



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

**NEWSLETTER NO. 16
FEBRUARY 2011**

COORDINATOR:

Isabelle Brajer
isabelle.brajer@natmus.dk

ASSISTANT COORDINATORS:

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

CONTENTS

LETTER FROM THE COORDINATOR	p. 3
INFORMATION/ REPORTS ON MEETINGS, CONFERENCES AND COURSES	
Impressions from the ICOM Denmark meeting - Ethics and Museums, Copenhagen, April 2010 by Isabelle Brajer	p. 4-5
Impressions from the symposium <i>Contemporary Art: Who Cares?</i>, Amsterdam, June 2010 by Katrine Segel	p. 5-7
Impressions of the 8th symposium on Art and Science at 22st Conference of the International Institute for Systems Research and Cybernetics, August 2010 by Hiltrud Schinzel and Karel Boullart	p. 8-12
Conservation and material culture – Reflections following the 23rd biennial IIC Congress, 20-24 September, 2010, Istanbul by Niccolo Caldararo	p. 12-13
Report on the symposium: The Restoration of Artworks in Europe from 1789-1815 – Practices, Transfers, Issues University of Geneva, October 1-2, 2010 by Isabelle Brajer	p.14-19

FORTHCOMING MEETINGS AND CONFERENCES, CALL FOR PAPERS p. 19-22

RECENT PUBLICATIONS AND REVIEWS OF PUBLICATIONS

Theory and Practice in the Conservation of Modern and Contemporary Art – Reflections on the Roots and the Perspectives
edited by *Ursula Schädler-Saub and Angela Weyer* p. 23

Art+Science. How scientific research and technological innovation are becoming key to 21st century aesthetics
by *Stephen Wilson* p. 24

A Laboratory for Art. Harvard's Fogg Museum and the Emergence of Conservation in America 1900-1950
by *Francesca Bewer* p. 24

Mixing and Matching: Approaches to Retouching Paintings
edited by *Rebecca Ellison, Patricia Smithen and Rachel Turnbull* p. 24-25

Books Will Speak Plain: A Handbook for Identifying and Describing Historical Bindings.
by *Julia Miller* p. 26

Slow Conservation by Sarah Staniforth p. 26

It's a Material World by Samuel Jones p. 27

CeROArt, issue no. 6 (2010) Horizons. First publications from young graduates in conservation p. 27-28

e-conservation magazine, No. 15 and 17 (2010) p. 29

GENERAL ANNOUNCEMENTS p. 29

LETTER FROM THE COORDINATOR

Dear friends and colleagues,

This triennial period is nearing its final phase. Preparations are underway for the 16th Triennial Meeting, which will take place September 19-23, 2011 in Lisbon. I hope to see many of you there. Many of you have sent papers, which are still in the process of peer reviewing. I estimate about 20 papers dealing with a wide range of topics will be included in the final program. The authors will be informed of the final selection in mid-April. A decision was made by the Directory Board and Working Group Coordinators to include more papers than at previous Triennial Meetings due to the overwhelming response to the call for papers, which resulted in an unprecedented amount of submitted abstracts. This, however, means that for the first time, there will be no printed publication. It will be replaced by a CD with all the papers in pdf format accompanied by a printed catalogue with all the abstracts. The possibility of 'print on demand' for an extra fee is still being investigated.

An important part of the session for the Theory and History of Conservation Working Group at Lisbon will be the business meeting. Here, we will discuss plans for the next triennial period, including the possibility of arranging an interim meeting. I thank those of you who expressed interest in organizing a round table discussion on the decision making process regarding contemporary art. This is one of the major topics of interest in this working group (with several papers presented at Lisbon), and we will discuss expanding group activities, possibly merging with other professional groups focusing on the special problems of conserving these types of objects. I also welcome any other ideas regarding future working group activities, maybe common research projects. Any topics you would like to discuss will be placed on the meeting agenda – just let me know in advance, so that I can make a business meeting plan.

The goal I set for this triennial period was activating the working group website, and in particular – the forum. I encourage those of you who have not yet visited the site at <http://www.icom-cc.org/forums/viewforum.php?f=24&sid=74b3be308be5e7702775b5af0d02f5af> to do so, and contribute your thoughts on any of the 20 topics under discussion, or start a new topic. I consider the forum as only moderately successful, despite the relatively high number of views, because member participation is rather low. Our working group is one of the large groups in ICOM-CC (currently 123 members) and most divers. There is a goldmine for discussion topics in this group (as seen by the response to the call for papers for Lisbon – 60 abstracts were submitted!) Share your thoughts and ideas with your colleagues. You need not write essays – shorter contributions are just as welcome. The forum is easy to use – it's intuitive when it comes to posting a text. But if any of you would like to post illustrations with your topics, I am more than willing to help you do this.

I hope to complete some other unfinished business regarding the website before the end of this triennial period. Inspired by Carole Dignard's page on the Ethnographic Collections Working Group website (see <http://www.icom-cc.org/82/Who%20Is%20in%20this%20Group?/>), I would also like to post similar information on the members of our group. I received a response to my survey from about 50% of the members of the Theory and History group, much too few to post statistically valid information. So, I will now be contacting the holdouts individually, and I hope to elicit enough responses to post the information on the website before the meeting in Lisbon. Most of the members who did respond did so immediately, and I thank you for this, and would like you to know the reason for the delay.

Finally, (Jep, here it comes – the pep talk) please remember that we are all members of this working group because of our common interest in theoretical and historical issues in our profession. More than any other working group in ICOM-CC there is an interweaving of interests uniting professionals of

different specialties. Let us tap this resource and learn from each other. Make the effort and participate actively in the forum. Send contributions to the annual newsletters. Think of how rewarding it is to inspire and help younger colleagues who are planting roots in the conservation profession. You have the opportunity to make your mark.

Very best greetings to you all,

Isabelle Brajer

REPORTS: MEETINGS AND CONFERENCES

Impressions from the ICOM Denmark meeting - Ethics and Museums, Copenhagen, April 2010

Isabelle Brajer (isabelle.brajer@natmus.dk)

In April 2010, a meeting devoted to the subject of ethics in relation to museums was organized by ICOM Denmark at the Copenhagen City Museum. It was unfortunate that this event coincided with the volcanic eruptions on Iceland, which prevented two of the speakers from participating. Nevertheless, the meeting was very interesting with a few formal presentations followed by a panel discussion and debate with extensive audience participation.

The meeting was organized by ICOM Denmark after many years of local debate regarding numerous cases touching on the 'grey zone' in museum ethics: placing monetary value on objects in museum collections; deacquisitioning and auctioning off objects in museum collections; and the return of objects acquired through historical war plunder to the lands of origin (in the case of Denmark this refers to objects taken from Sweden in the 17th century). Up to recently most of the debate regarding ethics in Danish museums focused on questions regarding the provenance of acquired objects. This subject became a pressing matter following the growing awareness of the connection between museum acquisitions in the West with the problem of preservation of objects of cultural heritage in developing countries marked by local strife and conflict. In keeping with developments in this area the original UNESCO convention on illegal trafficking from 1970 was supplemented in 1995 by a further set of guidelines in the UNIDROIT Convention on Stolen or Illegally Exported Cultural Objects. In a time where globalization has shortened the distance between developing regions and indigenous cultures with developed and industrialized nations, these guidelines provide a basis for ethical decisions for most museums.

A historical background providing the foundation for the general discussion was provided by Allissandra Cummins (President of ICOM), who presented an overview of the establishment of ethical rules, underscoring the role museums played in the development of social consciousness. For the first 20 years, ethics played no part in ICOM's organizational history, with no clear definition of the unwritten rules regarding professional behavior. Some museum organizations were forerunners in this area: the American Association of Museums, for example, was the first to establish rules of ethics for museum professionals in 1925. The worldwide political upheavals in 1968 were decisive in the establishment of ethical rules for ICOM. Demands were made for reform of traditional institutions, which restricted access to cultural heritage to the socially elite segment of society. These events were incipient for the establishment of museum's social consciousness, a subject on the agenda of ICOM's general assembly in 1971. One year prior to this, the dominating debate at the UNESCO general assembly in Paris was devoted to the subject of destruction and widespread plundering of objects of

cultural heritage, and lead to the adoption of UNESCO's *Convention on the means of prohibiting and preventing the illicit import, export and transfer of ownership of cultural property*. It set the minimal requirements for judicial and administrative rules that each country should implement to prevent illegal trafficking. This document was also accompanied by a statement that unless the museums meet their own responsibilities, UNESCO's efforts could not be fully effective. Thereby, the decisive role of museums regarding their collective responsibility in relation to societies worldwide was acknowledged.

The first ethical guidelines drawn up by ICOM in the early 1970s were *Ethics of Acquisition*. By 1980, these rules were considered to be too limited, and a revised and expanded version was adopted in 1986. It pertained to all issues in relation to the administration, research and exhibition of museum collections, and was further revised and ratified at the ICOM general assembly in Seoul in 2004. In its most recent version from 2006, the individual responsibilities are clearly defined for each activity. These ethical guidelines form the most explicit codex for museum behavior and have been generally accepted within the international museum world. They were instrumental in the following events:

- In November 2009, the *Holocaust (Stolen Art) Restitution Act* was passed in the United Kingdom, making it possible for national institutions to return art and objects of cultural heritage stolen during the Nazi years to their rightful owners.
- In October 2009 Taiwan withdrew their claim on two bronze statues that were stolen from mainland China 150 years earlier.
- In 2008, ca. 700 objects (including coins and jewelry) stolen during the American invasion in Iraq were sent back from Syria.
- In June 2009, France passed a law enabling the return of mummified Maori heads to New Zealand.

Several issues brought up by Allisandra Cummins became the focus of the debate. The case of objects caught by customs officers in Denmark and returned to their country of origin (Afghanistan) was questioned after it was revealed that these same objects were then presented as departing gifts to Danish soldiers finishing their tour of duty in Afghanistan. Several participants expressed opinions that there seemed to be a different set of principles regarding ethical issues pertaining to objects and those pertaining to human remains. Also playing a role in the ethical practices debate was the *way* by which the objects entered the museum collections, regardless whether they were objects or human remains: whether they were forcibly taken from the local inhabitants, whether they were passed on through many generations, or whether they were simply auctioned away by official parties who were disinterested in the objects at that time. An opinion uniting many participants was that museums do not own the objects in their custody – society has the rights of ownership. A question was brought up whether ethical issues regarding objects of cultural heritage were in reality hiding political agendas. For example, there was an issue addressing the ethical responsibility of the David Collection in Copenhagen, a museum world renowned for its Islamic art collection, regarding the exhibition of numerous images of the prophet depicted on artwork in its collection following the 2005 'Muhammad cartoon crisis', when 12 cartoons, most of which depicted the Islamic prophet Muhammad, were published in a Danish newspaper, sparking off widespread riots in several middle eastern countries. A concluding thread in the debate was that there was a need for a more open and honest reflection regarding our actions in a more global context, but that there often were no easy answers.

Impressions from the symposium *Contemporary Art: Who Cares?*, Amsterdam, June 2010.

Katrine Segel (katrine.segel@natmus.dk)

Did We Care about Contemporary Art?

In June 2010 the symposium *Contemporary Art: Who Cares?* (CA:WC?) was held in Amsterdam. The event was the long awaited aftermath to the 1997 success *Modern Art: Who Cares?* (MA:WC?). For

years participants have been looking forward to this event, hence expectations were high. This was emphasized by the amount of shown interest, and therefore organizers chose to raise the originally planned 450 seats with 100 extra. As the previous one CA:WC? was held at the Royal Tropical Institute (KIT). To make space for the extended number of participants live screenings of the lectures were shown in a room nearby the main auditorium. This decision was not ideal, because the feeling of being present where things happen was thereby removed. This could also be noticed by the lack of questions from the neighboring room after each lecture. Except for this detail KIT, with its beautiful auditorium, offered a wonderful setting for the event and probably the people who were granted an entry in the very last minute were happy about the decision.

Overall CA:WC? was very well organized. The schedule was meticulously followed by vigorous moderators. This year organizers of the symposium had chosen to focus on installation art. Studying the program this decision became clear, as a large number of the invited speakers (both to plenary lectures and parallel sessions) had been involved in the European research project *Inside Installation* (2004-07). A count also showed that almost half were from the Netherlands, while both Britain and Germany were very well represented.

Plenary lectures

An overall theme was given to the plenary lectures of each day. These were; 1. *Artistic Production and Collection Development*, 2. *Care and Conservation*, and 3. *Access, Presentation and the Public*. It can be discussed whether the given themes would actually cover what was being lectured. It did seem like a lot of importance was given to subjects like managing museum collections and the future role of institutions. Only the theme of the second day contained the word conservation. The explanation for this can be found on the CA:WC? web page. Here it is described that the organizers *aimed to accentuate the interdisciplinary nature of contemporary art conservation* by letting different kinds of professionals (museum directors, collectors, conservators, artists, art historians, artist assistants, scientists etc.) be heard. This was clearly reflected in the group of invited speakers. Unfortunately, it was not possible to find the same variety among the participants. The largest group of professionals was by far conservators. It was of course sad to notice the absence of other professionals, if the goal was to strengthen the interdisciplinary collaboration.

A lot of attention was given to the role of the museum. This seemed at odds with a crowd which consisted mainly of conservators, of whom some were students and others came from private workshops, and therefore not involved in museum practice on a daily basis. Maybe lectures such as Nicole Delissen's *Return on Investment* (on the initiatives taken by Stedelijk Museum in Amsterdam, while the museum has been temporarily closed), and Charles Esches *The Politics of Collecting Within the Possible Museum* would have been more appropriate among a group of museologists and/ or art historians. Also the discussion on how museums should maneuver in the 21st century (for instance by introducing the public to what is happening *behind the scenes*) is in my opinion not only relevant for contemporary art museums, but for all exhibiting institutions in general. This subject was not tedious, but perhaps time could have been spent in a different way?

Though distressing, it was therefore refreshing to hear conservator Marianne Parsch explain how she had to cut sculptures into smaller pieces for them to enter the exhibition space at the Goetz Collection in *Experience Made Me Rich and Now They are After Me*. Finally, there was a lecture with some action, whether you would agree or disagree with the described treatment.

Similar excitement was to be found in the lecture on Eija-Liisa Ahtila's installations and the physical changes they have gone through due to the problems of time-based media. Unfortunately the artist cancelled her appearance, which meant that the lecture had to be given by an assistant.

The best lecture seemed to be Peter van Mensch's cheerful *A Work of Art in a Museum is a Work of Art in a Museum*. Van Mensch talked about the object – originally a creation of an artist's idea, is transformed the minute it is institutionalised and later again confronted with the visitor. Therefore any decision concerning the object made by conservators, art historians and others has consequences for its significance, which is something we have to be aware of. That is why *'a tiger in a museum is a tiger in*

a museum and not a tiger'. Like many other conclusions drawn at CA:WC? this consideration was not new, but the lecture was delivered by van Mensch with an exuberant energy which resulted in a very stimulating moment.

Parallel sessions

Almost all parallel sessions were held at nearby locations and on the contrary to the main lectures these sessions turned out to be extremely interesting. Here each participant had the possibility of choosing a workshop or a lecture/ discussion which concentrated on a specific aspect of contemporary art. Inconveniently one could only attend three sessions.

Though personally I did not have any experience with conservation of performance art *How to Perform an Artwork* was an amazing eye-opener, and it is comforting to know that colleagues in other institutions (with inspiration from the dance world) have developed tools to document this art form. Likewise it was useful to participate in Judith Bosch's session *Interviewing Techniques*. Through very simple exercises and video recordings she introduced the participants to the typical mistakes made by the interviewer. Afterwards she pointed out methods on how to improve on communicating and questioning. One left the room with the feeling of having received a set of useful tools to help mastering this complex discipline.

Similar comments can probably be said about other parallel sessions, since a lively discussion and an uplifting atmosphere could be observed in the coffee breaks afterwards. It was as though the participants had been enriched, and had gotten something of what they came for.

Posters

As described, the plenary lectures only offered a limited focus on new treatment methods and scientific research. This lack became clear looking at the amount of interest in the 56 posters. Many participants expressed their disappointment that science and practical examples were excluded from the official program. It seemed as if the organizers had decided that new knowledge should only be presented through posters. A sad decision, as it is believed that many came to hear more about this subject.

Conclusion

The organizers' decision to focus on one art form alone and the overrepresentation of Dutch speakers meant that the variation within the lectures was not as wide as one could have hoped for.

Maybe it would have been more enticing if there had been a call for paper as a supplement to the invited speakers as this would have been an obvious event to present new voices.

Many conclusions drawn during the lecture series seemed to be repetitions of what has been discussed earlier for instance at MA:WC? Thereby not said, that preservation of contemporary art is facing a standstill. Repetitions only underline how difficult it is to maneuver within such a complex area, where every single case is unique and calls for special attention and interdisciplinary collaboration. While the importance of interdisciplinary collaboration was emphasized several times during the symposium, maybe we also have to seek for cooperation within our own profession. As one participant expressed conservators of contemporary art are constantly facing problems related to conservation of organic material. In the future it might be an idea to collaborate with conservators from other areas such as taxidermy?

But did we manage to get anywhere and *did we care about contemporary art*? The answer is; yes we definitely did. This was underlined solely by the amount of interest in the symposium. Much has already been achieved since the groundbreaking symposium MA:WC? was held in 1997. Today we have schools where student are trained to work with modern and contemporary art. Furthermore at many institutions it has become general practice to make artist interviews and seek for interdisciplinary collaboration, and in the wake of MA:WC? several international research projects focusing on contemporary materials and art forms have been launched. Also the importance of networking was underlined several times in the lectures and judging from the sound level in the breaks

participants worked hard on that throughout the symposium. So we are definitely getting somewhere!

Impressions of the 8th symposium on Art and Science at the 22nd Conference of the International Institute for Systems Research and Cybernetics Baden-Baden August 2– 6, 2010

Karel Boullart (karel.boullart@UGenr.be)

Hiltrud Schinzel (hiltrud.schinzel@t-online.de)

General tendencies:

The symbol of last year's IAS meeting was called 'the cloud,' the technical symbol of a network diagram and representation of the internet. This year we returned to this metaphor by stating that 'the sky got too cloudy.' In this context we refer to the lecture of **Prof. Jens Pohl**, Collaborative Agent Design Research Center, Cal Poly, San Louis Obispo, CA, USA, at the opening session *Solving the Data Deluge Problem*, because it is a paradigm for the view of many conference participants about the topical state of system research and the resulting problematic. Jens Pohl outlined that the main problem in systemizing and computerizing today is the data deluge and the need to move from data level to information management. Although we expect global connectivity and useful information and intelligent problem solving tools, we have scarce human resources in relation to the mountains of data. The consequence is a mess, because up to now only human beings can process data context. Furthermore, terminology overshadows meaning and this leads to errors. One consequence, for example, pertaining to computer/software IT, is that 30 – 50% of budgets are used to eliminate system failures. Noting the lacking link between un-contextualized data and the needed context (information, knowledge, wisdom), Prof. Pohl called for ontology-based contextualized and compatible systems, yet admitted that the most difficult field for finding contexts is culture and cultural differences. Anyway, with too much data the computer switches off and the human brain gets confused.

8th Art and Science Symposium:

Analogies could be noticed in lectures and discussions during the Art & Science session. Although the discussion during the small yet intense session was very lively, the 'input data' was too complex to be presented in short form here. What we can summarize is that we noticed not only a very acute desire and will to combine and merge in the artistic disciplines, which can be seen in multimedia and installation art, for instance. This tendency makes it often impossible to say whether a piece can be categorized as music or visual art. We too felt an enormous interest between our artistic and scientific participants to understand each other, to create helpful links between each other's research and to be animated by ideas from external context. The atmosphere, similar to recent past years, was non-hierarchical, which contributed to the liveliness and quality of discussion.

This, on the one hand, is a very positive tendency; on the other, the deep and enormous differences in thinking, language structure and use of names and terms are drastically highlighted. Translation obstacles exist not only between different languages, names and terms; they also have different meanings in different research fields as well. One example might be the term ontology, which was one of the most often used words in many IAS sessions, yet seldom explained what it meant in the specific context. Furthermore, even within a specific profession, a term might be used with different and/or changed meanings unknown to the user.

One striking example was the mentioning of the dual system form-content in the visual arts, whose term 'form' needed explanation for a chemist. It was not possible for persons from humanities to ad hoc explicate this traditional term to an 'innocent outsider' and to distinguish it from others, for example, the term shape. Although what is meant by 'form' in the visual arts might rather be called

‘shape’ in the related field of art music, ‘form’ for the visual art-expert had become such a matter of course, that explication raised a lot of ‘ontologically depressing self-reflection’.

Such annoying language barriers are not new and often led to the formulation of new terms. Still, in many cases, we might not yet be ready to use new terms in a satisfying way, which means, in a way, that the new terms are that simple and compelling to fit and spread accordingly. Terminological complexity, thus, is rapidly getting opulent and hardly manageable. To avoid a menacing Babylonian language chaos we need to counteract quickly.

On the other hand, artistic action still impresses in the same compelling way as ever, which proves that emotions are more fundamental and stable than circumstances. The interactive life performance by one of the meeting’s participants, **Leanne Zacharias**, was comparatively easy to understand and to join. The common experience was at the same time satisfying and harmonizing. This might be due to the direct access to music on an emotional level - in this interactive piece for all participating actor-listeners.

Although the lectures also showed that this coincidence of actor-observer is a great problem for analysis of many fields, for instance that of conservation research, the instantaneous excellence, intensity and elegance of such a communication including mutual emotional understanding is not surpassed. Compared to the self-evidence of great artistic works all scientific language as well as system-based analysis seems to be non-holistic, clumsy and inhibited. In this context, we may note that it might be very important for restorers to notice this fact and the resulting new chances for their profession where action and theory come together in a way comparable to the arts.

One other fact became obvious: value systems, philosophy - respectively metaphysics - have uniting qualities as well, if adapted in a processing way and when external influences (local circumstances etc.) are lacking as far as this is at all possible. In practice, this might mean that the protracted and tedious linearity involving data/information collection, analysis and knowledge, developing theories and methods leading to wisdom, and action/non-action can perhaps be overcome by introducing interactive short sequences of problem-adapted selective information analysis (theory – practice – review – reshaping theory – extended and/or selected analysis – practice and vice versa). Approaches in this fashion giving positive results have been achieved for many years by **Prof. Micarelli** and **Prof. Pizziolo** and are documented in all their lectures.

The discussions in the symposium verified the truth of the following quotations with which we started the session:

Art has a double face: expression and illusion, just like science has a double face: the reality of error and the phantom of truth.

René Daumal (1908-1944) French novelist and poet

Science has proof without any certainty. Creationists have certainty without any proof.

Ashley Montagu (1905-1999) British-born American anthropologist

To complement the impressions, we add some short notes on the lectures in alphabetical order of the speakers:

Summary of lectures:

In his lecture *Art and Ethics, Core and Periphery*, a follow-up of last year’s publication, **Prof. Dr. Em. Karel Boullart** (University of Ghent, Belgium) contended that art in stable and unstable cultural conditions tends to evolve within specific parameters. In stable contexts, art tends to its core - a synthesis of form and content, of event and thing, and of symbol and reality. This threefold unity, moreover, and the degree to which it is realised, guarantees the quality of the work. In unstable conditions, the unity tends to fragmentation: form or content, event or thing, symbol or reality. In morals and ethics something analogous happens: the ontological, lived ‘fullness’ of traditional morals

in stable conditions falls apart in autonomous and truncated ethical attitudes and theories, which manifest the same one-sidedness as appears in the fragmentation of art. And the author concludes: no work of art fails as much as ethics is wont to do.

In his lecture *Wondering about the Possibility of a Marvellous Exhibition, the Exhibition Itself Became Improbable*, **Dr. Guy Bovyn** (University College Ghent, Faculty of Fine Arts, Belgium) concentrated on the problem of exhibition, especially of art objects, and on the philosophical and cultural background of different paradigms of exhibition. He tackled the problem from a historical point of view, examining first the idea of the 'Wunderkammer', especially of the Italian Renaissance, and later the exhibition practices of the 17th and 18th century, which is the historical origin and ideological foundation of the dualism, if not the gap between subject and object, which characterises modernity. Dr. Bovyn contended there a recent tendency exists to return to a more subjective, integrative, associative and holistic way of proceeding (as in Florence in the Renaissance). By examining the notion of 'wonder', the author found in it the possibility of a synthesis: engagement and detachment are integral to the notion of wonder and can embody both stances at once.

In his lecture *Brief Notes on Gordon Pask, Architecture and Conversation Theory* **Prof. Dr. Gonçalo M. Furtado C. L.** (Oporto University, Portugal) presented the life and work of the British cybernetician Gordon Pask (1928-1996), who is not as well known as Prof. Furtado thinks he deserves. He concentrated on Pask's intellectual exchanges and endeavours, especially on his early involvement with architecture and most of all with his major scientific achievement, his so-called 'Conversation Theory' which deals in an original and synthetic way with knowledge and representation, arguing that 'conversation' is a central concept in cybernetics. Gordon Pask, the author concluded, is a seminal promoter of cybernetics in the arts.

In his lecture *The Resurgence of Culture and the Recovery of Artistic Consciousness: An Idemological Perspective*, which is a follow-up of last year's contribution, **Dr. Frank R. Hassard, Ass. Prof.** (IIAS UK, freelance writer and adviser regarding intangible heritage) further developed his idea of 'Idemology', thereby putting conservation problems of art and the relation of art and science in a more general cultural framework: a new agenda embracing social inclusion, cultural cohesion, the legitimacy of institutions, cultural representation and the ideas of ownership and identity through participation. Specific problems of conservation etc. in this way can be embedded in a broad, globalising cultural perspective, the characteristics and variations of which are vital to cultivating the sense of continuity, belonging and meaning essential to the transmission of cultural identity within the global sphere. Hence, conservation and restoration practices can be based on a more solid and less isolated basis.

In her lecture *Reconsidering Authenticity. Care of Conceptual and Installation Art*, **Dr. Monika Jadzinska** (Academy of Fine Arts, Warsaw, Poland) reconsidered 'authenticity' in conservation and restoration, especially in relation to conceptual and installation art. The notion is not only complex but needs reconsideration, most prominently when these recent art forms are considered. Inspired by M. Heidegger's and R. Ingarden's work, some tentative innovations were presented and argued for, especially concerning the change of attitude and the aims of care in conservation. Moreover, based on the work of Ch. S. Peirce, an innovative semiotic system research program was proposed. Dr. Jadzinska concluded that the basis of the theoretical framework and of practical conservation requires not only professionalism, but knowledge of the wide sweep of the cultural context of the work, essential for interpretation and technical skill and a 'vivid contact' with the artwork and its author as well.

In her lecture *Contemplating Integration: Modern Art and the Conservation System*, **Dr. Iris Kapelouzou** (PhD Candidate, Royal College of Art, London, UK) started with the wide recognition within the conservation community that traditional conservation ethics is inadequate to deal with the practical demands posed by modern and, especially, contemporary art forms. She contended that the adoption of a systems approach towards the field will assist in clearly defining the situation, in clarifying the ethical conundrums and in providing solutions to the problems at hand. In this

perspective, conservation's normative frame will be conceptualized as a regulator or control mechanism. Such an approach, moreover, will avoid the breaking up of the field in different domains with separate guidelines.

In his lecture *Architecture as a Skill between Art and Science*, **Tarkko Oksala** (Helsinki University of Technology, Ass. Prof. IAS Finland) also examined the relation of art and science, but from the more general perspective of architecture, which is, on the one hand, a science-based skill, and, on the other, an art in the full sense, as the author contended. In a first move, the history of the relationship between the two and its transformations were examined succinctly from Antiquity, especially Aristotle and Vitruvius, up to the Middle-Ages, the Renaissance and Modern thought. Finally, with reference to the solutions of, respectively, Frank Lloyd Wright and Alvar Aalto, the author discussed whether architecture gets its 'action-model' from science or vice versa, and that architecture is, although scientifically informed, not a science. In Goethe's words: 'grey is all theory, green the golden tree of life'.

In their lecture *The LAND-CITY-SCAPE. From the Contemporary Shattered Living Context to Land-City-Scape as Art-and-Science Participative Processes: Thinking among People, Creating New Ethic-Aesthetic Contexts*, **Prof. Dr. G. Pizziolo** (University of Florence) and **Prof. Dr. R. Micarelli** (PoliTechnic, Milano, Italy) continuing their research presented in previous lectures in the Art & Science symposium, further developed, in a general and foundational way, their perspective on our contemporary fragmented condition. Implementing an innovative art-science approach (based on and justified by recent holistic developments in different sciences, e.g. psychology, anthropology, biology, chemistry and philosophy, architecture and urban design) the authors promoted a synthetic, polyfocal and pluralistic participative process of social and relational decision-making, whereby the concept of 'land-city-landscape' is shown to be a valid and life-giving alternative to traditional rigid and authoritative approaches.

In her lecture *Tacit Knowledge – Tacit Communicating*, **Dr. Hiltrud Schinzel** (Magister Artium, Ass. Prof. IAS Germany) was concerned with aspects of artistic creation explicitly connected to the body, i.e. with a kind of knowledge, as M. Polanyi – who introduced the notion as 'tacit knowledge' – elaborated, which lacks verbal and/or theoretical structure. This kind of 'knowing how' is essential for visual arts, music, dance and acting, but also, the author contends, for conservation and restoration as a special craft. The discipline, moreover, by its very nature, intimately mediates between art and science, and hence is highly suitable to compare the processing of subjectivity in craft and the rule-bound procedures of scientific research. Both were investigated and some important consequences drawn. In this way, the differences between artistic and scientific thinking were elucidated further.

In her lecture *Rethinking A New Complex Science and Care of the Heritage of Visual Art*, **Prof. Dr. Iwona Szmelter** (Academy of Fine Arts, Faculty of Conservation-Restoration of Works of Art, Warsaw, Poland) proposed a new conceptual framework in order to analyse the theoretical foundations and the ethical and aesthetic principles of conservation of modern and contemporary art. On the one hand, she succinctly described the specifics of the relationship between the history and care of cultural heritage, on the other, she referred to theories of outstanding philosophers, such as R. Ingarden, H.G. Gadamer and U. Eco: the idea being that a holistic approach can be achieved regarding the problems of conservation and restoration. She illustrated this stance with the work of the artists M. Balka and C. Bednarski. She concluded that it is possible to create a unitary foundation for both the theory of conservation of traditional disciplines of art and the new trends of the 20th and the 21st century: heritage is tangible and intangible at the same time.

In their lecture *Manors and Villas in Croatia. Addendum for Selection of the most Valuable Croation Manors*, the authors, **Prof. M. Valcic** and **Prof. V. Morovic** (College of Business and Business Administration, Zagreb, Croatia) tried to theoretically establish, justify and practically implement a systematic and putative exhaustive series of criteria, e.g. from historical importance to artistic/aesthetic value, in order to, as far as possible, objectively rank cultural monuments – in this

case manors and villas in Croatia – for eventual preservation and restoration. They hope the proposed criteria will help avoid endless discussion on the matter and eventually will focus the authorities - local and national - on the most valuable monuments and to stimulate investors to renovate and reuse the less valuable ones, which, according to the set of criteria, are worth preserving nevertheless.

Containing 13 contributions - 12 lectures and one interactive performance – the symposium represented the work of colleagues from 10 countries: Belgium, Canada, Croatia, Finland, Germany, Italy, Poland, Portugal, United Kingdom and USA. All lectures, with the exception of two: *A Natural Metaphysics Grounded in the Emergence of Life and Mind* by **Prof. Dr. Jerry Chandler** (Research Professor, Krasnow Institute for Advanced Study, George Mason University, Fairfax, VA, USA) and the performance *Music for Spaces: Findings from the Front-Lines* by **Prof. Dr. Leanne Zacharias** (Brandon University, Canada), are printed in the preprints, which are available under the title ART and SCIENCE Vol. VIII, Proceedings of a special Focus Symposium on Art and Science held as part of the 22nd international Conference on Systems Research, Informatics and Cybernetics August 2 – 6, 2010, Baden-Baden, Germany, ISBN 978-1-897233-81-8 from IIAS – P.O. Box 3010, Tecumseh, ON N8N 2M3, Canada ATTN: Prof. George E. Lasker

Conservation and material culture – Reflections following the 23rd biennial IIC Congress, 20-24 September, 2010, Istanbul.

Niccolo Caldararo
Director and Chief Conservator
Conservation Art Service
P.O. Box 77570,
San Francisco, California 94107
Caldararo@aol.com

I want to share my feelings concerning the IIC Congress in Istanbul. I thought it was one of the best I've attended. The organization by the IIC staff was flawless and the Vista travel people in Istanbul made everything work. The conference setting was first rate and the Sabanci Centre people were effective and gracious. The museums demonstrated a professional staff and dedication.

I found Professor David Lowenthal's Forbes Prize Lecture to be moving and timely, especially how he tied together the history of conservation of art, sites and antiquities with the conservation movement of the environment. While he summarized the achievements of the past 200 years or so, he did not avoid describing the losses and failures in the context of world disasters, human created and natural. At times it seemed his lecture could have been titled, "A world so angry it can only break itself," as he related attempts to save buildings and artefacts in the midst of war, ethnic hatred and destruction.

A familiar tale ran through his talk, since what we do can be described as the gathering of threads long dispersed by chaos and strife. Each of us a generation, perhaps two lifetimes or less is separated from the smashing of a people and the loss of a way of life. We see today these stories daily on the news or in our work, where a group long established in a place is forced to flee, or sent to live like vagabonds over land and sea in search of a once full way of living, a life remembered in fragments that haunts us and then our children with the fantasy of a life rich in meaning now gone. The elegant message David crafted placing conservation of art, cultural property and the environment in a parallel view is consonant with our purpose. Without a respect for each other, knowledge of history and an understanding of the environment, only brutality can follow.

David's talk eloquently related the dilemma we find ourselves in as professionals and as citizens of the world. As the conference went on his comments and the interaction of the Round Table "Between

"Home and History" reverberated in conversation each day and evoked a number of impressions among people I met who shared their experiences. To me David's talk and the general demeanor of the discussions after, recalled a Native American woman who told a group of visitors I was among at another conference touring the Smithsonian a commonly told tale. Like that made popular by Ruth Benedict in her *Patterns of Culture* book of the "Broken Cup," this tale explained why Native Americans fought each other and were dissatisfied, filling their lives with disorder. The explanation was the loss of material culture and the common understanding of how to make things, that since Columbus not only was the old world gone and a new one took its place that was chaotic, but that the common purpose was lost. Like the "Broken Cup" story, the lack of a means to construct a world that makes sense is lacking, but in both stories the teller remarks that each people is given a whole cloth of knowledge to sustain them and the world. In one tale it is the blanket that protects, in the other it is the cup that holds the generations together and in each, without this unifying factor, the frustration turns to fury and violence against others and themselves.

In David's talk and later discussions the idea that techniques of making things, knowledge of how to do has been lost was common. The connections between generations have, as Margaret Mead said in her books and films on the "generation gap," been torn apart without a means of bridging once naturally made bonds. So much of what we do is to recreate how things were done. Often I and my colleagues are engaged in speaking with the last person who can make a certain tool for an obsolete process and find how it was done.

In America today we hear complaints that we no longer make things that the world wants to buy, and that ignores the vast computer application market and programming industry, but it does have a ring of truth, for not only the lost skills, but the vocations that made up whole communities of craftspeople who worked and taught how to do things. In 1987, I published an article in the JAIC on the history of archaeological conservation and the application of conservation to ethnographic collections. A seasoned conservator chastised me that writing articles did not make one a conservator, nor did the reading of articles and books on conservation. This, to him, simply confused people, distracted them from techniques and methods of the past and the culture context of the artisans. In his mind it was the making of objects over and over that taught one how to restore something. More than that, he argued that it was not important what we did as conservators, but how we did it. The fact that we could restore was what affected people, that even if they were not interested in the objects of our work, the existence of our efforts affected them in that we tried to relearn how to make the world whole again. At the time I thought that made us too special and important, but when I was informed of the Sabanci Museum's project to teach children about the objects in museums, archaeology and the use of artefacts in people's lives, it reminded me of another conversation.

Some years ago when I was working on a project in Hupa, we were asking the elders where we could take samples from the Jump Dance ceremonial objects to test for pesticides. These objects had been away from this people for over 100 years in museums. One elder told me that they were happy, they had come home. Thinking he meant the Hupa were happy, I responded clumsily and he corrected me that the objects were the ancestors come home and that we, the scientists were the blind, lost wanderers. Before us were his peoples' ancestors come home in his eyes to show the way to healing their world, but that we lived without knowing either that we once had a way or how to find it. Their elders wept at the sight of the deerskin and humming bird feather objects, spoke to them softly and sang to them what had happened since they had been home. At that moment I realized that we may never repair the threads to the dismembered robes of the world's scattered peoples but in trying we might stop the power of a world so angry that it can only break itself.

[Coordinator's comment: David Lowenthal's Forbes Prize Lecture is published in the most recent issue of *Studies in Conservation* (Volume 55, **Number 4** 2010)]

Report on the symposium: The Restoration of Artworks in Europe from 1789-1815 – Practices, Transfers, Issues University of Geneva, October 1-2, 2010

Isabelle Brajer (isabelle.brajer@natmus.dk)

It was quickly obvious that this meeting, taking place in the center of Europe, was dominated by polyglots. The presentations were given either in French or English (with no translations provided), and the discussions slipped from language to language – French, English, German and Italian – often changing mid-sentence striving for ease in communication at the cost of comprehension for the non-polyglots. For a person with an Anglo-Saxonian/Slavic linguistic profile (I was probably one of a handful present with a poor grasp of spoken French) the general feeling of frustration was inevitable, understanding enough to know that interesting and important information was being presented, but not enough to be able to relate it in a summary. Therefore, I thank those authors who shared their notes with me to make this summary possible.

The first paper, *The Marin affair: a polemic asserting a deontology*, presented by **Claire Gerin-Pierre** (co-author **Natalie Coural**, both representing C2RMF) set the stage for the historical period, describing a specific case, which is historically significant, as it resulted in one of the first documents addressing ideological issues of restoration.

At the end of December 1797, the politician Anthelme Marin (a deputy to the Council of Five Hundred, the lower house of legislature) accused the administration of the Louvre of negligence regarding the conservation and restoration of works of art: paintings were supposedly stored in disarray in corridors and stairwells and humid storerooms, and misguided interventions by restorers had permanently damaged priceless masterpieces. This controversy erupted during a hectic period with works of art from Napoleon's systematic confiscation of many collections, particularly in Italy, coming and going in large numbers. The Minister of Interior Department named a commission composed of 31 artists and experts to examine Marin's charges point by point. Following the investigation, a report was published justifying the work of the administration and the restorers employed in the Louvre. This report was diffused throughout Europe on order of the minister in order to cast a positive light on the value of the work of the administration of the Republic. It was a response to the widespread indignation of the spoliation of Italy, justifying France's ideological right to the booty because of negligence of the owners who possessed them before confiscation. The seized paintings were judged in dire need of attention, and a pattern quickly evolved whereby the paintings would be restored quickly upon their arrival to the Louvre before going on public display. Apart from addressing specific charges by Marin, this report also contained a more general section, which presented the first broad philosophical outline regarding restoration in France. The commission put forth general questions about restoration and answered them in depth, presenting its ideas on the subject. The questions also tackled technical problems, such as the causes of degradation, techniques of remounting, the protective role of varnish, as well as more significant remarks on the need or not for restoring works, and on the competence of restorers. For the first time, a public institution exposed and justified its choices regarding restoration.

The nature of this polemic was very political (Marin was a friend of the painter Jacques-Louis David, who had aligned himself with the political regime of Napoleon). It was important to show that not only was France capable of looking after these works of art, but as a result of their confiscation and restoration, the paintings were given a new lease on life. Had this not happened they would have deteriorated past the point of repair. Marin's accusations were taken very seriously. Justifying its conduct, the museum promptly exhibited one of the most important paintings confiscated from Italy: Raphael's Foligno Madonna, together with a complete report on the restoration – a rare and new example of a restoration made public.

The presentation by **Cathleen Hoeniger** (Queen's University, Kingston) - *Placing the Napoleonic Desire to Detach Raphael's Stanze Frescoes in Context* – focused on the sequestration of frescoes. During the Napoleonic occupation of Italy at the end of the 18th century thousands of works of art

were forcibly removed to Paris. The pillage, motivated by greed, was not only limited to movable works of art and objects of cultural heritage, but numerous wall paintings, among them Raphael's *School of Athens* were earmarked for detachment and transfer. The technique of transferring paintings practiced by the French restorers Robert and Jean-Michel Picault (both on easel and wall paintings) was regarded with naïve enthusiasm by influential persons connected to Diderot. The procedure was embraced because knowledge of treating flaking paint by consolidation was limited or non-existent at that time. The transfer technique was an extension of Diderot's interest in documenting crafts as part of his promotion and support of the process of industrialization. This drive resulted in experimental approaches to painting restoration, with French restorers willing to execute experimental procedures. The poor condition of Raphael's Stanze frescoes, deteriorated due to humidity, was used as proof of poor caretaking on the part of the Italians, giving the French an extra excuse to plan their detachment and transfer to Paris. The French experts were aware of the risks involved with this drastic procedure but conveniently overlooked them. The Italian restorers were more cautious, as seen in the case of the Loggia of Psyche in Villa Farnesina in Rome, where T-shaped nails were driven into the painting to anchor the deteriorating plaster instead of detaching it. In the case of Daniele da Volterra's *Deposition*, an unsuccessful transfer attempt by stacco a massello technique (transfer of painting together with the wall) was halted when the ceiling started to cave in. In 1806, the Italian restorer Pietro Palmaroli was called in to save the painting. When he proceeded with caution he was accused of stalling by the French. In 1828, the French were still trying to take this fresco, but it remained in its original location at Trinita dei Monti.

In her talk *The omitted restoration of the antique statues from Berlin in Paris*, **Astrid Fendt** (Antikensammlung, Staatliche Museum, Berlin) addressed the issue of the non-restoration of the antique statues removed from Berlin during the Napoleonic campaigns and taken to Paris. Astrid Fendt presented a case story which balances the numerous examples of experimental and drastic interventions carried out on sequestered works in restoration studios in France at the beginning of the 19th century with an example of restraint. In the course of the French 'art robbery' under Napoleon in 1806/7, innumerable works of art were taken from the Prussian king's collection to Paris, where they remained until their restitution in 1814/15. Among the sequestered works were such important and famous antique sculptures, as the bronze statue 'The Praying Boy', (currently a major piece in the Altes Museum in Berlin), and the 'Family of Lycomedes' another very well known work consisting of eleven figures, depicting Achilles dressed in woman's clothing hiding among the daughters of Lycomedes. The extremities of the figures, esp. the heads had been added by students at the French Academy in Rome before the work of art was brought to Prussia. The head of Lycomedes, in fact, is the image of the famous Baron Philipp von Stosch, the German archaeologist who lived in Italy (and funded Winckelmann's work). The statues taken from the Prussian collection had functioned as decorations in castles and gardens. Already in the beginning of the 19th century, art scholars and archaeologists knew about the non-authentic content of these sculptures. Upon arrival to Paris, the sculptures did not undergo a de-restoration process, and the Baroque additions remained intact. Taken to the restoration studio for sculptures in the Louvre, they were placed under the care of Bernard Lange and Mariano Giosi, who restricted treatment to small damages and instabilities that occurred during the transport to France. Napoleon wanted the statues ready for public viewing shortly after they arrived to France. Displayed as trophies of war in the 'Room of Victory' and the 'Room of Diane', it was obvious that political issues outweighed the need for scientific treatment of the sculptures.

Claudia Keller's (University of Zurich) talk entitled *The Spectator's Hurt Feeling – Johann Heinrich Meyer's Critical Discussion of Restoration* presented the hitherto uninvestigated figure of Johann Heinrich Meyer (1760-1832), Goethe's friend and advisor in the field of art. Meyer's attitudes toward restoration are recorded in a series of essays, mainly *Ueber Restauration von Kunstwerken*, published in Goethe's periodical *Propyläen* in 1799. The essay contains a detailed theoretical reflection on restoration, including a discussion of various methods of protecting and restoring ancient sculptures, different types of paintings as well as copper engravings. Regarding fragmental works of art, particularly sculptures, Meyer wrote: "...*beholders will fix their attention on the beauty of the forms, because they must make an effort to add the missing parts in their minds, in order to contemplate the imagination of the whole. For someone who is unpracticed, it may well be that any restoration is*

welcome, because it excuses him from making this effort, but if the restoration is wrong, and changes the original meaning and character of the whole, then the result is internal ambiguity and contradiction in the work, which must necessarily be detrimental to the formation of taste.” Meyer was aware that the viewer might be disturbed when no additions were made to fragmentary sculptures. In his essay *Königliches Museum zu Berlin* published in Goethe’s *Über Kunst und Altertum* in 1821-22, Meyer considers the offended “feeling of the beholder” when parts of the face, such as the nose, the lips or the chin, are missing. However, he also points out that unsatisfactory restorations can cause a “discord in the whole”. Summarizing Meyer’s contributions to the debate about restoration of works of art, Keller names Meyer’s idea of the main principle of restoration as refraining from the creation of an illusion, which hides the difference between the past and the present; rather, the temporality of the artwork should be clearly revealed, as it forms the basis for the imaginative completion through which the viewer copes with his desire for the past. [all quotes translated from German by C. Keller]

Claudia Keller’s presentation was followed by two talks describing the impact of Napoleon’s campaigns on conservation of paintings in Austria. The first was given by **Natalia Gustavson** (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna) *Retracing the Restoration History of Viennese Paintings in the Musée Napoléon (1809-1815)*. Despite precautions taken by Viennese authorities to prevent seizure of artworks by French, by relocating important paintings to outlying villages, 420 paintings were nevertheless sequestered from the Imperial Gallery at the Belvedere Palace, packed in wooden crates and shipped off to Paris, where they arrived in 1809. This drastic process took a toll on many artworks. Notably, Ruben’s monumental Ascension of the Virgin was cut into 3 pieces, frame and all. Parisian restorers were confronted with immense problems due to inappropriate transport and storing, and had to prepare the objects for exhibition in a short time. Current examinations of the objects combined with archival research have identified procedures carried out by French: lined paintings received an extra coating of lead white paint on the back; early examples of cradling were identified; and numerous transfers from panel to canvas were also carried out. The paintings were restituted after Napoleon’s defeat in 1815 (with the exception of 40 paintings which had been relocated to smaller museums outside Paris, and which only recently returned to Vienna). Upon their return to Vienna, many of the paintings had to be re-treated (the Rubens painting was probably reassembled after it returned). Research has shown that the methods used by the Viennese restorers did not differ much from those used by the French, only the materials were different.

Alice Hoppe-Harnoncourt (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna) broadened the picture of Viennese restoration practice with her talk *The Restoration of Paintings at the Beginning of the 19th Century in the Imperial Gallery of Vienna*. She also stressed the importance of combining archival research with examination of the object, as details about conservation procedures were seldom found in archives. Interventions, however, could be reliably dated when combining observations with historical knowledge. Alice Hoppe-Harnoncourt presented the respective directors of the Imperial Gallery, and the conservation activities taking place during their leadership. During Joseph Rosa’s period (1772-1804) the Imperial Collection was moved to the Belvedere Palace, reorganizing it chronologically and regionally. Many of the paintings were refitted into different frames (oval shapes were extended to fit into rectangular frames). Many of these refitting were done for aesthetic purposes only. For example, a strip of cloth was added to the left side of a male portrait by Cranach for the purpose of centering the figure, while leaving the companion piece – a female portrait – unaltered. Particularly trying was the period under the directorship of Heinrich Füger (1806-1818), when paintings were evacuated five times. The demand on the restorers was enormous upon restitution of the collection after Napoleon’s defeat. Records show that restorers treated about nine paintings a day to prepare them for public viewing at the Belvedere Palace. Joseph Rebell was the Director of the Imperial Gallery in the years 1824-28. Funds were allocated for the specific purpose of hiring Italian restorers for the treatment of Italian paintings in the collection (however, there is no real evidence that this happened). The work in the conservation studio was divided (as was commonly done at that time) into two parts: work on the support was carried out by carpenters, some of whom became very skilled in cradling operations; cleaning, varnishing and retouching was done by trained artists. Rebell also installed a central heating system with heated air piped in from the cellar, replacing the stoves in the individual galleries. Rebell’s successor, Johan Peter Kraft (1828-1856) realized that the dry warm air was damaging works

of art and had the apertures closed so that temperatures remained under 10 °C. There was a separate building referred to as the conservation laboratory at the Belvedere, but it was probably used for preparation of varnishes (due to the fire hazard). Evidence shows that the treatments were actually carried out in the galleries, or in adjacent rooms.

The presentation by **Mariam Nikogosyan** (The Grabar Art Conservation Centre, Moscow) *The Restoration of Paintings at the Imperial Hermitage (St. Petersburg) at the Beginning of the 19th Century* gave a rare insight on early developments in the conservation of easel paintings in Russia. With the institutionalization of Catherine II's private collection at the end of the 18th century, a restoration studio was created at the Hermitage. Developments in how this studio was organized and who was responsible for the caretaking of the collection were a result of the decisions of the official custodian of the paintings department, Franz Ivanovitch Labenski (a painter by profession). As in many other countries in Europe at that time Italian conservators were considered unsurpassable in the treatment of Italian paintings, but Labenski was dissatisfied with the quality and the costs of bringing in foreigners to work in Russia, so he hired Andrej Filipovitch Mitrokin (1766-1845), who is regarded as the Father of Russian conservation, and whose influence still lingers to this day. Labenski was familiar with the new techniques in lining, cradling and transferring being practiced in France at that time, and encouraged Mitrokin to implement them. Mitrokin became a specialist in these techniques, modifying them with local innovations, such as the use of isinglass mixed with honey. In the 1820s, the Hermitage conservation studio was manned by several professionals. Mitrokin founded a school to promulgate his methods. The apprentice level lasted 6 years, after which one became an assistant restorer for a period of 10 years before achieving the level of restorer. In reality, however, many of Mitrokin's students worked at apprentice level for 20 years due to lack of position openings - they had to wait until restorers retired or died to advance professionally. Mitrokin wrote down his methods and procedures in a notebook, which survived until the middle of the 20th century, but is now unfortunately lost. Despite this, his procedures for lining, cradling and transferring (panel to canvas) are deeply ingrained in modern Russian conservation practice.

The paper presented by **Capucine Lemaître** (Université de Rennes) dealt with mosaics (*First safeguards of ancient mosaics in France: genesis and development of a practice*). The history of restoration of mosaics emerges in France with the concept of inheritance and the feeling of a heritage common to all citizens, which occurred shortly after the Revolution. But another source also springs from the passionate feelings stirred by the Italian archaeological discoveries, touching erudite European travellers at the beginning of the 18th century. The diffusion of knowledge was carried out by the means of exchanges and publications, which the antique dealers and scholars shared, gradually initiating an interest in the vestiges preserved on the French territory and sparking a desire to preserve them. The cases of two local scholars, who were pioneers in the study and conservation of archaeological patrimony in their area, preserve the first reflexions about the restoration of mosaics as privileged witnesses of an ancient time. These scholars were Pierre Schneyder (1733-1814), who was the first director of the museum in Vienne (Isère) and François Artaud (1767-1838), who assembled the first French collection of ancient mosaics at the Palace of Arts in Lyon. The implementation of the first practices of restoration and the development of cultural policies supported by the elected municipal officials can be followed by the activities of these two men. When Pierre Schneyder invented a technique of dismantling mosaics, which was prone to a number of risks, François Artaud felt compelled to restrain him by calling upon the knowledge of a mosaic artist from Rome, Francesco Belloni, who was trained at the mosaic workshop at the Vatican, and who immigrated to France shortly after the Revolution. Here, he was charged by Jean Chaptal, a technical chemist and statesman, with founding the first school of mosaics in 1801. Thus, in the absence of local expertise, France inherited the Italian techniques which were practised until the end of 19th century by Italian mosaic artists established on the territory of France.

The paper presented by **Janusz Krawczyk** (University of Torun) focused on the question of the authenticity of pieces of furniture and problem of their conservation in the first Polish museum in Pulawy.

The end of the 18th and the beginning of the 19th centuries was a time of political and social

ruptures in the history of Poland. In the face of the dismemberment of the country, the Princess Izabela Czartoryska, a great and impassioned national patriot, also interested in European arts and literature, decide to create a museum, which she intended to become a 'Temple of the Memory.' The Temple of the Sibyl opened in 1801, as the first museum in Poland. It contained objects of sentimental importance pertaining to the glories and miseries of human life. The material history of the objects exposed in this museum is of great interest; it makes it possible to clarify the relationship between the way in which one perceived them and the practices of their conservation and their exposition. The paper focused on a tiny room devoted to the pieces of furniture. These formed a relatively homogeneous corpus from the point of view of the constitutive matter (wood) and their primary utility, but one can divide them into three groups according to the roles which they played in the museum.

The first group contained pieces of furniture, which fulfilled certain utilitarian functions: they supported or contained other collector's items. Pieces of furniture exhibited especially for their age value and their beauty made up the second group. They were admired as works of art. The third group was composed of furniture chosen due to their connection to the life of important historical persons. Contrary to the furniture in the first two groups, the values of the third group were founded on their authenticity. While being referent with the past, they played the role of intermediary between living persons and the geniuses of the past. While the pieces of furniture of the first two groups were treated with the artisanal manner which resulted from a long tradition of repairs, restorations and modifications, the objects of the third group demanded a search for solutions regarding their conservation.

The case studies of two pieces of furniture from the third group bought in 1790 (the chair of Shakespeare from Stratford-upon-Avon, and the chair of Rousseau acquired from his house on the island of Saint-Pierre) generate reflection on the technical and deontological issues characteristic for the period in question. In respect for authentic physical substance and symbolic significances connected with it, the remainders of wood from these chairs were placed into two bronze caskets.

This paper seeks to clarify the sources of inspiration for the particular solutions employed in the different ways of presentation in the furniture room. It invites reflections on the relations which the Princess maintained with Alexandre Lenoir and Vivant Denon. Also worth reflecting on is the impact of Christian tradition and particularly the worship of the holy relics, making it possible to establish a comparison between the two caskets in Pulawy containing fragments of chairs used by important historical figures with the bronze reliquary in Rome, executed in the years 1657-1666 according to the project of Bernini, containing remainders of St. Peter's pulpit.

The paper presented by **Francesca Lui** (Università degli Studi di Bologna), *The school of Bologna examined. Transfers, restorations and protective measures on works of art in the age of Napoleon (1796-1815)*, focused on local efforts to combat destruction of cultural heritage during the Napoleonic occupation.

Bologna, the city of the Dominican Guido Reni and Francesco Albani, became the seat of the Clementine Academy in 1710, which can be regarded as unusual for the 18th century with regard to its attitude about the conservation of works of art. Based on the instructions of the Bolognese painter Giulio Cesare Malvasia (*The images of Bologna. Paintings, Sculptures, Architecture*, 1686, which was re-published several times during the following century), numerous interventions and transfers were carried out on works of art in churches and private collections in the city.

From June 1796, Bologna, the second capital of the Papal States, was disrupted by the events of the Napoleonic occupation, which had many consequences for the imposing artistic inheritance of the city due to the suppression of churches and religious institutions, and of the consequent spoliation of the works of art, which were preserved there. An example is the sequestration of the painting by Raphael, Saint Cecilia, removed in 1798 from the church of San Giovanni in Monte and sent to Paris with about thirty other works representing the School Bologna in the Parisian National Museum. The famous panel by Raphael was exposed in 1798 in the *Salon Carré* in the Louvre. Just as the Madonna di Foligno, which was transferred to a canvas support in 1802, the painting Saint Cecilia underwent a similar treatment, the irreversible alteration of the support was carried out in 1803 by François-Toussaints Hacquin.

Shortly after the loss of the most famous works of Bolognese art, transferred to Paris, a commission of members of the Clementine Academy undertook a series of measures for the safeguard

of the artistic inheritance removed from their places of origin and transferred to new sites: it is carried out not only an inventory of the panels, but also experts' descriptions of their state of conservation and comments on the need for urgent restorations. On January 16, 1797, a law is passed formally prohibiting the cleaning of 'tables publiques' [panels considered to be public art] to prevent their damage, a problem heretofore.

The number of fabrics of ecclesiastical provenance arriving between 1810 and 1812 to the old Jesuit monastery of St. Ignatius constituted a significant core of the collections of the National Art Gallery of

Bologna. To take care of the new gallery of panel paintings, it was necessary to create the post of 'conservator' who would also be in charge of the restoration of these tables. The landscape painter Gaetano Tambroni (1763-1841), who represented the first institutional restorer of the Art Gallery of Bologna, was named in 1812.

The Archives of the State of Bologna contain a series of documents dating from the first years of the Napoleonic occupation illustrate this new situation. These documents contain remarkable information about the measures taken to safeguard this invaluable heritage of Bolognese painting on behalf of the institution charged to take care of them, namely the Clementine Academy, which became, in 1804, the National Academy of Art of Bologna.

Robert Skwirbli (Freie Universität, Berlin), presented the paper *Restoration of Artworks in the Berliner Royal Collection between 1800 and 1830: Internationalization, Professionalization, Institutionalization* marking developments influencing the emergence of art history as an academic discipline.

A public art museum was planned in Berlin between 1797 and 1830, the core of which was a collection of antiquities and a gallery of paintings. Particularly after 1815 extensive purchases were made of very old paintings, many of which were in poor condition. Already in 1804 the director of the Academy of Fine Arts in Berlin wrote up detailed instructions, including construction designs for the transport of large paintings, which were rolled up on special rollers. The transport of the Guistiniani painting collection from Paris to Berlin was entrusted to a painter. He took his task of protecting the paintings so seriously that he locked them up preventing even members of the Berlin Academy to see them, as he did not think them capable of handling historical works of art.

Restoration efforts following 1815 were on such large scale that considerable efforts were made to find painters, who not only had the skill to eliminate old damages, but also to deal with new problems, and who could understand new scientific ways of conservation and restoration. Through the efforts of the heraldic painter, Beckly, who entered into extensive consultations with experts in France and Italy, such as Féréol Bonnemaison and Pietro Parmaroli, an effective restoration studio was established at the Berlin museum, which was led by Jakob Schlesinger. A controversy, which erupted after the opening of the museum in 1830, regarding correct or incorrect methods of restoration of paintings reflects a new sensibility about the value of old paintings. There was a shift in organisational hierarchy, with increasing authority transferred to scholars of art at the cost of painter restorers. This example in Berlin impressively clarifies how at the turn of the century in Europe a new historical consciousness enabled the study of the history of art to develop as a scientific discipline.

FORTHCOMING MEETINGS AND CONFERENCES, CALL FOR PAPERS

Meeting announcement:

Paradigm Shift in Heritage Protection: Tolerance for Changes, Limits for

Changes, Florence, Italy. March 4th-6th 2011; The first part of the conference will commemorate Prof. Andrzej Tomaszewski, President of the ICOMOS Theory and Philosophy Committee, who died

last year, on the 25th of October.

- Venue: opening at the Uffizi Library (to be confirmed), scientific session at Auditorium al Duomo
- Contact: icomos.theory@fondazione-delbianco.org (t. +39 055 21 60 66)
- Registration (booking) : <http://www.fly-events.com/regform/register.asp?idev=181>

Call for papers: CeROArt

A new issue of the magazine CeROArt is expected for spring 2011. The general theme for the publication will be: "Reinventing methodologies". In this issue, we want to bring together innovative experiences in terms of design or implementation: case studies, interventions, specific restoration campaigns, scientific research, educational experiences, interdisciplinarity, use of new information and communication technologies, networking, etc. We hope to combine, more than ever, theory and practice, and encourage restorers, researchers, museum curators and members of the academic world or scientific institutions to communicate on this subject.

Articles should be sent by **March 1, 2011** to ceroart@revues.org

Muriel Verbeeck
Editeur scientifique,
CeROArt
<http://www.ceroart.org>
muriel.verbeeck@ceroart.org
ceroart@revues.org

CALL FOR PAPERS Attention: Short notice

IIAS - 2011
9th Special Focus Symposium on ART AND SCIENCE

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 8th Art and Science meeting in Baden-Baden. This Symposium will be a part of the 23rd International Conference on Systems Research, Informatics & Cybernetics, which will be held from August 1st to 5th in Baden-Baden, Germany, 2011, in conjunction with the 31th Annual Meeting of the International Institute for Advanced Studies in Systems Research and Cybernetics

Abstracts for paper proposals and proposals for performances will be reviewed by Karel Boullart and Hiltrud Schinzel. 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 sessions, 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. 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 main issue is to develop mutual understanding not only between the arts and their related and/or auxiliary sciences, but also between art and science in general as regards problems of communication both in structure, language and phenomena that can hardly or not at all be systemized (e.g. emotions).

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 behavioural 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 eight 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, Belgium, Europe
E-mail: karel.boullart@UGent.be

and

Dr. Hiltrud Schinzel Associate Professor IIAS
Mülheimerstr.7, D 40239 Düsseldorf, Germany, Europe
E-mail: hiltrud.schinzel@t-online.de

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>

Paper Proposals/Abstracts of approximately 300 words and proposals of performances should be submitted **as soon as possible**, but not later than **January 15th** to Prof. Boullart, Dr. Schinzel and 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 2011 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: January 15th 2011 (Please note: The abstract due date has been extended to the middle of February for ICOM-CC members)

Notification of Acceptance: February 15th 2011

Final Paper due: April 15th 2011

The full papers should be submitted to Prof. Dr. Karel Boullart and Dr. Hiltrud Schinzel by **April 15th 2011** at the addresses above. The full papers should also be transmitted **electronically** to

**Prof. George E. Lasker,
Conference Chairman
C/O IAS
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.ias.edu>

BOOKS:

**Theory and Practice in the Conservation of Modern and Contemporary Art
– Reflections on the Roots and the Perspectives**

edited by *Ursula Schädler-Saub and Angela Weyer*
Archetype Publications (2010)

Contents:

- vii Preface by *Martin Thren*, president of HAWK
ix Foreword by *Angela Weyer*, director of the Hornemann Institute
1 Introduction
Ursula Schädler-Saub

Theoretical Principles

- 9 The artwork that became a symbol of itself: reflections on the conservation of modern art
Salvador Muñoz Viñas
21 Media art and the limits of established ethics of restoration
Cornelia Weyer
33 A new conceptual framework for the preservation of the heritage of modern and contemporary art
Iwona Szmelter
50 Alois Riegl's *Denkmalswert*: a decision chart for modern and contemporary art conservation
Michael von der Goltz
62 Conservation of modern and contemporary art: what remains of Cesare Brandi's *Teoria del Restauro*?
Ursula Scädler-Saub
71 Conserving modern and contemporary art: reflections on theory and practice in Italy
Francesca Valentini

Theory and Practice

- 85 Reflections on the fate of modern murals: values that influence treatment – treatments that influence values
Isabelle Brajer
101 Theory and practice of the preservation of modern and contemporary art: complex tangible and intangible heritage
Iwona Szmelter
120 Some thoughts on the changing presentation and preservation of modern and postmodern art
Andreas Kühne and Lisa Kirch
135 From wall paintings to ephemeral installations: the Munich artist groups SPUR, Geflect and Kollektiv Herogstrasse
Ursula Schädler-Saub

Appendix 1: Selection of interviews with artists

- 159 Hans Matthäus Bachmayer
164 Heiko Herrmann
169 Heino Naujoks
175 Thomas Niggli
179 Rânebach
182 Helmut Rieger
185 Armin Saub and Heinz Weld

Appendix 2: Selection of interviews with art collectors, gallery owners and art critics

- 197 Susanne (daughter of the art patron and collector Willi Bleicher)
203 Michael Hauck (former company art representative)
207 Klaus Lea (gallery owner)
210 Dr. Frauke Schmidt-Sibeth and Dr. Hans Schmidt-Sibeth (art collectors)
213 Dr. Hanne Weskott (art critic and art historian)
218 Dr. Dietrich and Bettina Winkhaus (art collectors)

221 *List of contributors*

Art+Science. How scientific research and technological innovation are becoming key to 21st century aesthetics

by Stephen Wilson, Thames & Hudson (2010).

A Laboratory for Art. Harvard's Fogg Museum and the Emergence of Conservation in America 1900-1950

by Francesca Bewer, Yale University Press (2010)

Harvard's Fogg Museum was the first American museum with a scientifically based conservation and research department. During a period of immense growth of collections in the United States, director Edward W. Forbes and associate director Paul J. Sachs developed the Fogg into a vital training ground for a new breed of museum professionals attuned to the materials of art and the effects of environment. *A Laboratory for Art* is the first book to explore the crucial role the Fogg played in the evolution of conservation in the US and abroad. It traces the efforts of staff and students who developed protocols for the treatment and documentation of works - sometimes through trial and error; disseminated research findings by establishing professional forums and an indispensable journal; set standards for contemporary artists' materials during the New Deal; and, led the Allied drive to protect monuments and works of art during World War II. Alumni of the Fogg went on to leadership positions in museums and conservation laboratories across America.

Mixing and Matching: Approaches to Retouching Paintings

edited by Rebecca Ellison, Patricia Smithen and Rachel Turnbull

Archetype Publications (2010)

Methods of retouching, or inpainting, vary according to personal preference- the media, pigments and techniques used are each chosen to suit the individual object. A wealth of options is available to the practising conservator, many of which are covered in this volume. The history, development and method of application of each technique is discussed and illustrated, while additional papers explore practical and theoretical aspects of colour matching.

The three sections of this book (Egg tempera retouching, Resin retouching and Retouching complex surfaces) contain material presented at three separate workshops organised by the Paintings Group of the Institute of Conservation (Icon) and the British Association of Painting Conservators-Restorers (BAPCR) and held at the Courtauld Institute of Art, London.

Contents:

Foreword

Acknowledgements

Egg tempera retouching

Introduction

Rachel Turnbull

The history of egg tempera as a retouching medium
Ann Massing

The composition and chemistry of eggs and egg tempera
Alan Phenix

The art of tempera retouching
Mary Kempski

Resin retouching

Introduction
Rebecca Ellison

Retouching media used at the National Gallery, London, since the nineteenth century
Paul Ackroyd

The state of research into retouching resins
Spike Bucklow

Properties of pigments, retouching media and their use
Peter Koneczny

Retouching with a PVA resin medium
Sarah Cove

Retouching with Paraloid B-72
Kate Lowry

Retouching with Gamblin Conservation Colours
Jill Dunkerton

Retouching complex surfaces

Introduction
Patricia Smithen

Colour theory and the application of a portable spectrophotometer for retouching
Stig Evans and Andrew Hanson

An unusual case of integration and its solution
Oriana Sartiani, Leonardo Severini, Paolo Roma and Marco Ciatti

Pushing the borders of retouching and reconstruction: can enough ever be too much?
Laurent Sozzani

An introduction to B72 retouching gels
Peter Koneczny

Properties of B72 retouching gels and their use
Peter Koneczny

Texturing fills using a silicone mould

Simon Folkes and Sophie Reddington

Retouching media for acrylic paintings
Shelley Simms, Maureen Cross and Patricia Smithen

Books Will Speak Plain: A Handbook for Identifying and Describing Historical Bindings.

by Julia Miller. Ann Arbor: The Legacy Press, 2010. ISBN: 978-0-9797974-3-9 592pp., 374 illustrations in the text, many in color, bound in cloth and sewn. Accompanying DVD with 1,471 color images and captions (searchable).

Contents:

Preface and Acknowledgements

Introduction. The Purpose of This Handbook

Chapter 1. The Early History of the Codex

Chapter 2. The Medieval Manuscript Book and Beyond

Chapter 3. 1450 to 1800: The Book Changes Radically

Chapter 4. The Book from 1800 to 1900

Chapter 5. Identifying Binding Materials and Applications

Chapter 6. Describing Historical Bindings: a Template for Action

Chapter 7. The Task Ahead and Conclusion

Appendix 1. Historical Bindings: Structure and Style Hierarchy

Appendix 2. Sample Survey Suggestions and Description Case Studies

Appendix 3. Stacks Maintenance and Physical Condition Assessment Guidelines

Glossary

Bibliography

Index

Permissions

Colophon

ARTICLES:

SARAH STANIFORTH. Slow Conservation. *Studies in Conservation* **55**, 2 (2010) 74-80.

Abstract: This paper explores how the concepts of the slow movements can be applied to conservation. It examines the roots of preventive conservation, the relationship between the museum environment

and the global environment and ways in which museums can reduce their environmental footprint. Links are made between sustainability and traditional conservation practices from different countries and periods. It is proposed that the long-term sustainability of museums depends on the value that the public place on them, and this can be built through the engagement of trainees, volunteers and the public through conservation. The impact of international loan exhibitions in driving common environmental specifications which reflect international standards rather than the local climate and the energy consumption that is involved in achieving these conditions is discussed. Finally, a manifesto for slow conservation is proposed.

SAMUEL JONES. It's a Material World. *Studies in Conservation* **55**, 4 (2010) 242-249.

Abstract: Conservation, as a profession, is facing a series of challenges. The closure of training courses is a well-documented and depressing reality, from Australia to the UK. Within institutions, conservators have found it increasingly difficult to fight their corner as the nature of the museum sector changes. New demands are being made on organizations in receipt of public money and, in the wake of the financial crisis, funding will become even harder to come by. At the same time, social and technological changes have altered the operating environment of many sectors in all walks of life as the public come to have new expectations and the concept of the professional and the expert changes. Conservation is no exception. However, these changes bring opportunities as well as changes. Building on the Demos pamphlet It's a Material World (2008), this paper argues that conservators constantly deal with ideas and concepts that are at the very heart of the public realm, caring for the values around which society is built. Drawing on these and making them explicit could help the profession make its case anew, and could also help policy-makers – and society – meet some of the most significant challenges that we collectively face.

FORBES PRIZE LECTURE

DAVID LOWENTHAL. Omens from the Mediterranean: Conservation Nostrum in *Mare Nostrum*. *Studies in Conservation* **55**, 4 (2010) 231-241.

BOOK REVIEWS

RITA ALBERTSON WITH WINIFRED MURRAY: *Mixing and Matching: Approaches to retouching paintings*. Edited by Rebecca Ellison, Patricia Smithen and Rachel Turnbull. *Studies in Conservation* **55**, 4 (2010) 313-315.

CHRISTEL PESME: *Contemporary Theory of Conservation*, by Salvador Muñoz Viñas. *Studies in Conservation* **55**, 4 (2010) 315-316.

PUBLISHED PROCEEDINGS:

ART and SCIENCE Vol. VIII, Proceedings of a special Focus Symposium on Art and Science held as part of the 22nd international Conference on Systems Research, Informatics and Cybernetics August 2 – 6, 2010, Baden-Baden, Germany, ISBN 978-1-897233-81-8 from IIAS – P.O. Box 3010, Tecumseh, ON N8N 2M3, Canada ATTN: Prof. George E. Lasker. (see summary of this meeting by Hiltrud Schintzel and Karel Boullart in this newsletter for contents of this publication).

Online journals :

CeROArt, issue 6, 2010. Horizons. First publications from young graduates in conservation, URL : <http://ceroart.revues.org>

In the current issue the following articles are of interest to members of this working group:

ANA BAILÃO. Application of a methodology for retouching – A case study of a contemporary painting. <http://ceroart.revues.org/index1603.html>

Abstract

Between November 2006 and January 2010, an investigation into retouching methodologies was carried out. The aim of this paper is to describe, in four steps, the retouching methodology of a contemporary painting. The four steps are: chromatic and formal study, considering the use of Gestalt theory and the phenomena of contrast and assimilation; selection of the technique; choice of the materials and retouching practice.

MARTA GOMEZ UBIERNA. Salvaging a cultural identity through reintegration – Restoration work on the pulpit of “San Leonardo in Arcetri”, Florence. <http://ceroart.revues.org/index1804.html>

Abstract

The following article owes much to the master’s thesis on “The Restoration of the pulpit in the church of San Leonardo in Arcetri”, which deals with an outstanding work of Florentine Romanesque art. The remaining architectural elements of the pulpit, dismantled in the sixteenth century, were reassembled on a number of occasions in 1782 and 1921, as a result of efforts to reclaim the cultural identity of the region through a revival of its medieval heritage, even down to its most fragmentary remains. The main difficulty encountered during these interventions - such as the restoration work carried out by the “Opificio delle Pietre Dure” in 2009 - lay in the recovery of the black and white polychromy, of the quintessentially Florentine marble inlay through various interventions involving the integration of the stone. Study of the techniques and materials used has provided a unique opportunity to map out the various stages of restoration that the piece underwent, identifying the materials used in each intervention, allowing choices to be made regarding the conservation methods. The aim of the current project was the integration of new, completely reversible and compatible elements into the polychromatic marble inlay, elements that were created on the basis of the results of an experiment with synthetic materials and their various methods of application.

MAGDALENA GRENDA. *Tratteggio* retouch and its derivatives as an image reintegration solution in the process of restoration. Case study: restoration of a 20th century lithograph film poster by Stefan Norblin. <http://ceroart.revues.org/index1700.html>

Abstract

*The article describes issues concerning retouch in paper conservation- restoration with particular consideration of *tratteggio* retouch and its derivatives as an image reintegration solution, not very popular among paper conservators. It was a part of author’s MA project to examine the possibility of using *tratteggio*- like retouches during the restoration of 20th century Polish film poster by Stefan Norblin, printed in colour lithograph.*

SIMON LAMBERT. Italy and the history of preventive conservation. <http://ceroart.revues.org/index1707.html>

Abstract

Italy is a point of reference for the conservation community worldwide, but it has yet to make a definitive leap towards preventive conservation. This paper examines some of the reasons to explain this, in the hope that this may be useful for other countries. After a brief look at the history of preventive conservation from Antiquity to the Second World War, two seldom-discussed Italian initiatives are presented: The Franceschini Commission (1964) and the Pilot plan for the programmed conservation of cultural heritage in Umbria (1976).

GAËLLE LECLERCQ. Métamérisme. La problématique des retouches dans les tons bleus. <http://ceroart.revues.org/index1818.html>

Abstract

In the field of the conservation-restoration of paintings, the retouching intervention is a critical act during which a metamerism phenomenon can easily be created in the blue hues. This research suggests an alternative to this problem. Indeed, it is possible to find some current pigments which have

a similar spectral composition to traditional pigments usually used by the ancient painters and so, this option would reduce the risk of creating a metamerism.

e-conservation magazine, No. 15 (July) and 17(December) 2010

URL:<http://www.e-conservationline.com/>

ARTICLES:

DIMITRIOS DOUMAS. Science and Restoration at the Service of Interpretation:

<http://www.e-conservationline.com/content/view/961>

Abstract

The article discusses the relationship between art history/curatorship, conservation and conservation science within the context of the art museum. It identifies the physicality of artworks as the underpinning of interpretation and the meaning-making process entailed in the museum experience; hence it denotes the pivotal role conservation and particularly restoration play within this framework. It stresses the significance of the analytical examination of works of art as an art historical tool rather than a conservation aid. Thus, it draws attention to the interplay between scientifically obtained information, which analytical work produces and the subjective standards, which restoration encompasses. Finally, it advocates the artistic dimension of conservation and asserts that visual appreciation and aesthetic understanding are prerequisites for any kind of restoration intervention carried out on artworks.

COMMENTARY:

DANIEL CULL. Conserve or Destroy?

<http://www.e-conservationline.com/content/view/906>

GENERAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

Registration for the ICOM-CC 16th Triennial Conference in Lisbon has now started! (see

<http://www.icom-cc2011.org/registration.aspx>)

Reduced fees for those who register at the early bird registration price will end on **March 31, 2011**.