



ICOM COMMITTEE FOR CONSERVATION WORKING GROUP "THEORY AND HISTORY OF CONSERVATION"

**NEWSLETTER NO. 15
DECEMBER 2009/ JANUARY 2010**

COORDINATOR:

Isabelle Brajer
isabelle.brajer@natmus.dk

ASSISTANT COORDINATORS:

Rebecca Rushfield Muriel Verbeeck
wittert@juno.com muriel.verbeeck@ceroart.org

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL	p.3
REPORT FROM THE ICOM-CC DIRECTORY BOARD/ COORDINATORS MEETING	p.4 - 8
INFORMATION/ REPORTS ON MEETINGS, CONFERENCES AND COURSES	
Impressions of the 7th symposium on Art and Science at 21st Conference of the International Institute for Systems Research and Cybernetics, by Hiltrud Schinzel	p. 8-12
Impressions from the seminar - Conservation: Principles, Dilemmas and Uncomfortable Truths, by Isabelle Brajer	p.12-17
Réflexe ou réflexion ? Les acteurs et le processus décisionnel dans la conservation-restauration, by Catheline Périer-D'Ieteren	p.18- 21
Reflex or reflexion? Actors and the decision-making process in the field of conservation-restoration, by Catheline Périer-D'Ieteren (translation by I. Brajer)	p. 21-24
FORTHCOMING MEETINGS, CONFERENCES AND COURSES, CALL FOR PAPERS	
CeROArt, issue no. 5 (April 2010) "Restoration on the stage and behind the scenes" IIAS - 2010 8th Special Focus Symposium on ART AND SCIENCE and	p.25

1st Symposium on SYSTEM RESEARCH IN ARTS AND HUMANITIES	p. 25-27
Online course on Restoration Theories and Methods, Horneman Institute	p. 27
PROJECTS	
Research at the Hamilton Kerr Institute	p. 28
RECENT PUBLICATIONS AND REVIEWS OF PUBLICATIONS	
Conservation: Principles, Dilemmas and Uncomfortable Truths , edited by Alison Richmond and Alison Bracker	p. 28-29
Art, Conservation, and Authenticities Material, Concept, Context , edited by Erna Hermens and Tina Fiske	p. 29-31
Expanding the conservation canon: assessing cross-cultural and interdisciplinary collaborations in conservation , by Robyn Sloggett	p. 31
The Carlsberg Preparation: An early 20th century surface treatment for wall paintings in Denmark , by Isabelle Brajer	p. 31
ART and SCIENCE Vol. VII, Proceedings of a special Focus Symposium on Art and Science held as part of the 21st international Conference on Systems Research, Informatics and Cybernetics	p. 31
CeROArt, issue no. 4 (2009) Les dilemmes de la restauration-Un choix et des valeurs	p. 31
e-conservation magazine, No. 12	p. 31-32
New online journal: Ge-conservación	p. 32
Forthcoming Publications	p. 32
GENERAL ANNOUNCEMENTS	p. 32

Did you ever attend an ICOM-CC Triennial Conference or working group interim meeting and get swept up in a whirl of enthusiasm? It happens to me every time. You meet other people with the same interests, you exchange ideas about future research projects, you share information on subjects you have studied or read about. You leave the meetings filled with optimism and conviction that the energy you are infused with will last throughout the triennial period until the next conference. But then daily life catches up with you. Deadlines for projects line up one after the other. The daily strife and stresses of juggling work with a personal life take a toll. Working groups that do not hold interim meetings inevitably fall into a cycle of rushes of activity in connection with the triennial conference followed by lulls characterized by passivity. But it doesn't have to be like that. Our website is our working group's meeting place any time of day and any point in the triennial cycle. To get there you don't have to pack your bags. You don't have to go through security check. You don't have to spend hours in an airport and on a plane. All that you have to do to meet with people who share your interests is go to the working group website at www.icom-cc.org, and click on the Theory and History of Conservation forum. There are no deadlines (unless you are contributing to a newsletter). There are no peer reviewers to evaluate the validity or to dissect the meaning of your contributions.

Everyone is welcome to post anything he or she would like to share or to ask of the other members of the working group. Imagine you are on the coffee break at a Triennial Conference catching up with friends, acquaintances, and professional contacts. Imagine you are drinking a glass of wine or beer with colleagues after a meeting. What do you talk about then? You talk about the projects you are working on. You ask questions in hope of increasing your knowledge on a particular subject. You share a funny or sad story related to your work. You talk about the conservation profession as a whole, or about our organization in particular.

Since the working group's discussion forum was launched last summer, the amount of posting activity has been moderate (excluding mine), but steadily growing. This makes me believe that we are slowly heading towards our group's goal for this Triennial period: to make the forum the place for an active exchange of information. I am optimistic that you, the members of this working group, will help us maintain a lively connection in the period when we don't see each other. If you look at the topics in the forum, they range from scholarly contributions to the sharing of amusing incidents. I can imagine that each of you has something interesting to share with the rest of us.

I know what it is like to overcome reluctance to use an unfamiliar technical tool. However, posting a text on the forum is easy. Just hit the blue "New Topic" or "Post reply" button and write in the window that appears (or copy and paste a prepared text into the window). Posting images is a bit more complicated. I will be happy to provide more detailed instructions to anyone wishing to do so. Or you can just send the images to me and I'll insert them into your posted text. Don't let this be a barrier. Also, anyone unsure of their English language skills can send their texts to me and I will be happy (even delighted) to help. Remember that French and Spanish are also official languages of ICOM-CC and I will see that any posting in those languages is translated into English for the benefit of the majority of the members.

As of December 2009 there were 85 members on our working group – almost the size of a full symphony orchestra. You might think of me as the conductor of this orchestra. Our first movement can be described as *adagio*. Let's move on to *andante* and *allegro*. However, I prefer to see myself as the Mother Hen with a barnyard full of chicks poking the ground, sharing worms and running around *animato* and *con brio*.

Isabelle Brajer

REPORT FROM THE ICOM-CC DIRECTORY BOARD/ COORDINATORS MEETING

ICCROM, 21-23 October 2009

The ICOM-CC Directory Board met with 17 working group coordinators (or assistants) in Rome for the triennial planning meeting. On the agenda were discussion of plans for the 16th Triennial Meeting in Lisbon (September 2011), presentation of the web communication project, as well as working group operational issues.

WEDNESDAY, 21 OCTOBER

Mounir Bouchenaki, the Director General of ICCROM, gave the welcoming talk, stressing the need for strengthening cooperation between the two organizations, maintaining a good network and creating a more balanced representation for conservators on the ICOM-CC Directory Board. Mounir Bouchenaki touched on international regional challenges affecting conservation including globalization, climate change, and economic change. He talked about showing solidarity with underprivileged nations, saying that we must show them that cultural heritage is an important part of life-- not a luxury to be taken care of after dealing with problems like hunger and poverty. He stressed that cultural heritage is an integral part of life and that loss of cultural identity is a serious problem. He said that investment in conservation has an impact and we must work together to highlight the value of preserving cultural heritage.

The meeting continued with **short presentations by working group coordinators** (or representatives) about what each group has achieved in the first year of the triennial period. I reported that in accordance with the goals of our working group for this triennial, I have launched the working group forum, with (as of now) moderate participation by members. I noted that working group membership dramatically increased after the forum became active and therefore I perceive the forum as a very positive influence on our working group dynamics. I hope that, with time, more working group members will feel more comfortable about voicing their views in the forum.

A discussion followed about why very few working groups have **active forums on the website**. Some coordinators held the view that in order for the forums to work, members must check the website frequently-- which was considered to be unlikely. I expressed my view that I do not know why this should be a hindrance. The forum is easy to use and I check for new postings it as routinely as I check my e-mail. It takes only a few seconds. Another drawback that was pointed out by several coordinators was the fact that several working groups have well-functioning list serves that compete with the forums as modes of communication. The biggest advantage of the list serves is that are sent to everyone interested in a particular field and not just members of ICOM-CC. This prompted a discussion about opening the forum to all viewers-- a point I will return to as it was one of the major issues we discussed at the meeting. I pointed out that many of the postings in the T&H forum include images, which is a great advantage for this mode of communication. There was talk about having one large discussion forum for all of the working groups, but the general consensus was that with such a large and varied leadership it would be very difficult to sustain a proper discussion. Many coordinators agreed that instead of the Directory Board asking us to make the forums work, it should listen to what coordinators feel needs to be done to accomplish that. A list of options was drawn up for a later vote that would determine the general consensus amongst the coordinators.

After the coffee break, the meeting split into two sessions with the Directory Board members leaving the coordinators who continued their discussion. The topics discussed were:

- **Open access for the website**
- **Triennial conference**
- **Education and training of conservators**
- **Internal communications**

Generally, most coordinators were in favor of open access to the website both in terms of access to abstracts from Triennial meetings (access is now limited to only first 5 weeks) and access by non-members to discussion forums. However, it was acknowledged that the desire to make information freely available is in conflict with the need to generate income. If access is open to all, the benefits of membership that remain will include: museum access with one's ICOM card, lower conference fees, access to preprints online before the Triennial meeting, and priority in paper selection. It was agreed that instead of insisting on completely free access, it might be more realistic to draw up a list of priorities. The generation of potentially lost income through pop up advertising or by a slight increase in Triennial Conference fees was discussed.

In the voting that followed the discussion of issues, the following results were noted:

- List serve vs. forum – 15 out of 17 coordinators wanted a list serve style communication platform
- Restricted vs. open access to forum – 7 status quo (continuation of working group forums); 5 in favor of open access; 5 in favor of open forum for all members as well as maintaining working group forums.

Comments after voting: Our goal is to make our website a trusted and valued resource. We should therefore pool our resources there, while still maintaining the option of using external sites as many working groups have members outside of ICOM and do not want to lose their valuable contributions.

Regarding the next Triennial Conference the following topics were discussed:

- **organization of sessions (possibility of joint or special sessions)**
- **presentations at sessions**
- **involvement from South America, Africa and Asia**

The importance of scheduling sessions so that there is less overlapping of those of broad interest groups was stressed. Many coordinators were interested in organizing joint sessions with related groups provided that this could be organized in advance. Some groups are considering short joint sessions with another group, and using the remaining time for their own stand-alone and longer session. Special sessions might be organized to present the latest results of ongoing research or around a topic suggested by the local host conservation community. The possibility of scheduling shorter presentations was mentioned, with most people preferring 30- minute time slots as these are also easier to organize across all working groups allowing for easy session-hopping.

The discussion also focused on our desire to foster involvement by and encourage papers from members in South America, Africa and Asia. Some dissatisfaction was expressed about the difficulty of having different standards in the selection process. It was agreed that all papers should be subject to the same process-- even those from the host country. This started a discussion on the difficulty members from many countries would have meeting the standard as the papers selected for recent Triennial meetings have been more scientific. There may be a need to press for more papers on treatment procedures as long as this will not result in papers that repeat standard, well-known treatments. According to the experience of one working group, one factor that prevents authors from presenting papers on treatments is a fear of hostile comments after their talks. They must be reassured that if this happens the session chairs will step in to stop it. A general plea can be issued to the audience reminding it of the enormous benefit to the profession if conservators can talk openly about their treatments. However, a current deterrent to treatment oriented papers is the present ranking system for papers which gives high marks for innovation. The coordinators' representation on the editorial committee should ensure that accepted papers reflect practice as well as science.

Regarding the **education and training of conservators** there was a general discussion about the vulnerability of conservation programs noting several recent closures and about whether the Directory Board of ICOM-CC could lobby at government level.

Andries van Dam (ICOM-CC webmaster) presented the **ICOM-CC Web Communication Improvement Project**, describing how the present website was developed and what changes can be made in the future. The objective of the website design was to be clear, consistent and communicative. The current website is based on the ICOM Paris database (synchronization with their database is

currently not possible, but is a goal for the future). 1,700 accounts were created, as well as 21 Working Group Management accounts. The current website was designed and optimized to conform to latest web standards. There is currently a time-limited public access (the open access to the public is a top priority according to the vote of the coordinators). The current website has a membership database with mass e-mail function, and working group coordinators can organize and send information to members. The forum section allows for debates which are moderated by coordinators. There is a streamlined registration and online payment facility which is pre-set to synchronize ICOM-CC membership with the ICOM member database in Paris. The Google statistics show that in one month after the Triennial Meeting in New Delhi there were 3,658 total visits with 2,727 unique visitors. The average time on site was 6 minutes 12 seconds and the average number of pages viewed was 5.9.

The problems with membership were related to members/coordinators not activating their website accounts and members not signing up with working groups.

The forum has a low post-rate and very low reply-rate. Threads usually have to be started by the Coordinators. It is possible to subscribe or unsubscribe to a topic once it is posted as well as be notified about new postings.

Three new forums are planned:

- Coordinators forum
- Directory Board forum
- mixed forum for Coordinators and Directory Board

THURSDAY, 22 OCTOBER

The morning session of the second day started with the Directory Board presentation of ideas for the **ICOM-CC strategic plan**. The upcoming ICOM Meeting in Shanghai (Nov 7-13, 2010) on the topic of “Museums and Harmonious Society” might be an opportunity for **increased collaboration** between the various ICOM committees and ICOM-CC working groups. For example, there could be better cooperation between ICTOP (ICOM International Committee for the Training of Personnel) and the ICOM-CC WG for Education & Training. It seems that some efforts to foster cooperation have been unsuccessful (the coordinator for the MMCA WG received no reply upon contacting the Modern Art International Committee) and the question was raised whether the ICOM-CC contingent in Shanghai might be able to develop closer ties in person.

Another strategy suggested is to **develop closer links** with other professional conservation organizations to better pool resources and improve services to members. Having a joint conference in 2014 with IIC is one possibility. Other organizations, such as ICOMOS are also keen to collaborate with us. (I am a member of ICOMOS, and a member of the Executive Advisory Committee for the newly formed International Scientific Committee of Cultural Objects in Monuments which has headquarters in Athens and I will do my best to promote cooperation between the ICOMOS group and any interested ICOM-CC working groups.) The idea was put forth to use other meetings as an opportunity to have interim meetings and raise awareness of ICOM-CC. It is important to let the Directory Board know of activities that could promote inter-organizational cooperation. There was talk of developing an approach wherein all ICOM-CC Working Groups are involved in exploring greater public involvement in conservation. This would require a follow up on the Task Force on Public Engagement which was disbanded.

There is a need to **expand membership outside Western Europe and US** which are home to 80% of the ICOM-CC membership. Perhaps if there was an even less expensive category than “Friend of ICOM-CC”, more members would come from Africa, Central and South America, China, India, etc. The Directory Board informed us of changes in the ICOM membership rules that will be beneficial to that group. Affordability is one issue, but another issue is whether our organization can be meaningful to broader communities. There is a need to pro-actively encourage people to visit the website.

The final strategy discussed was ensuring the **day to day operational management** of the ICOM-CC in a consistent, professional and efficient way. The specific actions discussed were the review and approval of the Working Group programs. The answer to the question as to why this is such a slow process was that several coordinators were very slow in sending their programs to the Directory

Board. Other topics discussed were the up-date of bylaws and the manual for coordinators, organizing the ICOM-CC archives, and the evaluation of the preprint process with changes made as necessary.

After the lunch break, **the preprint process for the Triennial Meeting in Lisbon (2011)** was presented. A **website was commissioned** for the coordination of the preprint process and a **peer review pool has already been selected**. Abstracts can be submitted in English or French and the final papers can be submitted in English, French or Spanish. The coordinators have requested that Spanish be included as one of the languages for submitting preprints at the abstract level, as it has been approved as a language for the final paper. A coordinator can discuss rankings with assistants, but it is the coordinator who determines the final mark. The new procedure to begin with the Lisbon Meeting is that all abstracts and papers must be completed and submitted on the meeting website. Instructions, templates for abstracts and papers, schedules, etc. will all be posted on the website. The scoring system for ranking papers will be simplified. The word count will include everything in the text, including captions, references and tables. There will be a strict limit of 8 images (tables not included), with no composite images permitted.

FRIDAY, 23 OCTOBER

The **membership application process** was reviewed. New members apply to their National Committees and then select a committee where they will cast their vote. National Committees make all changes and updates to the ICOM-CC via Paris. If one joins after September, then his membership begins from January of the following year. Replacement stickers for the ICOM cards are sent by the National Committees.

The webmaster talked about how **open access** would affect the website: public access might result in a reduction in quality and standards; moderators will have to intensify their oversight; a screening process for spam will have to be implemented and the ICOM-CC will have to pay for it; contributors will have to create accounts so that they can be checked.

The coordinators' list of priorities was presented to the Directory Board. It included (in descending order): Open forum; permanent access to all abstracts from Triennial Conferences for all working groups; open access to all newsletters; access to interim meeting postprints-- especially for delegates who paid to attend the meeting (currently only ICOM-CC members have access). The Directory Board had no issue with opening up the forum, but was not keen on continuing list serves and will see how it works out. It was the opinion of the Directory Board that since the new website was launched, there has been an increase in membership due to the 2nd level (members only) access. The ICOM-CC Triennial Conference publications will be available on the website with restricted access. (Other organizations do not make all material available to the public.) It was agreed that it will be possible to revisit these decisions at another time.

The discussion moved on to **membership renewal problems**. A decision was made to send reminders to distribution lists. There are many reasons why so many current members have not registered and signed up with working groups: The invitation was only sent once; there is no "first-time registration" or "existing members registration" button on the website; many members believe they are already registered because they are members; there are problems with incorrect e-mail addresses on file. It would be much easier if there was an option for current members to register directly on the ICOM-CC website rather than having to go through the existing process of requesting an invitation from Joan Reifsnnyder (ICOM-CC Secretariat). Members need more explicit guidance on how to register. If they missed or lost or deleted the original invitation, they have received no other information about it. There is also no explanation of the registration process on the ICOM-CC webpage (apart from a general "problems with access" link to Joan's e-mail address.

Changes to the coordinator's manual were presented.

The afternoon session focused on the subjects of **branding** and **terminology**. Regarding the former, the ICOM-CC logo is used on badges, flyers, agendas, etc. The logo should be used in its full (ICOM-CC) form with secondary brands used in addition. If there are any issues regarding this, the Directory Board should be consulted. In the case of interim meetings, it is essential that the publisher be ICOM-CC and not the ICOM-CC working group.

Regarding terminology, a suggestion was made that an additional page be added to the website to assist facilitate dialogue with the public. Gael de Guichen presented a tentative idea for improving contact with the general public with a game to be played on the website. The idea of using a game for engaging public awareness of conservation found approval with some more than with others (I thought it was too infantile), but generally it was felt that it was not appropriate for explaining terminology and that a far more professional approach should be adopted to illustrate definitions of conservation, restoration, etc.

Finally, a revision to the definition of the profession was discussed. The current definition is 25 years old and needs revising. Is the definition of conservator/restorer adequate? Should it be made more inclusive (conservation scientist, conservation teachers, etc.)? As with many of the topics discussed, no decisions were made. The comment was made that whatever we should do, it should be in line with the ICOM-CC strategic plan.

This summary was only possible through the sharing of notes made by other coordinators. I am particularly indebted to Jean Brown, Tiarna Doherty, Cecily Grzywacz and Tom Learner.

Isabelle Brajer

INFORMATION/ REPORTS MEETINGS, CONFERENCES AND COURSES

Impressions of the 7th symposium on Art and Science at 21st Conference of the International Institute for Systems Research and Cybernetics

Baden-Baden, 3-7 August, 2009

General tendencies

The symbol of this year's IIAS meeting may be called the "cloud", the technical symbol of network diagram. At the same time the cloud represents the internet, which is 'intangible' as it has no defined place and is in permanent flux. Its design symbolizes the unpredictable in general concerning all walks of life, the awareness of which could be noticed at IIAS as a general shift from epistemological to ontological thinking (Hassard). A growing consciousness of the immeasurable complexity of our world and of the impossibility of systems to sustain it could be felt, and became manifest in words like fragmentation, chaos, and gigantism that floated through the conference rooms. There seems to be an urge, probably enforced by the economic crisis, to get things sorted out by going back to one's roots and reanimating them, by promoting relations anywhere and adding small(er) group gatherings to global networking. Topical is a shift in thinking from the 'absolute' (including dogmatism and hierarchy) to democracy, as well as from this and other dualisms to polyfocality (the term used by Werner Hofmann, an Austrian art-historian). This tendency was represented in the frequent use of words such as re-nesting, re-planning, relating, collaborate consciousness (opposed to self-sufficient consciousness, Graham), and de-centrifcation including micro-community networking (De Preester/Galle, Pizziolo/Micarelli).

Contemporary rapid processes evidently make us conscious of the process character of life in general, and therefore many lectures dealt with process thinking including flexibility and adaptability of

systems to a continuous change of circumstances. Changes tend to lead to creation; therefore terms like multilog (replacing dialog, Wimmer), viability (substituting sustainability, Boyd) and many other verbal adaptations to topical problem solving attempts could be heard. Happily, a lot of humour was present and often used as 'deflation of pretence' (Rudloff).

7th Art and Science Symposium:

The same trends could be noticed in the lectures and discussions of the Art and Science session. Most contributors established that innovation can be found in the arts and is able to unnerve and even dissolve seemingly consolidated 'scientific' thinking. This might be expected in our unstable times, yet by promoting serious mutual understanding it can have fruitful consequences. Accordingly, the field of art proper showed its gain in influence and volume with contributions about new avant-garde art and exceptional research topics. We see this development as a very positive one. The sequence of papers in this year's session was structured by artistic genre from visual art to (theatrical and musical) performance, ending in functional and social art like architecture, and, at the same time, was structured from specific to general, from paradigmatic demonstration to abstract essence.

The symposium started head-on with the problem of the incompatibility of different systems and system perspectives, especially the art world and the world of economics. In her paper **Dr. Hiltrud Schinzel** gave a hilarious account of the clash between such systems. The restoration of one artwork by Marcel Broodthaers, considered from an ethical point of view led to manifest incompatibilities between the systems concerned. The author concluded with some suggestions how to avoid such an impasse.

During the discussion, the author's suggestion to claim autonomy and personal rights for artworks was regarded as a revolutionary idea. This is not surprising at a time when even the human being is looked upon as a manipulatable bunch of carbonic atoms. Parallels to problems in the field of music were noticed. According to Frank Hassard, the rights of the conservator should be covered by copyright. This raised the question of legal responsibility in this profession.

The next joint lecture by **Dr. Helena De Preester** and **Dr. Jerry Galle** examined some contemporary artistic practices, such as net.art. The authors explored how the objective of early 20th century avant-garde art is now approached by some branches of contemporary art. Art that doesn't retire into museums and galleries, but enters into the life of a large number of web users might have more social importance and more immediate effect than art exhibitions-- however avant-garde they may be. The authors claimed that youtube international is controlled and that 'hactivists' are similar to former 'dadaists'. Their work can be seen on some websites with names like dada virus, dada 1356, etc. N. Bourriaud's term "Relational Art" (2002) was examined and criticised in this context and the short lifetime of such art explained.

In the discussion, **Prof. Hiwaki** mentioned similarities between Relational Art and Japanese Ikebana art consisting of flower arrangements that last at most two hours. However, Ikebana, which has its roots in a more harmonious past does not aim to criticise social structures.

Dr. Guy Bovyn analysed the 'Mataha Expedition – Hawara 2008' by Louis de Cordier, an interactive project between artist-scientists-media and the public which he curated. This project and its implementation showed that people in the media, science and art cannot be reduced to their institutional positions and social role. The interface between art and science is also an interface between art/science and our social life at large. The demonstration of the multifunctional use of the project by different groups was impressive. In this context, the artist acted as translator/mediator between science-, art- and media-systems. Still, the complexity of the process led to a life of its own, which tumbled on the edge of chaos.

The same could be seen in the performances of Romeo Castellucci, which were showed in a video collage by **Prof. Dr. Freddy Decreus**. They presented a recent and famous series of theatrical performances. Castellucci's work is a brilliant illustration of the deconstruction of all settled relationships as they have been fixed in traditional western philosophy and the arts of representation.

By his analysis in Deleuzian terms, wherein nomadic and rhizomatic desires prevail, Decreus shed a new light on the 'very special sphere of collective intimacy and vulnerability' induced. New eyes for new realities are created by the spectators, who also have to individually make sense of the performance. This artist (like Mathew Barney in the visual field, Bovyn) tries to reach our sub-consciousness with touching images as well as very long sequences of loud and elementary music. As in the former lecture the edge to chaos was noticeable.

Because **Prof. Lasker's** (chairman of IAS) brought the 7th Art and Science session together with the International Symposium of Systems Research in the Arts and Humanities, the next event on the program was a Cello performance by **Prof. Dr. Leanne Zacharias**. The performance made it possible to disengage from spoken word and one could concentrate on the senses which are awakened by pure sound. This improved the understanding of the two following very complex, 'synaesthetic' lectures.

Holger Zschenderlein and **Christopher Rose** focused on the interface of art and science, namely meteorology, design and sound-art. The authors presented and discussed 'The Breathing City', a project they are working on. The affinity of this presentation to the preceding ones was obvious. Each circled around the disintegration/reorganisation of traditional patterns of social form and semantic content. In a manner analogous to the Hawara project and net.art, the organizers include both specialists and the public. The large block of melting ice does not need an explanation, but the melting itself is unpredictable-- not even the time that the melting process will take can be calculated. Following this presentation, a discussion arose about the necessity for a mediator and whether a story is necessary when dealing with ideas of such complexity. This question will probably occupy us further as regards process art. Furthermore, it is important in the general context of art that is performed like music, theatre and any performance by a visual artist.

Prof. Clarence Barlow, a composer of electro-acoustic works followed with yet another complex work which takes human speech and synergizes it with sound/music. He demonstrated his theory, technology and sound with short excerpts of his performances.

The papers presented to this point dealt with art that must be documented if it is to be accessible in the future. In the session that followed, the lectures focused on the problems of the 'promotion' of culture by means like museums as well as by education in general.

Dr. Frank Hassard was able to further develop his previous year's research. He is one of a number of members of IAS who focus their research on one specific topic. His focus is 'cultural democracy'; hence 'globalisation' and the fate of cultural traditions worldwide. He emphasized that culture is the whole of which science is just a part, and that western attitudes have led to the dual system of objectivity and subjectivity. This shift from epistemological to ontological thinking, which could be detected in the preceding lectures was clearly outlined by the speaker and, in this context, Hassard's creation of the term 'idemology' explained, as a hermeneutical issue concerned with the future, an ongoing interactive process. The museum way of making culture public was regarded as wrong for today's needs (as was apparent too from the lectures of DePreester, Bovyn, Zschenderlei/Rose etc.).

In the discussion **Steffi Wiesbauer** suggested the word "tradition" replace the word "heritage" because "heritage" is bound to the concept of possessing, which supports subject-object relations to artefacts. She also compared the work of the restorer to that of the translator with all the difficulties and necessary adaptations to visual as well as verbal language in flux.

Chris Rose suggested including the aspects of processing and the time spectrum into conservation. Doing so would mean developing new methods which meet the demands of topical art and incorporating the insights of topical research methods.

The lecture of **Prof. Dr. Gary Boyd** and **Prof. Dr. Vladimir Zeman** again examined a topic of universal importance: how to promote legitimately social well-being in a context of public media messages that can be positive but can also be very deleterious for the promotion of social harmony

locally and globally. Unfortunately, we cannot show you the hilarious image-demonstration Gary Boyd gave to illustrate their thoughts. You can enjoy it on the website: <http://www.slideshare.net/471stalex>. The authors explained, situated and tackled this very difficult problem of 'rightful censure' and proposed opening up spaces for non-dominative discourse on Habermas' criteria. This paper was highly concerned with the information technologies which have and will continue to have global consequences of the first order. As most things cannot be sustained, the authors suggested a new term, "viability" to replace the term "sustainability". The internet was claimed to be more useful for communicating than for grouping or gathering. There were arguments against this opinion. The author rightly responded that one cannot get global information, cooperation and consensus in small groups. This problem will need further discussion and eventually a compromise can be found.

The next lecture by **Prof. John Hiller** demonstrated a lack of 'rightful censure' regarding museum work and complemented Boyd and Zeman's critique of museum practice. Hiller showed different non-coordinated museum websites and discussed their positive as well as negative sides.

The next part of the symposium concentrated even more on the impact of art and artistic structuring on society, and architecture was the focus.

Prof. Ayten Aydin gave a short overview of the whole range of arts and their special characteristics, including gardening as a kind of process art.

Prof. Tarrko Oksala's lecture was somewhat more general insofar as it considered the concept of symmetry. Basic and abstract as it seems at first sight, the author showed us that from the viewpoint of architecture symmetry can be seen from a new and more concrete as well as general perspective. The problem of rigidity of symmetry raised the issue of problems of complexity: Bovyn claimed that to avoid chaos, complexity needs a reference. Yet the question remains as to which reference fits which context.

Prof. Rita Micarelli and **Prof. Giorgio Pizziolo** combined abstract thinking with practical usage, highlighting insights from both. In discussing cities, they articulated the possibility that spaces can be related without hierarchy. By doing so, the common separation between landscape and city can be collapsed. The new term 'collage cities' was used for this phenomenon.

The next speaker, **Prof. Greg Andonian** provided a historical survey of architectural structures opposed to each other. Dual systems were analysed as being prisons and rigid symmetry as being static. If all of these insights were brought together, they could make contemporary architecture more linking and human needs-based.

The next paper would have been equally inspiring. Unfortunately, its author **Dr. Koen de Pryck** could not come. One can read the paper in the preprints. Koen de Pryck made some proposals concerning the nature and opportunities of 'playing games'. He suggests that, on a Darwinian basis, 'playing games' is situated precisely on the interface between art and science because it proves to be an important 'cognitive tool'. The author concludes that a plurality of 'truths' is more to the point than the traditional rationalistic linearity that Western culture considered to be unavoidable. Perhaps then the lectures presented in this symposium can be considered as 'Darwinian' experiments.

In the last contribution, **Prof. Dr. Karel Boullart** combined the problems described and analysed in the previous lectures and continued his exploration of the similarities and differences between the creative aesthetic and ethical action. The author examined in somewhat more detail, the problems, characteristics, difficulties and evasions which occur both in the creation of art and in ethical action and problem solving when one is confronted with the need to make decisions. Artistic talent and ethical wisdom are analogous. But the second, the author concluded, is more difficult to obtain. There is more need for this wisdom than for anything else, but generally it is in short supply.

In the final discussion, the urge to move away from dualistic thinking to a multilayered polyfocality was noticeable, as the duality problem always leads to a fixation on monopolistic views (Mbaeyi), which seem to be outdated in regard to time-bound processes (including life in general). Yet, accepting duality as a static prison does not imply that chaos is the solution as chaos tends to be a dead-end, and, by that criterion, is also static. Moreover, chaotic structures tend to bring about brutal one-sided reactions. Finally, a lack of process thinking was deplored (Schwarzlander) and important, as yet untouched questions like “can fragments structure themselves during processes?” came up.

To combine issues, as De Preester/Galle, Bovyn, Zschenderlein/Rose and many others suggested, and to use “multilog” (the word being an equivalent to “dialogue” according to Wiesbauer) as a communications tool seems to be the best solution developed to date. It is a prospect whose development can be worked on under the condition that time is considered to be a factor.

The session closed with the common intention to communicate via email during the following year and to proceed with/process our artistic research for the next ‘meeting performance’ in Baden-Baden. We are very glad that so many multitalented persons with ‘multiple intelligences’ (Rose) were present in our session this year and we look forward to joint experiences in 2010.

With the exception of the following presentations:

On Music deriving from Language

by Prof. Clarence Barlow, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA, USA

Narrative: Virtual Museum Aspects

by Prof. John Hiller, IAS Emeritus Professor UNSW

The Invisible Role of ART – Science – Technology Tripod in Healing Humanity

by Prof. Ayten Aydin, IAS Former UN/FAO Adviser, Civil Engineer/Anthropologist

Thinking Among People, Creating New Contexts

by Prof. Giorgio Pizziolo, IAS Italy, University of Florence and Prof. Rita Micarelli, Atelier dei Paesaggi Mediterranei – Toscana Politecnico di Milano

Intuitive Art of Architecture Vs. Inquisitive Science of Design

by Prof. Greg Abdonian, School of Architecture, Carleton University, Ottawa, Canada

you can find all lectures in the preprints of the symposium, available under the title ART and SCIENCE Vol. VII, Proceedings of a special Focus Symposium on Art and Science held as part of the 21st international Conference on Systems Research, Informatics and Cybernetics August 3 – 7. 2009, Baden-Baden, Germany, ISBN 978-1-897233-20-7 from IAS (Office@IIAS.info and/or lasker@uwindsor.ca)

September 2009

Prof. Dr. Karel Boullart
Londenstraat 74
B-9000 Gent
Belgium
karel.boullart@UGent

Prof. Dr. Hiltrud Schinzel
Mülheimerstr. 7
D-40239 Düsseldorf
Germany
hiltrud.schinzel@t-online.de

Prof. Dr. Leanne Zacharias
Brandon University
School of Music
Canada
leannezacharias@yahoo.com

Impressions from the seminar - Conservation: Principles, Dilemmas and Uncomfortable Truths

Royal Academy of Arts, London, 24-25 September 2009

On the occasion of the launching of the book *Conservation: Principles, Dilemmas and Uncomfortable Truths* (Elsevier/Butterworth-Heinemann) a seminar, organized by the editors Alison Richmond and Alison Bracker, took place at the Royal Academy of Arts in London on the 24th and 25th of September 2009. Most of the speakers were not contributors to the book, although Jonathan Ashley Smith and

Salvador Muñoz Viñas were two speakers who presented new material in relation to their contributions to the book, and Dinah Eastop elaborated on her contribution to the book. The papers, which were presented over the course of four sessions, nicely complimented the contributions to the book. Four years had passed since the book was commissioned, and the seminar was an opportunity to present new thoughts or fresh points of view regarding conservation theory. The diversity of perspectives intended to encourage debate, which was evident during the panel discussions that closed each of the sessions.

The first session on the theme of *Principles, Dilemmas and Uncomfortable Truths* was chaired by **Laura Drysdale**, whose paper on the topic of the importance of language in the conservation profession presented at the ICOM-CC meeting in Lyon in 1999, is probably familiar to many of our working group members.

Jonathan Ashley-Smith opened the session, sharing with us his thoughts on age-related issues affecting our profession in an entertaining talk entitled: *The Adolescence of the Profession*. The psychological profile of conservation was presented in a historical perspective spanning the past few decades together with glimpses from the Jonathan's family photo album. Example: images of Jonathan in his 30s belligerently wielding a stick, or his wife pointing a pistol at the viewer illustrated the typical aggressive view of the conservation profession in the 1970s. Over the next two decades this has declined to mock aggression, and has further deteriorated into inertia (son as teenager, reclining on his bed) and indifference (daughter as teenager, blowing bubble gum). According to Jonathan, the high number of active professionals in mature adulthood does not necessarily mean that the profession as such has reached maturity. In fact, his thesis is that the conservation profession is in its adolescence. The drive to define the profession in terms of ethical guidelines, rather than knowledge and competence has led to generic vagueness that can only be described as useless. You are allowed to think that you are allowed to do things, but you are really restrained by general rules. This results in a state of mind typical of adolescence – alienation and the establishment of conflicting self images. We have images of the conservator being a scientist amalgamated with a hands-on person; a scientist amalgamated with a manager; a scientist amalgamated with a person interested in spiritual values (often at conflict with scientific evidence). The different aspects of our profession should not be lost in generalities. Jonathan concluded that our profession is not yet mature, but it doesn't have to be. We should embrace diversity and stay young.

The second talk was given by **Salvador Muñoz Viñas**, who true to his customary thought-provoking and provocative manner talked about the lack of objectivity in our profession: *You are not being objective. Conservation as an act of taste*. In order to prove that we are not objective in our core conservation decisions (not decisions of specific technical nature), Salvador presented The Changing Criteria Argument. The first argument focused on issues of historical value, and was illustrated by two examples: Nelson's bloodstained coat with a bullet hole exhibited at the National Maritime Museum and Leonardo da Vinci's drawing of the Virgin and Child with St. Anne and St. John the Baptist (National Gallery, London), which was vandalized, resulting in a 6 cm shotgun hole in breast of the Virgin Mary. In the case of the former, the damage was preserved as historically significant. In the case of the latter, the drawing was subjected to a difficult restoration process with the aim of removing the damage. Thus, historical imprints are either conserved or deleted for no objective reason. Proceeding in a similar fashion, Salvador presented examples showing how context is either preserved (underwater sculpture by Jason de Caires Taylor in Granada) or sacrificed (the front of the Pergamon Altar reconstructed in Berlin vs. the original archaeological site in the ancient Greek countryside, which is presently in Turkey). Original intent was also examined. Sometimes the producer's intent is an important concern and is respected (Tate Gallery's decision to not exhibit the moth-damaged Joseph Beuys's Felt Suit), or sacrificed (Mikado 141F, the old locomotive standing on a short track at the Polytechnic University in Valencia). Similar decisions are made in relation to the original material fabric of objects. Remnants of the original frescoes in the medieval shrine of St. Francis were painstakingly pieced together after the earthquake in Assisi, even though about 25% of the material was beyond recovery, leaving gaps in the decoration. In contrast, a new paint layer was applied to Niki Saint Phalle's sculpture in Hannover. Salvador's conclusion: in the conservation profession, criteria change according to feelings, tastes or preferences and other subjective factors. This should not be concealed, but stressed.

Sarah Maisey continued the first session with an interesting talk focusing on a subject not much discussed in our profession: *When things go wrong: Sharing experiences for collective learning*. Mistakes are made by top professionals in many fields, for example the medical profession and airline industry. However, in contrast to these professions, the conservation profession cultivates a culture of perfection – conservators rarely, if ever, admit to their mistakes. Conservation, however, is also a high risk profession that can be compared to other high risk industries, and we can learn from established practices dealing with mistakes in those fields. Airline pilots and doctors are not blamed for mistakes as long as they are willing to report them and share their experiences. Sarah presented the psychology of errors, dividing them into two groups: errors of execution, and errors of planning. Dissecting how and why errors occur in our profession (example: a tripod set up in an unstable position might topple and inflict damage on the object that is photographed) can lead to plan for error prevention. Sarah advocates the establishment of an anonymous professional reporting system for errors and near misses that will significantly increase the amount of information. Furthermore, conservators should be educated about error analysis and reporting, and error reporting should be included in ethical guidelines.

Andy Glover closed the session with his talk: *Conservation fads, fashion and flummery: An incontrovertible truth?* Andy's talk was a personal rather unstructured presentation, a loose string of stories from his professional life including experiences with ethnographical objects, polychrome sculptures and frescoes in the Sistine Chapel. According to Andy, ignorance, disdain and defensiveness resulted in the establishment of separate tracks in our profession, instead of embracing the continuum of conservation, craft and science. According to Andy, in principle conservators welcome opportunities for increased engagement in decision making, but in reality consider the involvement of others as a threat to their hard earned professionalism. According to Andy, conservators are masters at finding dubious scientific or ethical rationale to support their decisions, and dress up recommendations with a veil of certainty as if this was the incontrovertible truth. Although I agree that there is room for improvement, particularly in field of communication and dialogue with various stakeholders, I found Andy's cynical point of view and use of single examples to present generalizing conclusions rather unsatisfactory.

Jonathan Rée, a freelance philosopher and historian based in Oxford, England chaired the afternoon session on the first day. The theme of the second session was *Making meaning: Theories and philosophies of conservation ethics*.

Dinah Eastop expanded on her chapter in the book with her interesting presentation: *A material culture analysis of conservation principles*. The talk focused on how conservation principles influence conservation practice, and how practice influences principles. Dinah launched her talk by presenting Woody, the character from the animated film Toy Story 2, who was stolen by an unscrupulous collector who intended to sell the toy to a museum. The dilemma facing Woody was whether he was a child's toy or a collector's item. Woody decides he is a toy, which means that he will ultimately be disposed of as rubbish. But the decision also affects the treatment of his broken arm, which is mended, temporarily extending his usefulness. Dinah used this example to illustrate the dynamics between material cultural and social relationships, expanding to and stressing the importance of language as a force linking people and things. Language in a material culture is a metaphor that transfers meaning from one domain to another. Focusing on the meaning of 'principle', Dinah showed three examples, each of which illustrated a different point – principles taken for granted, principles debated and principles overruled by democratic ballot. In the recent conservation and new exposition of the Aleppo Room in the Museum of Islamic Art in Berlin there is no mention of principles in the report – it is presumed to be self-evident that the new exposition will return the object to the original configuration. The second example was a gamelan – an assembly of instruments accorded much respect, which is exhibited in the Asian Civilization Museum in Singapore. The gamelan is occasionally played in the museum. The instruments go out of tune when they are played. Tuning involves filing the metal down, thus causing irreversible changes, something at odds with conservation practice. In addition, this action must be accompanied by food offerings, something at odds with museum practice. The third example was the recently repainted sculpture of the King of Hawaii – Kamehameha I. A decision was made by community ballot to use the colours of Hawaii – red and yellow – as the primary colours, and

the eyeballs were replaced. This case showed conservation as a tool of social mobilization, focusing on contemporary needs, not on the original state or materials.

Helen Glanville presented the next talk: *The painting as material interface between artist and beholder: Restoration philosophy, perception and neuroscience*. Helen discussed the dynamic nature of the relationship between the artist, the work and the beholder based on the ideas of the philosopher John Dewey, which were put into practice by Cesare Brandi in Italy. Given recent focus on Brandi in connection with the first centenary of his birth, and the numerous publications, seminars and meetings connected to this event in 2006, Helen's contribution was surprisingly novel and very interesting. For Brandi, as for Dewey, a work of art exists only when it is experienced on an aesthetical level. It is the task of the restorer to provide this experience, and if a painting fails to speak to the viewer, the restorer has failed. Helen presented various examples from the field of perception neuroscience and Gestalt psychology to illustrate problems affecting restoration decisions, such as the preservation of harmony and colour consistency during cleaning.

Sebastiano Barassi also focused on Brandi in his talk: *Dreaming of a universal approach: Brandi's Theory of Restoration and the conservation of contemporary art*. Sebastiano took a more conventional approach, presenting Brandi's main ideas and principles. Subsequently, he demonstrated the incompatibility of these principles in relation to contemporary art because of the radically new nature of these works and their extreme fragmentation. Brandi's ideas fail when applied to recent works of art mainly in his presumption of the univocality of artistic intent and his belief in the 'imperative of conservation'. Sebastiano thinks that Brandi's theories offer a useful starting point for the discussion of core principles in conservation, but that Brandi's failure to create a universally valid framework raises the question whether a single theoretical approach is a realistic or even a desirable aspiration.

Ari Tanhuanpää presented the last talk of the first day: *Conservation as Meaning-Making in 17th Century Dutch Art*. Ari launched his talk by pointing out that the field of conservation and research in technical art history regards the essence of a work of art in much the same way that 'traditional' art historical research does. It is the conservators' task to reveal the 'authentic' meaning and appearance of an artwork that matches the artist's intention. However, Ari is of the opinion that art conservation still seeks its substantiation from science, as there is a parallel concentration on phenomena observed or revealed on micro-level through analytical research methods. This is unlike the methodology of art historical research. The rhetoric of conservation, however, is based on implicit distinctions between the object's 'original' and its present condition. The identity of the work of art is thus grounded in subjective categorization, which results from interaction between mind and matter. Therefore, conservation is always a critical act of interpretation.

The first session on day two, focusing on *Social Memory: Tangible and Intangible Heritage*, was chaired by **Simon Cane**.

Sanchita Balachandran presented a quite fascinating talk-- my fascination possibly due to the exotic nature of working with human remains: *Among the Dead and their Possessions: A conservator's role in the death, life, and afterlife of human remains and their associated objects*. There is still much ambiguity about human remains as objects for conservation treatment in terms of the human aspect and emotional engagement. Sanchita presented three case histories involving past disrespectful treatment of human remains and her current interactions. The first was the case of a body that didn't have a society to speak for it, and was thus treated as a secular object. It involved an ancient Egyptian female mummy now in a museum in the United States. It was purchased and brought from Cairo to Baltimore in 1895 by Dr. Goucher to be exhibited in his gallery of curiosities. The mummy, named Boris, was actually a 50 yr- old woman who had borne two children. Sanchita described how her condition investigation took on a voyeuristic quality with the conservator feeling uncomfortable about the severed head and the hole in the area of the heart. In order to perform certain treatments it was necessary for her to remove her gloves, making interaction with the body very intimate and shocking. The second case involved an ancient Egyptian child burial, which was excavated at an archaeological site. It probed the question of whether the requirements of the excavation were in conflict with the responsibility of the conservator. The burial had been vandalized earlier, the smashed bones of the upper body mingling with beads of lapis lazuli and ivory bracelets. The archaeological documentation of the find took precedence over issues of preservation, and the

bones and objects were exposed to the environment for the duration of the work. When she finally was allowed to carry out treatments, kneeling over the human remains, Sanchita found much of the ivory literally falling apart due to exposure to the sun. The body, sent to the Human Remains Department of Egyptian Antiquities Authority, remains disassembled 6 years after the study, provoking the question whether it is enough to memorialize the burial through photographs. The final case involved a bone fragments and relics of a beatified Franciscan nun – Blessed Mother Marianne Cope (1838-1918). The objects that were buried together with the body -- buttons, safety pins, coffin hardware, the nun's crucifix—became relics. Sanchita described the treatment procedure of re-crucifying the tiny figure of Christ while remounting it on the cross. A written version of her presentation is scheduled to appear in the Fall/Winter 2009 issue of the Journal of the American Institute for Conservation (JAIC).

The author of the next talk, **Sudha Srestha**, was unable to attend the seminar, so her paper was presented by her research collaborator **Alison Brown**. The paper entitled *Cultural heritage institutions and the safeguarding of tangible and intangible heritage in a changing world: Katmandu, Nepal*, focused on the need to preserve the social-cultural landscape, rather than only the built heritage (the Katmandu Valley is inscribed on the World Heritage Site List). In the past, the conservation of cultural heritage, both tangible and intangible, was carried out by local inhabitants through a special socio-cultural organization called the Guthi. One of the main vehicles for conservation of their heritage was the organization of festivals. The paper examined how the decay of the Guthi system threatens the tangible and intangible heritage, and calls for the strengthening of this traditional means of community self-determination.

Kirsten McKee continued the session with her presentation: *From conservation to controversy? The intangible legacy of Calton Hill*. Kirsten presented the problem of dealing with 'uncomfortable' heritage. Calton Hill, which lies within the World Heritage Site of the City of Edinburgh, offers a panoramic view over a 19th century-designed landscape within an urban environment. It is the home to several monuments from the Scottish intellectual Renaissance. In the past five years the City Council and the Edinburgh World Heritage Trust have funded millions of pounds worth of essential repairs to a number of nationally important edifices, yet are currently struggling to find an appropriate use for these structures. One of the main reasons for this is the Hill's ignominious reputation. It was a place for prostitution, beginning in the 18th century and continuing through the 19th and 20th centuries. In fact, the activities of sexual promiscuity associated with this site override the legacy of the grandiose architecture. The problem of ensuring that this aspect of the Hill's past is considered with equal validity to that of the other elements is a serious threat to the future use and management of the site. Commonplace after dark gay cruising can be considered an important part of the intangible heritage of social practices. There is a drive to safeguard and enhance the Hill by removing sexual activity, but then values central to this site would be ignored.

Kim Muir, presenting her talk: *Remembering the past: The role of social memory in the restoration of damaged paintings* which focused on the consequences of the 'objective' contemporary practice of strictly limiting retouching to the areas of the loss and using easily removable materials (making the hand of the conservator unobtrusive). The underlying cultural factors that influence restoration decisions are largely downplayed. Using examples of restorations where the damage was considered to carry historical or cultural meaning, Kim explored the influence of social memory and the decision to retain evidence of this memory. She also highlighted the strongly subjective factors that influence the appearance of the paintings where damage is selectively preserved. For example, during the retouching of a portrait by John Singelton Copley, a larger hole created by a bayonet in the area of the hair was not restored, but a smaller hole closer to the eye was retouched. Another example: Deliberate scratches made on a figure of St. Mary in connection with Reformation destruction of images were preserved, while other lacunae were retouched, leading to the unnatural highlighting of a specific area. Muir considered how restoration guides the viewer's engagement with the painting, and how the restoration itself will exert its own influence of future treatment decisions.

The last session, chaired by **Renée Tobe**, focused on the issue of *Contested Values: Historic Buildings, Monuments and World Heritage Sites*.

Jhilmil Kishore presented the first talk: *Haveli – Indian courtyard house*. Although India has 27 listed World Heritage Sites, historic city centers are not included. The general attitude of apathy towards historic domestic quarters has resulted in the destruction of this type of built heritage. Jhilmil

appraised India's experience with inner city renewal through a case study of Havelis in the historic city core of Saharanpur in Uttar Pradesh. A Haveli is an Indian courtyard house. The word *Haveli* means mansion, but it symbolizes a lifestyle centered on a rambling household with extensive servant quarters. The aim of the talk was not to provide a definite analysis of the conservation challenges, but to begin a debate and discuss possible options available within the changing global economic and environmental climate. Conservation in India was formalized in 1958 with the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Sites and Remains Act that listed over 7000 sites more than 100 years old. However, development was prohibited in areas surrounding these sites and, as a consequence, many inner cities degenerated into poorly kept slums.

The problem of linking evaluation plans with plans for interventions for built heritage, and community participation in planning and design were the topics of **Hsien-yang Tseng's** well illustrated talk: *Reconsidering conservation in response to the contested values of built heritage: Taiwan in the 2000s*. What makes built heritage different from other objects of cultural heritage is that built heritage is not "refusable" meaning one cannot avoid looking at it. It becomes a common object representing various contested values. When certain values are stressed, others are affected, creating contradictions. For example, if the historical value of a structure is stressed, this might negatively affect its functional value. Hsien-yang presented four case stories illustrating his points: 1) Individual Civil Houses where heritage values co-mingle with private interests, provoking the question of whether we are conserving for individuals or for society at large; 2) Japanese Colonial Houses, where aesthetic and social values conflict with social values. The uncomfortable truth is that the colonizing tradition is part of the Taiwanese cultural heritage even though this idea creates social tensions; 3) In the case of the Losheng Leprosarium built by the Japanese colonizers in the 1930s, heritage values clash with development interests. Historical values are also challenged by ignorance of history. Acceptance of this history can be painful. By preserving the Leprosarium as it was built the Taiwanese learn to face the dishonorable elements of their history including the fact that even after leprosy proved to be curable, families rejected lepers forcing them to live in seclusion; 4) The Chang Kai-shek Memorial Landscape was built after the death of the last Emperor of China in the late 1970s. It was conceived as a National Monument, but for which nation? Because of Taiwan's multinational heritage, Chang had the status of conqueror for some, while that of leader for others. As the priority of the values associated with this monument changed, many of the statues were dismantled. Now, there is a movement to reconstruct the demolished statues-- but only those that will not provoke social tensions.

Diane Watters also focused on the issue of how changing priorities affect built heritage using the sad example of Cardross Seminary in west Scotland in her talk: *Cardross Seminary, decay & ruin*. St. Peter's College, Cardross, was the main Catholic seminary for the training of priests in the 1960s and 70s. It was an award-winning building when it was opened in 1966, but was closed in 1980 after 14 years of use. Following numerous failed attempts to find a new use, and despite the formation of a trust in 2004, 29 years later it stands a vandalized, gutted ruin. The reasons for the short life of the seminar were very serious: penetrating dampness resulted in fungal growth; structural maintenance problems, problems with sound and heating isolation. These problems compromised the building's beauty, usefulness and constructional stability. Watters presented the dramatic narrative of the seminary's design and use and its era of physical decline. At the heart of her narrative was the paradox of increased academic, architectural and state interest in the building and its acceptance as a piece of modern architectural heritage while it remains a ruin. Because of its condition, it will likely slowly fade and lose its relevance.

Ehab Kamel presented the last talk: *Historic context and cultural content – The case of Historic Cairo*. Ehab touched on the broad issue of preserving Egyptian identity through the preservation of its built heritage, asking how people perceive their heritage. Conservation efforts are often channeled into single main monuments, but these are seldom part of the living culture of the people. In conservation planning, priority is given to tourist attractions, with no effort made to keep the story of places of living culture alive for the inhabitants. Only a minority of the people know the story of the place in which they live. In tackling these problems, care must be taken not to misinterpret the story-- which might lead to museumification. When interpreting that culture we should take into account that each environment is culturally specific and hence culturally variable. Ehab used Historic Cairo as a case for reflecting on these issues, concluding that the connection between Historic Cairo's tangible remains and the intangible spirit of the place can be perceived and should be preserved.

Réflexe ou réflexion ? Les acteurs et le processus décisionnel dans la conservation-restauration.

Colloque International APROA-BRK/VIOE, Bruxelles, 19-20 Novembre 2009

Présentation des conclusions.

Tirer des conclusions d'un colloque de deux jours si riche en communications portant sur des thèmes et des objets aussi variés, n'est pas chose aisée.

Je voudrais revenir en premier lieu sur le choix judicieux du thème du colloque et sur ce qu'il reflète : « *Réflexe ou réflexion* » dénote pour moi une prise de conscience de plus en plus aigüe de la part des conservateurs-restaurateurs, de la responsabilité ciblée (à chaque fois spécifique) qu'ils ont envers les biens culturels et le besoin qu'ils ressentent de la partager.

Le processus décisionnel (qui prend la décision) est une interrogation à laquelle Poul Philippot répondait déjà dans les années 70 en affirmant, au grand dam des conservateurs de Musées, que c'est le rôle des restaurateurs. En effet, ils détiennent de toute façon la responsabilité essentielle puisque c'est eux qui, en final, travaillent sur le Bien.

Aujourd'hui, les conservateurs-restaurateurs, après un parcours semé d'embûches, ont gagné leur autonomie, mais ils doivent partager les décisions avec un nombre toujours plus élevé d'acteurs qui dépasse largement la sphère de la trilogie initiale, rappelée par **Salvador Muñoz Viñas**, à savoir l'historien de l'art, le scientifique, et le conservateur-restaurateur. Même si la reconnaissance de la profession n'a pas encore abouti dans notre pays (Belgique), les mentalités ont changé et l'avis du restaurateur depuis le *Document de Pavie* (1997) est davantage écouté. L'ICCROM, réalisant la difficulté du processus décisionnel, est le premier à avoir créé, en 2002, un cours pilote à l'attention de la communauté internationale intitulé *Sharing Conservation Decision* suivi, fort du succès du précédent, d'un programme sur le même thème en 2008 (**Veerle Meul**). Ces cours furent précédés, en 2000, par *Sharing Conservation Science*, les deux aspects étant complémentaires, comme toutes les communications entendues l'ont clairement démontré.

Depuis lors, les mentalités ont encore évolué dans la prise de décisions. **Salvador Muñoz Viñas** dans sa communication introductive *très débattue*... trouve que l'avis du détenteur de l'œuvre (le client) doit davantage être pris en considération. **Isabelle Brajer** parle de l'importance de la perception de l'œuvre par le public ! Actuellement, une tendance à attacher plus d'importance à la conservation du message porté par l'œuvre qu'à son authenticité se dessine très souvent. Enfin, les phases d'intervention ou les matériaux choisis sont souvent déterminés en fonction du budget alloué. Par ailleurs, les conflits dans la prise de décision finale ne sont pas rares.

L'essentiel, pourtant, reste de trouver un langage commun entre tous les intervenants permettant d'établir une méthodologie d'approche interdisciplinaire du Bien à traiter, chacun gardant sa *spécificité* tout en faisant bénéficier l'autre de sa *spécialité* comme ce fut le cas pour la restauration de l'horloge musicale de la collection Grand Ducale du Luxembourg (**Charles Indekeu, Muriel Prieur, Derk Stomps, Michael van Gompén et Bob van Wely**). Preuve, s'il en est que, depuis quelques années, un énorme pas a été franchi dans le domaine de la collaboration pluridisciplinaire efficace.

Un deuxième objectif vital est de poser des questions sur la base des données fournies par les examens et les discussions préalables et d'y répondre en formulant des propositions sur le résultat final que l'on veut obtenir tout en respectant la déontologie de la restauration et l'histoire matérielle de l'œuvre. Dans le cas des intérieurs historiques, une collaboration pluridisciplinaire est la meilleure garantie de décisions adéquates d'intervention, comme l'a démontré **Anne van Grevenstein** à propos du château de Haar (Hollande). Association qui fait collaborer sur un même échafaudage conservateurs-

restaurateurs et artisans ou encore conservateurs-restaurateurs et architectes ou entrepreneurs. L'ouverture au public d'une demeure historique pose aussi des problèmes de conservation préventive auxquels il convient de réfléchir afin d'aboutir à un projet durable. Prendre la bonne décision face à un ensemble historique, riche d'œuvres et de significations variées, nécessite un dialogue ouvert entre toutes les parties si l'on veut conserver à l'ensemble une apparence unitaire.

Lorsque l'éventail des options de restauration est grand, l'objectif de l'intervention, le message que l'on veut faire passer et l'aspect final que l'on veut obtenir, doivent dicter le choix.

Ainsi, le bon état matériel du portrait de Nicolaes van Bambeeck de Rembrandt, restauré par **Hélène Dubois** et **Françoise Rosier**, a guidé par lui-même le type d'intervention menée sur le support (seule œuvre du Maître à ne jamais avoir été rentoilée) et sur la surface picturale obturée par un épais vernis, mais qui n'avait pas connu de nettoyages drastiques. Le traitement prudent fut toutefois, on l'a entendu, l'objet de débats entre conservateurs-restaurateurs au sein d'une commission d'experts internationaux. Les discussions s'étendirent même à l'impact du cadre qui joue un rôle si important, comme le disait Brandi, sur la présentation d'une peinture, par ailleurs très réussie pour ce portrait !!!

La variété des paramètres à prendre en considération dans les décisions de restauration est grande, comme l'a si bien mis en évidence **Muriel Prieur**. Parmi ceux-ci, la dimension religieuse d'une œuvre, comme la dévotion qu'elle suscite, sont des facteurs essentiels malheureusement trop souvent obturés. Si un changement d'aspect important pour se rapprocher de l'état original intervient par rapport à l'image telle qu'elle est ancrée dans les mémoires et adorée, il faut préparer le public à ce changement par une campagne de sensibilisation.

On retiendra encore un autre paramètre important, me semble-t-il, celui de la fonction de l'objet dans son environnement initial.

Le facteur temps entre aussi en ligne de compte dans la prise de décision. Faut-il TOUT conserver ? Même un patrimoine très détruit ? Quels critères de décision adopter ? Quel sera l'avenir d'une bonne restauration exécutée selon les règles actuellement admises ? L'aspect du bien restauré sera-t-il modifié et aussi, comment s'inscrira cette restauration dans la durée par rapport au goût et aux impératifs socio-économiques de l'époque à laquelle elle sera prise en considération ? **Carola Van den Wijngaert** a traité de ce problème à propos du patrimoine religieux partiellement destiné à disparaître ou à être réhabilité avec des fonctions très différentes de celles initialement prévues. **Marjan Buyle** a également abordé cette problématique au travers de l'histoire matérielle très agitée du *Pavillon de Notelaer*, profondément transformé au XIXe siècle par des interventions successives voulues par ses propriétaires. Quelle option de restauration choisir aujourd'hui : *statu quo* ou restauration partielle ? Ce qui ramène naturellement à l'attitude actuelle face à la dimension historique telle que définie par Brandi.

Déterminer le degré d'intervention lors d'une restauration suscite évidemment le plus de questionnements et c'est peut-être dans ce type de décision que la collaboration interdisciplinaire joue le rôle le plus important. Cette aptitude à collaborer et à prendre des décisions en commun relève de la formation et doit donc s'apprendre. C'était un des objectifs du projet pilote de restauration du portique de *L'église de l'île de Lopud*, présenté par **Charles Indekeu** et **Georges Dewispelaere**. Les étudiants ont ainsi pu débattre du concept de l'intervention minimale qui s'est mué en intervention modérée au sein d'une plate-forme de discussions inter-institutions et à caractère international, les habituant ainsi à tenir compte des sensibilités différentes qui se manifestent d'un pays à l'autre.

Les options d'intervention à prendre en cours de traitement doivent naturellement être déterminées par les examens préalables, mais elles doivent aussi pouvoir être modifiées en fonction de « *découvertes fortuites* ou *d'impératifs techniques* ». Il s'agit alors de développer une argumentation crédible pour convaincre de modifier la décision initiale, ce qui n'est pas évident, comme il en a été débattu suite à l'intervention de **Nicole Goetghebeur**. Il peut aussi arriver que les options de restauration changent par accident dans la réalisation d'un projet, par manque de suivi ou pour raison économique ou encore de facilité, comme nous l'a expliqué **Johan Grootaers**. **Anne Grevenstein** propose même

d'introduire cette possibilité de « modification en cours » dans les cahiers de charges afin d'obtenir plus facilement le feu vert des commanditaires.

Dans le cadre des examens préalables de peintures, ce qui pouvait à première vue paraître des surpeints ou des repeints, s'avère être en réalité des retouches de l'artiste, des *reprises d'auteur*, comme l'a suggéré **Marie Postec**. Ceci montre la prudence qu'il faut apporter au diagnostic, le rôle de l'expérience qui s'acquiert et surtout le fait (et là nous revenons directement au thème du colloque) qu'il ne faut pas agir par réflexe mais bien observer et, sur la base de données objectives, éventuellement oser remettre en question des idées reçues et communément admises. Un autre bel exemple de cette démarche nous a été donné par le portrait de Rembrandt. En effet, les données fournies par un examen pointu d'une œuvre aussi célèbre et aussi étudiée a mené à des conclusions différentes de celles des experts, tant sur le format de la peinture que sur la signature du Maître.

Le choix des techniques de restauration et la problématique de l'authenticité sont à leur tour un vaste domaine au niveau de la décision d'intervention. Je dirais même, pour reprendre l'expression d'**Isabelle Brajer**, un « *sujet de discorde* ». L'oratrice l'exemplifie en présentant l'expérimentation d'une nouvelle méthode de retouches en peinture murale qu'elle appelle la « technique de camouflage », en contradiction avec l'axiome de Brandi selon lequel *la retouche doit être reconnaissable*. La méthode interpelle car elle cherche à trouver la « manière » d'intégrer harmonieusement des lacunes parfois importantes à l'ensemble et, sur photo, elle semble y parvenir ! On passe ici de la suprématie de la théorie à la pratique.

Ce qui montre une fois de plus combien les théories de Brandi sont un *terreau de réflexion* à la disposition des décideurs pour alimenter les débats. Faut-il suivre ces théories ou non et, dans la négative, il est essentiel d'argumenter son choix. Ou faut-il s'autoriser aujourd'hui à compléter ces théories et axiomes sur certains points, vu l'évolution de la réflexion en conservation-restauration, l'éventail de plus en plus large de Biens culturels à traiter et le public (au sens large) à prendre en considération. L'appellation de *camouflage*, comme l'a signalé **Françoise Rosier**, devrait cependant être modifiée car elle revêt une connotation négative.

Ces réflexions nous mènent aux attitudes d'intervention qui varient également en fonction du type de Bien culturel et de l'intérêt que les décideurs y portent. Les sgraffites, par exemple, sont les parents pauvres de la restauration, comme l'a démontré **Bernard Delmotte**. Leur *statut d'art décoratif*, considéré comme inférieur à celui de l'œuvre d'art, ne suscite pas d'intérêt pour les traitements de restauration. A signaler quand même le programme de la Fondation Roi Baudouin, de sensibilisation des propriétaires à l'entretien de ce patrimoine.

Le textile, fragile par excellence, demande des interventions minimales, comme l'a montré **Peter De Groof**. Malheureusement, souvent par méconnaissance de leur valeur, ces dits « *chiffons religieux* » ne jouissent pas de mesures de conservation préventive adéquates et donc s'altèrent considérablement et souvent de manière irréversible.

Enfin les sites archéologiques ne bénéficient pas non plus, encore selon **Marleen Martens**, de réflexions spécifiques quant à leur conservation. Beaucoup d'entre eux « invisibles » demandent encore à être retrouvés sur le terrain pour être protégés.

Ainsi se termine cette tentative de résumer en quelques phrases un colloque aussi proluxe en réflexions. Les problèmes à résoudre au cas par cas restent nombreux et se renouvellent en fonction de l'avancée de la recherche et de l'expérience. Combien d'entre eux, abordés aujourd'hui, ne faisaient pas l'objet de réflexions il y a 5 ou 10 ans. Ceci augure de nouveaux débats passionnants sur le bien fondé des décisions d'intervention ou sur les controverses qu'elles suscitent.

Le thème choisi par l'APROA-BRK révèle la maturité de l'Association et le dynamisme de ses membres toujours prêts à se remettre en question en réfléchissant *ensemble un pas plus loin !!!*

Et j'aimerais, dans ce contexte, vous rappeler un écrit de Georges Hulin de Loo.

« Comme j'ai contribué à accréditer l'erreur, il n'est que juste que je fasse mon possible pour la dissiper. Rien n'est plus contraire à l'esprit scientifique que l'entêtement dans l'erreur : toute

recherche scientifique dans n'importe quelle science d'observation se fait en tâtonnant : tous ceux qui ont beaucoup cherché se sont trompés plus d'une fois...

Seuls peuvent se dire exempts de toute erreur ceux qui n'ont jamais émis un jugement personnel ; ceux qui ont exprimé leurs avis sous une forme si imprécise et si prudemment équivoque qu'on peut ensuite y trouver toutes les interprétations (c'est le talent spécial des fonctionnaires de certaines administrations) ; ceux enfin qui, une fois qu'ils se sont prononcés, sont éblouis de leur propre lumière au point de devenir aveugles pour la réalité et incapables de retourner en arrière. Dieu nous garde le plus longtemps possible de cet enfantillage sénile qu'est la prétention à l'infaillibilité en matière de science ».

Il me reste à féliciter les organisateurs de cette manifestation pour sa tenue scientifique et sa convivialité et à les remercier de m'avoir accordé leur confiance pour tirer ces conclusions.

*Catheline Périer-D'Ieteren
Professeur à l'Université Libre de Bruxelles*

Reflex or reflexion? Actors and the decision-making process in the field of conservation-restoration

International BRK-APROA/VIOE Colloquium, Brussels, 19-20 November 2009.

Presentation of the conclusions

Drawing conclusions from a two-day conference so rich in presentations relating to such varied topics and objects is not an easy matter to achieve.

I would like to focus initially on the judicious choice of the topic for the conference and on what it reflects: "Reflex or reflexion" indicates for me an increasingly acute awareness on the part of conservator-restorers of the responsibility they have towards the works of cultural heritage, and the need that they feel to share this obligation. The decision-making process (who makes the decision) is a question which Paul Philippot answered in the 1970s by affirming to the dismay of museum curators that it was the job of the restorer. In any event, they hold the essential responsibility since it is they who work on the objects.

Today, conservator-restorers after a journey fraught with difficulties have gained their autonomy, but decision making is shared by a growing number of actors well beyond the trilogy mentioned by **Salvador Muñoz Viñas**-- the art historian, the scientist, and the conservator-restorer. Even if the recognition of our profession has not yet been achieved in Belgium, attitudes have changed and the opinion of the restorer has been sought more since the Document of Pavia was drafted in 1997. ICCROM, realizing the difficulty of the decision-making process, was the first to have organised (in 2002) a pilot course designed for the international community entitled *Sharing Conservation Decision*. This extremely successful course was followed by a program on the same topic in 2008 (**Veerle Meul**). These courses were preceded in 2000 by *Sharing Conservation Science*-- the two aspects being complementary as all of the presentations at this colloquium clearly demonstrated. Since then, attitudes in decision-making have evolved even further. **Salvador Muñoz Viñas** in his much debated introductory presentation states that the opinion of the holder of work (the client) must be taken more into account. **Isabelle Brajer** speaks about the importance of the public's perception of a work! Currently, the tendency is to attach more importance to the conservation of the message carried by the work rather than to its authenticity. Lastly, the phases of intervention or the materials chosen are often determined by the fund available. Moreover, conflicts about the final decision are not uncommon.

Essentially, a common language for all of the stakeholders that would make it possible to establish a methodology for an interdisciplinary approach to objects needing treatment remains to be found. Each side keeps its specificity while benefiting from the other's speciality. This was demonstrated by

the case of the restoration of the musical clock from the collection of the Grand Duke of Luxembourg (**Charles Indekeu, Muriel Prieur, Derk Stomps, Michael van Gompén and Bob van Wely**)-- proof of the enormous step that has been taken in recent years in the field of effective multi-disciplinary collaboration.

A second vital objective was to pose questions based on data provided by preliminary examination and discussion and to answer them by formulating proposals for achieving the result one wants while respecting the ethics of restoration and the material history of the object. **Anne van Grevenstein** demonstrated that in the case of historical interiors, a multi-disciplinary collaboration is the best guarantee for adequate decisions of intervention using the example of Castle de Haar (Netherlands). The opening of a historical residence to the public also poses problems of preventive conservation which must be considered in order to achieve a sustainable project. Making the right decision regarding a historically complex unit rich in works of varied significance requires an open dialogue between all the parties.

When the range of the options for a restoration is large, the objective of the intervention, the message that one wants to pass on and the final appearance that one wants to achieve must dictate one's choices. Thus, the good material condition of Rembrandt's portrait of Nicolaes van Bambeeck, the only work of the Master never to have been lined and which had never undergone a drastic cleaning, guided the type of intervention carried out by **Hélène Dubois** and **Françoise Rosier** on the support and on the pictorial surface sealed by a thick varnish. The careful treatment was, however, the object of debate among conservator-restorers within a commission of international experts. The discussions even extended to the impact of the frame, which as Brandi said, plays a significant role in the presentation of a painting-- particularly for this portrait!!!

The variety of parameters to be taken into account in restoration decisions is large, as highlighted so well by **Muriel Prieur**. Among them is the religious dimension of a work as the devotion which it inspires is an essential factor. If, due to an intervention, there is a change in a significant aspect of the image that is fixed in peoples' memories and is adored, it is necessary to prepare the public for this change by a public awareness campaign. It seems to me that another significant parameter-- that of the function of the object in its initial environment --will still be retained.

The time factor also comes into play in decision-making. Is it necessary to preserve EVERYTHING? Which decision criteria do we adopt? What will be the future of a good restoration carried out according to current rules? Will the appearance of the restored object be changed and how will this restoration compare in the long run to the tastes and the socio-economic requirements of the times? **Carola Van den Wijngaert** spoke about these problems in terms of the religious inheritance which may be rehabilitated with functions very different from those initially envisaged. **Marjan Buyle** also approached these problems through the very turbulent material history of the *Notelaer Pavilion* which was profoundly transformed in the 19th century by successive interventions carried out by its owners. Which restoration option do we choose today-- status quo or partial restoration? This leads back to the current attitude defined by Brandi regarding the historical dimension.

Determining the degree of intervention obviously raises the most questions and it is perhaps in this type of decision that interdisciplinary collaboration plays the most significant role. The ability to collaborate and make joint decisions is formed during one's training and must be learned. Collaborative decision making was one of the objectives of the pilot project for the restoration of the portico altar of the church of the island of Lopud, presented by **Charles Indekeu** and **Georges Dewispelaere** in their paper. The students thus could discuss the concept of the minimal intervention-- which has evolved through a platform of discussions within institutions of international character-- and thus accustom themselves to reflecting on the differing sensitivities that occur in various countries.

The options for intervention that can be undertaken in the course of a treatment must naturally be determined by prior examination, but they also must be able to be modified in response to "fortuitous

discoveries or technical requirements". It is then a question of developing a credible argument for modifying the initial decision. This was discussed by **Nicole Goetghebeur**. **Johan Grootaers** explained how restoration options can change by accident during the realization of a project for lack of monitoring or for economic reasons or convenience. **Anne van Grevenstein** even proposes that this possibility of "modification in progress" be introduced into the specifications of the project in order to more easily obtain the acceptance of the sponsors.

During the initial examination of a painting which may at first sight appear to be over-painted or repainted but proves to have final improvements made by the artist, **Marie Postec** suggests that *the updating of the author* must be considered. This shows the prudence which is necessary to bring acquired experience to the diagnosis and highlights the fact that one should not act by reflex but observe well, and, on the basis of objective data, dare to challenge conventional wisdom and commonly accepted ideas. A beautiful example of such a case was the portrait of Rembrandt. Indeed, the data provided by a purposeful examination of such a famous and much studied work led to conclusions that differed from those of the experts both regarding the size of the painting as well as the signature of the Master.

The choice of the techniques and the problems of authenticity, in their turn, affect the decision of type of intervention. I would even say, using the words of **Isabelle Brajer**, that they are a "subject of dissension". The speaker illustrated this by presenting a new method of retouching on wall paintings that she calls the "camouflage technique", in contradiction with the axiom of Brandi which states that retouching must be recognizable. The method is challenging because it seeks to find a "manner" for the harmonious integration of sometimes significant gaps into the unit and, according to the pictures she showed, it seems to reach that point! Brajer showed once more how much the theories of Brandi are *grounds for reflection* at the disposal of decision makers and feed the debates. Whether Brandi's theories should be followed or not, it is essential to argue for the choice. Given the evolution of thinking in conservation-restoration, the increasingly broad range of objects of cultural heritage that are treated, and taking into account the public (in the broad sense), should one be allowed today to complement certain points of these theories and axioms. As **Françoise Rosier** commented, the name camouflage should be modified because of its negative connotation.

Attitudes about intervention vary according to the type of cultural asset and the interest that the decision makers carry. Sgraffiti decorations, for example, are the poor relations in the field of restoration, as **Bernard Delmotte** showed. Their stature as decorative art inferior to works of art does not arouse interest in their conservation. With the project sponsored by the Foundation of King Baudouin, owners have been sensitized to the need for the maintenance of this heritage.

Textiles, fragile objects par excellence, require minimal interventions, as showed by **Peter De Groof**. Unfortunately, often because of ignorance of their value, these so-called "religious rags" are not given adequate preventive conservation and thus deteriorate significantly and often irreversibly. Finally, according to **Marleen Martens**, archaeological sites do not profit either from specific reflexions on their conservation. Many of them being "invisible" still remain to be found and to be protected as sites.

This concludes an attempt to summarize in some paragraphs a conference so prolific in reflexions. The issues presented by each speaker were numerous and related to the advancement of research and experience. How many of the issues presented today were not the subject of reflexion five or ten years ago. This augers well for exciting new debates on the merits of decisions for interventions or on the controversies which they generate. The topic chosen by the professional organisation APROA-BRK reveals the maturity of the Association and the dynamism of its members who are always ready to challenge themselves by together reflecting *one step further!!!*

And, in this context, I would like to point out a quote from Georges Hulin de Loo. "*As I helped give credence to the error, it is only fair that I do my best to dispel it. Nothing is more contrary to scientific spirit than obstinacy in error: any scientific research in any observational science is done*

while groping: all those who sought much are misled more than once... Only those who have never put forth a personal judgement can say they are free from any error; those who expressed their opinions in such a vague form and with such prudent ambiguity that one can find all interpretations (it is the special talent of the civil servants of certain administrations); finally, those who, once decided, are dazzled by their own light to the point of becoming blind to reality and incapable of turning back. God preserves us as long as possible this senile childishness of the claim to infallibility in matters of science".

It remains for me to congratulate the organizers of this event for this demonstration of its scientific behaviour and its conviviality and to thank them for having granted their confidence to me in drawing these conclusions.

Catheline Périer-D'Ieteren
Professor at the Université Libre de Bruxelles
(translation: Isabelle Brajer)

FORTHCOMING MEETINGS, CONFERENCES AND COURSES, CALL FOR PAPERS

CeROArt, issue no. 5 (April 2010) **"Restoration on the stage and behind the scenes"** **Deadline: February 15, 2010**

More than ever, the definition of the "act of restoring" is torn between art and profession: the restorer's work generates curiosity, in the same way as a performance, and, nowadays, it is not unusual to see it staged and presented within the context of a museum or an exhibition. We are witness to a spectacularisation of the profession which is being mediatised, filmed, televised, podcast; it headlines magazines and programmes with a wide audience base, and has been accorded a specific type of prestige. Not only does this have an impact on the public's idea of the profession, but also on the works restored. What are the effects, on the stage and behind the scenes, of this exhibition of restoration?

If you wish to support our venture, we would thank you to forward the link to the magazine to your contacts likely to be interested. You can subscribe or unsubscribe to the magazine via the journal website <http://ceroart.revues.org> under the following heading: "La lettre de CeROArt". CeROArt thanks you for your careful reading and wishes your participation, as a reader or as an author, in its editorial project.

Muriel Verbeeck, Ph.D. Editor - Professor,
ESA Saint-Luc de Liege
31 Boulevard de la Constitution
B-4020 Liege
Belgique
muriel.verbeeck@ceroart.org

IIAS - 2010 **8th Special Focus Symposium on ART AND SCIENCE** **and** **1st Symposium on SYSTEM RESEARCH IN ARTS AND HUMANITIES**

Deadline: March 15, 2010

Chaired by
Prof. Dr. Karel Boullart
Dr. Hiltrud Schinzel - Magister Artium
Prof. Dr. Leanne Zacharias - Performance Chair

Papers and projects are invited for presentation at a Special Focus Symposium on Art, Science and Humanities that will be a follow-up of the last year 7th Art and Science meeting in Baden-Baden. This Symposium will be a part of the 22nd International Conference on Systems Research, Informatics & Cybernetics, which will be held from August 2nd to 6th in Baden-Baden, Germany, in conjunction with the 30th Annual Meeting of the International Institute for Advanced Studies in Systems Research and Cybernetics.

The synergy of the Art & Science and Art & Humanities Symposia from last year will be continued; therefore the call for paper is bi-named. Abstracts for paper proposals will be reviewed by Karel Boullart and Hiltrud Schinzel, proposals for performances by Leanne Zacharias. Following last year's research forum, we are pleased to announce this special interdisciplinary event.

Scientists and artists in the disciplines of visual art, installation art, music, composition, performance art, design and architecture are invited to submit in one of the following formats:

- Academic research paper
- Report on practice-based work and/or educational program
- Philosophical essay

We also encourage variety in presentation format, including performance, video, etc.
(10 – 15 minutes maximum)

The aim of the meeting will be to present and discuss interdisciplinary investigations between the domains science and art including avant-garde research and paradigms of interdisciplinary cooperation. Based on the vivid interest in inter-disciplinary dialogue that emerged in last year's session, social linking of different individuals and groups as well as dialogue between and across disciplinary lines and practices, focussing on existing and potential interactivity is a main focus of the symposium (presentations stimulating synaesthetic experience are especially welcome). Scientific investigation of artistic disciplines and artistic media, presentation of research projects and artistic performances in different genres are all equally welcome. Last but not least, theoretical and philosophical considerations are regarded of utmost importance.

The Symposium Organizers therefore propose the following themes and issues for reflection and debate:

1. Contributions pertaining to the clarification of relationships between art and science (including systems research), their structural and functional similarities and differences including both 'theoretical frameworks' as novel 'application and processes'. Specific themes concerning the interface between both are welcome too. The aim is to help determine how art and science can learn and benefit from each other.
2. Contributions may also focus on analysis of examples and on case studies concerning collaboration between artists and scientists. This includes the potential of technology, technological evolution and pedagogy to stimulate '*rapprochement*' between art and science and their eventual impact on the problem of social harmony and peace.
3. Contributions concerning whether or not and in what measure art and science are or can become conducive to promote or to establish harmonious relationships between people: either by their putative impact and effect due to their intrinsic properties or by mental and behavioral attitudes due to the psychological and sociological mindset they presuppose. Theoretical papers, case studies and/or artistic performances are equally welcome.
4. As we live in a dynamic universe characterized by evolution at all levels, it has been interesting during the last seven years to have contributions concerning evolution in science and in the arts, their interface, their relation to society, etc. Therefore this subject is of high interest for the symposium.

5. The four points described are linked and sometimes cannot be separated. Therefore contributions combining the perspectives indicated in a creative and innovative way are likewise welcome.

Interested persons please contact symposium chair:

Prof. Dr. Karel Boullart

Londenstraat 74, B.9000 Gent, Europe

E-mail: karel.boullart@UGent.be

and

Dr. Hiltrud Schinzel

Mülheimerstr.7, D 40239 Düsseldorf, Europe

E-mail: hiltrud.schinzel@t-online.de

and

Dr. Leanne Zacharias

School of Music – Brandon University

270 18th Street Brandon, Manitoba, Canada R7A5M5

phone: 204-727-342 fax: 204-728-6839

E-mail: zachariasl@brandonu.ca

as well as General Conference Chair:

Professor George E. Lasker

International Institute for Advanced Studies

P.O.Box 3010

Tecumseh, Ontario, Canada N8N 2M3

E-mail : Lasker@uwindsor.ca

The Paper Submission Guidelines, the Copyright Transfer Form and the Conference Registration form are available at the Home Page of the IAS at <http://www.ias.edu>

Proposals of performances should be sent **as soon as possible**, but not later than **March 15th** to Prof. Zacharias for evaluation. Paper Proposals/Abstracts of approximately 300 words should be submitted **as soon as possible**, but not later than **March 15th** to Prof. Boullart and Dr. Schinzel and **March 30th** to Prof. Lasker for evaluation. All proposals will be judged based on scholarly quality, originality and potential for further discourse. Papers must be written in English. Abstracts may be submitted via email (Microsoft Word) to the organizers.

All submitted papers will be refereed. Those selected will be scheduled for presentation and published in Conference Proceedings.

Authors of selected proposals will be invited to submit a final paper of approximately 2500 words including references (not to exceed 5 single spaced typed pages) and, as in previous years, will be invited to give a 20-minute presentation plus 10-minute discussion session as part of the 2010 Symposium.

Conference Proceedings will be published by the International Institute for Advanced Studies in Systems Research and Cybernetics, and will be available to all registered participants at the time of the Conference.

Important Dates:

Abstract due: March 15th respectively March 30th

Notification of Acceptance: April 9th

Final Paper due: May 9th

The full papers should be submitted to Prof. Dr. Karel Boullart and Dr. Hiltrud Schinzel by **May 9th 2010** at the addresses above. The full papers should also be transmitted **electronically** to

**Prof. George E. Lasker,
Conference Chairman**

**C/O IIAS
P. O. Box 3010
TECUMSEH, ON N8N 2M3, Canada
E-Mail: Lasker@uwindsor.ca**

Please note that all symposium participants are responsible for their own travel, accommodation and registration fees.

The Special Focus Symposium is sponsored by:
The International Institute for Advanced Studies in Systems Research and Cybernetics
and Systems Research Foundation

Further information about the Conference is available at: <http://www.iias.edu>

Online course on Restoration Theories and Methods

Horneman Institute, Jan. 18 – Apr. 4, 2010

This course focuses on the history of restoration as explained through the different restoration theories and their practical application in Italy and elsewhere since the late 1940s. The course also deals with color theory in order to better understand the practical application of retouch methods that will be introduced in great detail.

URL:<http://www.hornemann-institut.de/>

PROJECTS

Research at the Hamilton Kerr Institute

Painting Restoration Before *La Restauration* : the origins of the profession in France

Ann Massing

To be published in 2010 by the Hamilton Kerr Institute and Harvey Miller as Volume 3 of the series *Painting and Practice*

<http://www-hki.fitzmuseum.cam.ac.uk/research/current/french.html>

RECENT PUBLICATIONS AND REVIEWS OF PUBLICATIONS

BOOKS:

Conservation: Principles, Dilemmas and Uncomfortable Truths

edited by *Alison Richmond* and *Dr. Alison Bracker*
Butterworth-Heinemann (2009)

Contents:

- vii Contributors' biographies
- xiii Acknowledgements
- xiv Introduction
Alison Bracker and Alison Richmond

1	Chapter 1: Auto-Icons <i>Jonathan Rée</i>
6	Chapter 2: The Basis of Conservation Ethics <i>Jonathan Ashley-Smith</i>
25	Chapter 3: The Aims of Conservation <i>Chris Caple</i>
32	Chapter 4: The Reconstruction of Ruins: Principles and Practice <i>Nicholas Stanley-Price</i>
47	Chapter 5: Minimal Intervention Revisited <i>Salvador Muñoz Viñas</i>
60	Chapter 6: Practical Ethics v2.0 <i>Jonathan Kemp</i>
73	Chapter 7: Conservation Principles in the International Context <i>Jukka Jokilehto</i>
84	Chapter 8: The Concept of Authenticity Expressed in the Treatment of Wall Paintings <i>Isabelle Brajer</i>
100	Chapter 9: The Development of Principles in Paintings Conservation: Case Studies from the Restoration of Raphael's Art <i>Cathleen Hoeniger</i>
113	Chapter 10: A Critical Reflection on Czechoslovak Conservation-Restoration: It's Theory and Methodological Approach <i>Zuzana Bauerová</i>
125	Chapter 11: The Problem of Patina: Thoughts on Changing Attitudes to Old and New Things <i>Helen Clifford</i>
129	Chapter 12: Archaeological Conservation: Scientific Practice or Social Process? <i>Elizabeth Pye</i>
139	Chapter 13: Conservation and Cultural Significance <i>Miriam Clavir</i>
150	Chapter 14: The Cultural Dynamics of Conservation Principles in Reported Practice <i>Dinah Eastop</i>
163	Chapter 15: Why Do We Conserve? Developing Understanding of Conservation as a Cultural Construct <i>Simon Cane</i>
177	Chapter 16: Heritage, Values and Sustainability <i>Erica Avrami</i>
184	Chapter 17: Ethics and Practice: Australian and New Zealand Conservation Contexts <i>Catherine Smith and Marcelle Scott</i>
197	Chapter 18: Conservation, Access and Use in a Museum of Living Cultures <i>Marian A. Kaminitz and W. Richard West, Jr with contributions from Jim Enote, Curtis Quam, and Eileen Yatsattie</i>
210	Chapter 19: The Challenge of Installation Art <i>Glenn Wharton and Harvey Molotch</i>
223	Chapter 20: Contemporary Museums of Contemporary Art <i>Jill Sterrett</i>
229	Chapter 21: <i>White Walls</i> : Installations, Absence, Iteration and Difference <i>Tina Fiske</i>
241	Index

Art, Conservation, and Authenticities | Material, Concept, Context

Edited by Erma Hermens and Tina Fiske. Postprints of the International Conference held at the University of Glasgow, 12-14 September 2007, Archetype Publications (2009).

Contents:

ix Foreword

xiii	Acknowledgements <i>Erma Hermens and Tina Fiske</i>
	Authenticities: keynotes
3	Authenticity: how to get there? <i>Christian Scheidemann</i>
13	Degrees of authenticity in the discourse between the original and the viewer <i>Joyce Hill Stoner</i>
22	Authenticity and restoration of wall paintings: issues of truth and beauty <i>Isabelle Brajer</i>
33	Beyond Authenticity <i>Salvador Muñoz Viñas</i>
	Authenticities: historic case studies
41	Restoration or de-restoration? Two different concepts of presenting the authentic condition of ancient sculptures in the Collection of Classical Antiquities in 19 th -century Berlin <i>Astrid Fendt</i>
50	<i>The Child in the Womb in its Natural Situation</i> , a painted lead sculpture made for the anatomist William Hunter: a question of authenticity <i>Peter Black and William Murray</i>
60	The picture frame: knowing its place <i>Gerry Alabone</i>
70	Concepts of authenticity as related to a 15 th -century Florentine <i>cassone</i> panel in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London <i>Eowyn Kerr</i>
80	The authenticity of French furniture: interpretation and preservation issues <i>Stéphanie Rabourdin-Auffret</i>
88	Wallpaper reconstructions in historic interiors: balancing the aesthetic with authenticity <i>Jean-Baptiste Martin</i>
96	Examining ‘authenticity’ in two contemporary conservation projects in Scotland: Charles Rennie Mackintosh’s Dysart Kirk murals and Daniel Cottier’s painted decorative scheme at Cottier’s Theatre, Glasgow <i>Robert Wilmot</i>
106	The authenticity of heraldic arms on Olycan family portraits by Frans Mals: weighing the object vs. the image in restoration <i>Sabrina Meloni, Gwen Tauber and Alice Tate-Harte</i>
115	A reconstruction of Maerten van Heemskerck’s <i>De Calvarieberg</i> (1543): accuracy and visual interpretation <i>Charlotte Caspers and Kate Seymour</i>
125	A multifaceted approach to the study of Tudor portrait miniatures: a case study of the ‘Crocker’ miniatures <i>Katherine Coombs, Alan Derbyshire, Nicholas Frayling and Timea Tallian</i>
134	Issues surrounding the attribution of a Holbein drawing <i>Victoria Button</i>
143	Van Gogh’s brushstrokes: marks of authenticity? <i>Ella Hendricks and Shannon Hughes</i>
	Authenticities: contemporary case stories
155	Creamcheese: from disco to museum installation <i>Tiziana Caianiello</i>
165	‘The voice of things’: Koji Kamoji and authenticity in installation art <i>Monika Jadzinska</i>
174	Preserving installation art: hypothesis for the future of a medium in evolution <i>Marina Pugliese and Barbara Ferriani</i>
183	Ducamp under the hammer: iconoclasm, vandalism and authenticity <i>Dominic Paterson</i>
190	Authenticity in practice: an ethnographic study into the preservation of <i>One Candle</i> by Nam June Paik

- Vivian van Saaze
 199 Authenticity – a matter of time? Restoring *Glauben Sie nicht, dass ich eine Amazone bin* by Ulrike Rosenbach
 Cornelia Weyer
 208 Moving images, editioned artworks and authenticity
 Ariane Noël de Tilly
 217 The artist's role in installation and future display at the Gallery of Modern Art, Glasgow
 Polly Smith and Ben Harman
 227 Archivists meet artists: insights into authenticity
 John Roeder
- Authenticities: further considerations**
 237 'Is this real?' Authenticity, conservation and visitor experience
 Irit Narkiss
 246 Ontology, worldviews and authenticity
 Karel Boullart
 252 Authenticity and science: an ongoing relationship
 Spike Bucklow
 259 The 'paradigmatic art experience'? Reproductions and their effects on the experience of the 'authentic' artwork
 Rebecca Gordon

ARTICLES:

ROBYN SLOGGETT. Expanding the conservation canon: assessing cross-cultural and interdisciplinary collaborations in conservation. *Studies in Conservation* **54**, 3 (2009) 170-183.

Abstract: This paper explores some of the dilemmas that relate to the existence of collections of cultural material and efforts to preserve them. It examines issues that arise when multiple points of view are focused on the origins, ownership, custodianship and meaning of such material. Such an investigation is impossible without exploring the landscape in which cultural materials conservation has developed. In doing this it is necessary to identify the boundaries of the disciplinary territory that currently frame conservation practice, and to investigate the role of conservation at the edges of this terrain; the boundary knowledge of the discipline where interdisciplinary knowledge is developed and traded. This paper argues that conservation has an important contribution to make along the axis of broader social and humanitarian concerns, and that new disciplinary and cultural intersections are a critical part of contemporary conservation practice. It also discusses some strategies that may usefully strengthen the role of conservation beyond institutions, and support collaborations for cultural replenishment and continuity.

ISABELLE BRAJER. The Carlsberg Preparation: An early 20th century surface treatment for wall paintings in Denmark. *Zeitschrift für Kunsttechnologie und Konservierung* **23**, 1 (2009) 5-23.

Abstract: The Carlsberg Preparation was developed by the Danish conservator Eigil Rothe (active 1898 – 1929) over the course of many years in collaboration with several laboratories including the Carlsberg Brewery Laboratory (hence the name of the preparation). It was a complicated mixture of alkaline soap, oil, resin, casein, wax and camphor. The proportions and combination of these ingredients changed many times over the course of the two decades of its use. It was initially used as a surface treatment for wall paintings contaminated with soluble salts to create a barrier preventing their precipitation on the surface. It was also used as a preventive treatment on newly uncovered (and unsoiled) paintings, making the paint layer water-resistant and allowing easier soot removal in the future. But the most common use of the preparation was as a binding medium for retouching wall paintings.

PROCEEDINGS:

ART and SCIENCE Vol. VII, Proceedings of a special Focus Symposium on Art and Science held as part of the 21st international Conference on Systems Research, Informatics and Cybernetics August 3 –

7. 2009, Baden-Baden, Germany, ISBN 978-1-897233-20-7 from IAS (Office@IIAS.info and/or lasker@uwindsor.ca) (see summary of this meeting by Hiltrud Schintzel in this newsletter for contents of this publication).

Online journals :

CeROArt, issue 4, 2009. Les dilemmes de la restauration-Un choix et des valeurs, URL : <http://ceroart.revues.org>

All articles in this publication are of interest to the members of this working group.

e-conservation magazine, No. 12, December 2009 URL:<http://www.e-conservationline.com/>

reviews :

The 3rd Conservation-Restoration Workshop for the Artistic Components of Historic Monuments
October 14-16, 2009, Bucharest, Romania
by Anca Dina

articles:

Les dilemmes philosophiques de la conservation-restauration
by Pierre Leveau

commentaries:

"Let's Pin the 'Long Tail' on the Conservation Donkey"
by Daniel Cull,
<http://www.e-conservationline.com/content/view/836>

New online journal: Ge-conservación

Ge-Conservación is a periodical published by GEIIC (Grupo Español de Conservación/ Spanish Conservation Group of the International Institute for Conservation of Historic and Artistic Works) URL:<http://www.ge-iic.com> in association with the Duques de Soria Foundation. Its purpose is to contribute to the scientific development, dissemination and exchange of knowledge in the field of cultural heritage conservation and restoration.

The journal aspires to be a critical tool and will give priority to interdisciplinary approaches and reasoned criteria and methodologies. It is open to all persons whose articles are in keeping with the publication's objectives and characteristics. URL:<http://ge-iic.com/revista/>

Forthcoming Publications:

Postprints of the International Seminar in Hildesheim: Theories and Practice in Conservation of Modern Art: Reflections on the Roots and Perspectives, January 13-14, 2009. Ursula Schädler-Saub, editor. Published by the Hornemann Institute, forthcoming Spring 2010.

Postprints of the International Colloquium: Reflexe ou Reflexion ? Les Acteurs et le Processus Decisionnel Dans la Conservation-Restauration, organised by APROA-BRK/VIOE in Brussels 19-20 November 2009, Marjan Buyle, editor. Papers in the original languages (Flemish, French or English), all abstracts in English. Forthcoming mid 2010.

GENERAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

- In keeping with the new terminology adopted by ICOM-CC at the last Triennial Conference <http://www.icom-cc.org/242/about-icom-cc/what-is-conservation/>, the name of this working group has been changed from “Theory and History of Conservation-Restoration” to “Theory and History of Conservation”.
- Please note that the call for papers for the next Triennial Conference (2011 in Lisbon) will be announced soon.