unpublished work, relevant to the Congress theme and to conservation. We are also looking for an awareness of the need for ethical treatments. Multidisciplinary proposals are encouraged. A requirement of submission is that one of the authors of each selected paper or poster must attend the Congress to present the work to the audience.

To make your submission please go to the Congress page of the IIC website https://www.iiconservation.org/congress/

General Announcements

After the Black Death: Painting and Polychrome Sculpture in Norway 1350-1550

An interdisciplinary project based in Conservation Studies centres on the Cultural History Museum’s collection of late-medieval liturgical objects

The project is led by Dr Noëlle Streeton (principal investigator) and Professor Tine Frøysaker (project manager/project investigator), who have assembled an international network of diverse researchers.

http://www.hf.uio.no/iakh/english/research/projects/medieval-painting/index.html

The language of art conservation

Mireia Xarrié

A good deal of 20th and 21th philosophy has been devoted to the analysis of language. This paper aims to answer why the language of art conservation has not been studied, and to describe when conservators need and use language.

Why has this language not been studied?

Although, there are some essays with interesting titles as The language of conservation: applying critical linguistic analysis to three conservation papers, where Laura Drysdale reveals how restrictive the objective language of science in conservation. It is remarkably that there is a lack of academic investigations about the language of art conservation. However, we have been researching about art conservation’s language (contextualization, use and examples) for fifteen years. In fact, we travelled to many
European and North American libraries because we were interested in publications written in eight languages, thus, the more languages, the better to understand this topic from an international point of view. Moreover, the interest for terminology was induced by our previous publications, the art conservation glossary series\textsuperscript{1}, where we reviewed more than 1107 books and created a database with 14000 terms and definitions.

The study of language is complex; as already noted we experienced it; and probably explains the lack of academic studies. A number of reasons could be put forward: in one hand, it requires knowledge about linguistics, and in the other, art conservation’s publications\textsuperscript{2} are not easily accessible. Certainly, the publishing activity of any discipline contains its language. The linguistics, who study a discipline’s terminology, they first locate a core bibliography and then they retrieve, analyse and study its technical vocabulary\textsuperscript{3}.

Another prefatory remark is that to locate a core bibliography (corpus) about art conservation is not straightforward. In fact, it is a pitfall because art conservation has a broad-based and extensive thematic scope. Such evidence is remarkably scarce, we detail it again below.

Secondly, a further problem is that art conservation publications are not only written in English; instead are multilingual, then maybe geographically disperse in foreign libraries, as we did in our investigation.

Another reason is that most of these publications are printed on paper; located in libraries; and they are not all digital and easily consultable in internet. With no doubt, this is a pivotal factor to understand why it is difficult to access to information and knowledge in this field.

In sum, as we attested the lack of previous scientific studies about art conservation’s language, several questions were risen. Therefore, it became an essential prerequisite the help of linguistics and science information’s professors, and then as an interdisciplinary research, we garnered most of the conclusions.

Mireia Xarrié belongs to a family with a long tradition (since 1929) in Barcelona’s museums and art conservation. Furthermore, she has a Bachelor in Art History, a Master degree in Media and ICT and a Ph.D about Cultural Heritage. termdoc@gmail.com Linked In: http://es.linkedin.com/pub/mireia-xarri%C3%A9/25/a99/b48/

You can read the full article and the bibliography at http://mireiaxarrie.com/mx/articles

\textbf{Next Newsletter}

The Newsletter No 20 will have a call for papers 15th of September 2015. Papers could include: course and conference reviews, reviews of publications, current research topics, forthcoming meetings and conferences, and other topics that may be of interest to the Working Group membership.

\textsuperscript{1} Terminology for art conservators: A new approach. (2006). Published in ICOM-CC Documentation Group.

\textsuperscript{2} We have written two papers about art conservation dictionaries: Art conservation dictionaries and Multilingual dictionaries about art conservation.

\textsuperscript{3} It has been described in our article: Education, publications and terminology.