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FROM THE PRESIDENT’S DESK

Seventy years ago the founders of IIC, many of whom had been Monuments Men during the Second World War, established a learned society with a vision of the modern profession. They formed a group that ‘knew not just what to do but why they did it’ combining technical expertise and scholarly understanding.

How fitting, therefore, that the McEwan Hall in Edinburgh, where we were meant to meet for our 28th Biennial Congress in November, should have inscribed on its walls, “the beginning of wisdom is this: seek wisdom and whatever else you seek, seek also understanding.”

Judging by the almost unanimous response that we received from the over 2000 registrants from 89 countries who tuned in and actively participated, the Congress fulfilled those principles of imparting and sharing wisdom and understanding extraordinarily well. The mix of virtual presentations and live Q&A, regional hubs and poster sessions provided richer and deeper experiences and worked far better than we had ever imagined it could. The Forbes Prize lecture by Dr Norman Tennent provided another landmark in this series of biennial talks by eminent conservators. We were delighted that the Keck Award, for contributions towards promoting public understanding and appreciation of the conservation profession, was won by Sports Lisboa Benfica in Portugal for their wonderful outreach program. And finally, we announced that we hope to meet again both in person and online for our 29th Biennial Congress in Wellington, New Zealand in two years time.

So what have been the learnings from this Congress? Firstly, and most critically, that we must work harder at ensuring accessibility and inclusion for our members. We now have some idea how many would like to be at an IIC Congress but, for whatever reason, are unable to get there physically. We have created a new paradigm for how we approach conferences in the future. Where before we have seen the digital online component of conferences as supplementary and subordinate to the physical, we now must see it as a parallel experience, with all that means for planning and presentation. In the future we shall be exploring staging hybrid conferences.

Secondly, we have learnt that staging an online conference is a great deal more time consuming than a physical one and that a hybrid physical/virtual one will be a significantly more complicated exercise again. We also know we have much to learn about preferences, behaviours and the way we best connect with online audiences. However, this in turn is creating some exciting possibilities for the way in which IIC can use the digital realm to diversify and reach out more broadly. We look forward to keeping you informed of our plans in this area as we, 70 years on from our founding, plot a course for the future of our profession.

Meanwhile, look after yourselves and each other.

With my best wishes,

Julian Bickersteth
IIC President
MESSAGE FROM THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

It is a strange thing to feel proud in the present, but I do. I feel proud of IIC and our global community—from our small team’s herculean effort to deliver a successful congress online to IIC’s Council who have come together to listen, reflect, and offer support to members when needed. IIC has created more online events, furthered its reach to new audiences around the world and received a greater number of Fellowship nominations than ever before. Months of uncertainty, reduced travel and isolation have meant we have needed to pivot multiple times and find new ways to bridge the fissures in the world we once knew.

Through our events, symposia and congress we have experimented with the boundaries of what’s possible, making us ask questions about community, sustainability, travel and digital access, which we know will shape our thoughts long after coronavirus has passed. Through our prizes and awards, we have recognised and celebrated the greatest achievements within the field, and through our growing and diverse network of members and Fellows, we are living our values and founding principles.

Most of all I feel proud of our profession; that in the midst of isolation and hardship we have continued to find ways to keep caring for cultural heritage and for each other. The IIC’s vision is to foster a society enriched by looking after our own and other’s cultural heritage, and I think we can all say we have taken a step towards that vision in 2020.

Thank you, as always, for your continued passion and support.

Sarah Stannage
IIC Executive Director

EDITOR’S SOUNDING BOARD

I am pleased to finally present to you this special issue celebrating 70 years of IIC! It is full of memories, interviews, and photos spanning the past century of our profession. And as promised (for those keeping tabs on such things) I share with you one of my own congress memories, risking a bit of embarrassment in the hope that it brings a smile to your face.

2016 in Los Angeles was my first IIC congress, and I was thrilled to finally meet, in person, IIC colleagues I’d already been working with for several years. After a busy (yet rewarding) week of working behind the scenes, I was finally able to relax a bit during the closing reception, chatting with Julian Bickersteth and a few congress delegates. As an American, I found working with so many colleagues from Europe—especially Great Britain—to be a new and delightful experience. Perhaps a bit tired and giddy, at the time it seemed to me like a good idea to try out some British slang, so as I bid my farewells to the group, I said, “It’s time for me to bugger off” as I needed to run and catch my plane. Julian and the group looked a bit stunned and gave awkward chuckles as I bowed out, and in my own mind floated the questioning phrase, “I do not think it means what you think it means.”

So, here’s to a new year with the hope that I’ll have the opportunity see you all at the next IIC Congress (NZ 2022) in person… perhaps without the British slang.

Sharra Grow
IIC Editor, News in Conservation
DISCOVER THE MYSTERIES BENEATH

The Apollo is the new standard in infrared reflectography.

Following in the footsteps of the world-renowned Osiris Camera, Apollo uses an internal scanning mechanism to produce high-quality, high-resolution infrared reflectograms with an unparalleled level of clarity and detail.

These can be used to study various aspects of a painting, from changes to underdrawings and pentimenti in the work, to underpainting and transmission of pigments at different wavelengths when using our Filter Set. If you're looking to create detailed, high quality, high resolution infrared images, Apollo is the IR camera system for you.
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Watch the XpectralTEK video above. To learn more about XpeCAM, click [HERE]. And follow XpectralTEK on social media.
IIC 70TH ANNIVERSARY ONLINE TREASURE HUNT

There are 3 #IICTreasureHunt Anniversary logos hidden on our website www.iiconservation.org.

Explore the website to find the logos by answering the questions below to enter a prize draw. Entries close on 31 January 2021, the results of the prize draw will be announced in early February 2021.

To enter the Prize Draw: Answers can be submitted HERE or via the #IICTreasureHunt QR code.

Q1: What is the date of the earliest “News in Conservation” issue archived on the website?
Q2: Who gave the Forbes Prize lecture at the 1961 Congress in Rome?
Q3: What year was the first IIC International Training Centre for Conservation Course?
Q4: How many current IIC Fellows are needed to nominate a person for IIC Fellowship?
Q5: There are several independent associations affiliated to IIC located around the world. How many IIC Regional Groups are formally associated with IIC?
Q6: Where did the 1988 Congress take place?
Q7: IIC first hosted Student Poster Sessions in 2010 at the Congress in Istanbul. Who was awarded the first Student Poster Prize?
Q8: Where was the first IIC Student and Emerging Conservator Conference (S&ECC) hosted?
Q9: One of the benefits to being an IIC member are the free Professional Development Series Webinars. Can you list the subject for the third professional development seminar that was offered?
Q10: The IIC offers many awards and grants for our members. What grant offers funding support for students and emerging conservators to attend an IIC Congress?
Q11: List the THREE (3) locations of the IIC Anniversary Logo on the website.
We hope this brief collection of IIC memories will remind you of a few of your own.

Scene from the 2004 IIC Congress in Bilbao. Norman Tennent, Sarah Staniforth and Norman’s partner John Cowan as they attempt to speak no evil, see no evil, and hear no evil. (Photograph by David Leigh)

Taken at the 50th Anniversary celebration of IIC in 2000. In order from left to right: Norman Tennent, John Winter (President IIC), Jude Fraser, Kay Soderlund, Marcelle Scott (President AICCM), Vinod Daniel. Current IIC President Julian Bickersteth (owner of this photograph) noted that Norman Tennent is a great tie between the 50th and 70th Anniversaries of IIC, as he was the Forbes Prize lecturer at the 2020 Congress!
Jean Portell found this note with her files for the IIC-AG (IIC-American Group) 1963 Annual Meeting held in New York.

If only these were still the nightly rates for New York City hotels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hotel</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Singles</th>
<th>Doubles</th>
<th>Nightly Rate Per Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hotel Warwick</td>
<td>65 West 56th Street, New York City</td>
<td>$5 - $7</td>
<td>$9 - $12</td>
<td>$11 - $25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel Paris</td>
<td>West End Ave. at 97th Street, New York City</td>
<td>$5 - $7</td>
<td>$9 - $12</td>
<td>$12 - $14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyndham Hotel</td>
<td>42 West 50th St., New York City</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$12</td>
<td>$14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Since there are numerous hotels in Manhattan, these are suggestions only.
Members of IIC standing in front of Albert Hall, London for the 1967 IIC Congress which was themed “Museum Climatology”. (Image courtesy of Joyce Hill Stoner/FAIC Oral History Project)

The perfect image for a game of “Where’s Wally?” or perhaps “Where’s Gettens?”

Joyce Hill Stoner wrote this poem in honor of Harold Plenderleith’s 90th birthday in 1988. A call had been sent out to gather contributions for a celebratory packet to present to him.
Looking Back at IIC’s Beginnings

An interview with Hero Lotti by Sagita Mirjam Sunara

Twenty years ago, Hero Lotti (née Boothroyd Brooks) undertook the demanding task of researching IIC’s beginnings. The results of her research were published in the booklet A Short History of IIC: Foundation and Development. To bring the fascinating story of the forming of IIC closer to its members and the readers of News in Conservation, we interviewed Hero for this special issue.

SMS: How did your research come about?

HL: IIC invited me to undertake a study of the Institute’s history to celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of its foundation. I had finished my PhD into the history of practical developments in English easel-painting conservation the previous year (1999). Although my PhD thesis was exclusively concerned with practice, the sources I had used were rich in information about the broader history of conservation.

SMS: What sources did you use?

HL: Almost entirely archival sources. It’s the most exciting kind of research in my view, because of the unmediated contact with material from the past and the detective work involved in seeing how much information can be pieced together. I spent a lot of time in the IIC office, then in Buckingham Street, going through the various files and folders. I also went to the USA for a week, to look at archival material in Boston at the Straus Center for Conservation and in Washington at the Freer Gallery of Art and at the Smithsonian Institution. I also spent a few days in Brussels to consult the archives at the Institut Royal du Patrimoine Artistique.

SMS: IIC was the first professional society of art conservators. Who proposed its formation and when did this idea arise?

HL: The idea emerged as the Second World War drew to a close, and thoughts began to turn to the resumption of peacetime activities. George L. Stout (Head of the Department for Conservation and Technical Research at the Fogg Art Museum, Boston, then on war duty as a Memorials Officer) wrote a letter on 23 April 1945 to F.I.G. Rawlins (Scientific Adviser at the National Gallery, London) in which he raised the idea of some kind of international body concerned with conservation, although we can’t be sure that this was the first time it was mentioned. It is likely however that Stout was responsible for the idea, and in any case he was fundamental to its realization. Rawlins was also very determined and active in forming the future Institute. When IIC was founded five years later, Stout was its first President and Rawlins its General Secretary.

SMS: Who were the other key figures? How did this process go?

HL: In the USA, Rutherford J. Gettens, the chemist at the Department for Conservation and Technical Research at the Fogg, and Richard D. Buck, a fine arts graduate who also worked in the Department, were both key figures. Murray Pease of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, and Sheldon and Caroline Keck who worked in Brooklyn, all of whom had studied at the Fogg Department before moving to their positions in New York, were also important, especially after incorporation in promoting membership in the USA. The first formal meeting held to discuss the creation of the Institute took place in November 1947, at the Fogg Art Museum. In preparation for the meeting, Stout and Arthur Pope, the Director of the Museum, drafted a document concerning the aims and outline of the proposed organisation.

The most important figures from the UK, apart from Rawlins, were W.G. Constable (then Curator of Paintings at the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston) and H.J. Plenderleith (Deputy Keeper at the British Museum Laboratory).

Although the idea for an international professional body was an initiative of individuals from the USA and the UK, in 1947 Paul Coremans (Director of the Archives Centrales Iconographiques d’Art National et du Laboratoire Central des Musées de Belgique) became involved. He acted to inform and involve Continental European countries in the proposed organization. Coremans hosted a meeting in September 1948 at his office in Brussels at which the proposed Institute was discussed from the Continental European perspective. By the time of the Brussels meeting, Arthur van Schendel (Curator of the Department of Paintings at the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam) had become involved.

SMS: These were people from different countries, even continents. How did they manage to establish and maintain professional relations in the years preceding the founding of the IIC?

HL: Several of the key figures for the later foundation of IIC had known each other for many years. In October 1930 an ‘International Conference for the Study of Scientific Methods for the Examination and Preservation of Works of Art’ was held in Rome, organized by the International Museums Office, for the exchange of ideas and experience among experts in the developing field of the scientific study of works of art. Stout and Constable (then Assistant Director of the National Gallery, London) were both present. At the Conference a ‘Committee for the Restoration of Paintings and the Use of Varnish’ was set up, of which Constable was one of two Chairmen; Helmut Ruhemann later recalled Stout showing a sample of polyvinylacetate and predicting it would be the

varnish of the future. One of the upshots of the Conference was the preparation of a manual on the conservation of paintings—published as the Manuel de la Conservation et de la Restauration des Peintures in 1939, and in English in 1940—the Editorial Committee of which first met in Paris in March 1933 and included Stout, Constable, and Plenderleith, who had not been present at the Rome Conference.

The publication Technical Studies in the Field of the Fine Arts, 1932-1942, was also significant in forging professional contacts among several of those who would later work together in forming IIC. The journal was edited at the Department for Conservation and Technical Research at the Fogg. Stout was Managing Editor, and Gettens was Assistant (later Associate) Editor. The journal had an international Advisory Committee, which included Constable throughout. Plenderleith contributed an article to the journal at Constable’s invitation and was listed as a member of the Advisory Committee from the April 1935 edition. Rawlins joined the Committee from the July 1935 edition, the year after he had been appointed head of the newly created Physical Laboratory at the National
Feature Articles

Gallery, London, although he didn’t meet Stout and Gettens until he visited the Fogg Art Museum in February 1939. Although the Second World War disrupted normal working life, it also stimulated contact between those in various countries with a shared interest in how to protect works of cultural heritage from the dangers of war. Stout corresponded with Plenderleith in 1942 having read Air Raid Precautions in Museums, Picture Galleries and Libraries (1939), which Plenderleith had co-authored with Rawlins, and wrote a letter to both Plenderleith and Rawlins in January of the following year in which he enclosed a statement on the protection of monuments in wartime. As a Monuments Officer, Stout travelled to France and Germany and stopped off in London where he met Plenderleith in July 1945 before returning to the USA. A month previously Coremans had visited Britain, where he met Plenderleith and Rawlins for the first time, to discuss their investigations into the protection of works of art during the war.

Two events in 1947 provided opportunity for discussion about the proposed international body. It seems likely that Plenderleith and Rawlins introduced Coremans to the idea while they were all involved in the inquiry held as part of the trial of the forger H.A. van Meegeren in Holland in January 1947. The successful use of an international committee of experts to settle the controversy surrounding the van Meegeren case was influential in the National Gallery’s decision to set up an international committee to undertake a confidential inquiry into the cleaning of National Gallery paintings, which had been the subject of controversy since the previous year. While acting on the Weaver Committee in London in August 1947, Stout and Coremans discussed the proposed Institute with Rawlins and Plenderleith.

SMS: The events you mentioned are some of the most important milestones in the history of our profession! It’s obvious that a number of factors led to the formation of IIC, but if you had to single out one event, what would that be?

HL: I think the formation of IIC depended not so much on an event as on the sense that conservation needed to become more professional and more scientific, and on the awareness that this conviction was shared internationally, albeit in contexts that were distinct. Of course, it was crucial that the protagonists already knew each other and had established their shared interests in the years preceding the formation of IIC. And perhaps the rupture caused by the War, and the need to redefine the terms of working life after it, in themselves favoured the achievement of such an initiative as IIC.

We thank Hero for the interview, and we invite you to read the full interview on the IIC website, HERE.

Hero Lotti is an independent researcher writing a history of the care of paintings in the 19th and 20th centuries. Before taking time off work to raise her family, she was a British Academy Post-doctoral Fellow at the Courtauld Institute of Art, researching the history and theory of English easel-painting conservation.

Sagita Mirjam Sunara has a degree in conservation (easel paintings and polychrome wood) and a doctoral degree in art history (history of conservation). She works at the Arts Academy, University of Split, teaching courses in conservation of easel paintings and polychrome wood, research and documentation, preventive conservation, conservation history and theory, and artist interview. Her current research interests focus on outdoor sculptures.
THE FORBES PRIZE LECTURE, 1996 COPENHAGEN CONGRESS

Delivered by Andrew Oddy
This version of the lecture reproduces excerpts of the printed text from IIC Bulletin No. 5, October 1996, pp 1-5 with minor corrections and the addition of illustrations.

It goes without saying that it is an honour and a privilege to be invited to deliver the Forbes Prize lecture. It is, however, a two-edged sword. On the one hand, it means that the Council of IIC thinks that I might have something interesting to say, but on the other, it usually means that the lecturer is near the end of his or her career and, in my case, I am under the impression that I have another five years to serve!

In years gone by, the Forbes lecturer could say anything; there was no theme and no guidelines, only a hope that the lecture would be interesting. In my time, I have had the privilege of listening to five very different orations, of which I remember with particular pleasure that by Lars Barkman in 1975 - probably because the subject was waterlogged wood and, at that time, I was involved with the preservation of a medieval wooden boat. Sadly, I was not present at Oxford in 1978 to hear the only female Forbes lecturer, Caroline Keck. Would the Council please note that it is high time we had more women on the rostrum for this occasion?

Nowadays, however, the Forbes lecture has changed. It has been moved to the beginning of the biennial conference and is supposed to reflect the theme of the meeting, in this case archaeology.

Two possible themes for the lecture immediately spring to mind: my thirty years as a conservation scientist in the British Museum for one, and a review of worldwide developments in archaeological conservation in the last ten, twenty or thirty years for the other. As far as a review goes, you do not need me to compose one for you as most conservators these days are the product of conservation training courses and will, or should, have learnt the latest methods as well as something of the history of the subject as part of their syllabus.

So what about my life in conservation at the British Museum? Well, I can assure you that much of it has been enjoyable and interesting, and I feel proud at having been employed at one of the greatest of international museums. But I am not sure that I could entertain you for the next forty minutes, as my prowess as a raconteur has never been well developed. I have, however, worked with some of the most scholarly curators and had access to an unparalleled collection so that, as well as working as a conservation scientist on waterlogged wood, salty stone and corroding...
metals, I have been able to indulge my interest in ancient technology with research on gilding, tinning, niello, wire-making and debasement studies on gold coins.

But all this you can read about in the specialist literature. More interesting are the personal contacts. Of these, the most precious has been more than a passing acquaintance with that all-time great, Harold Plenderleith, who is still going strong and will be 98 years old on 19 September. Among the stars of archaeological conservation of the generation before me, I met Rutherford Gettens of the USA, Robert Organ, originally of the British Museum, but who migrated to the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, Lars Barkman from Sweden, Børson Christensen from Denmark, Anna Rosenqvist from Norway, and the indefatigable Hanna Jedrzejewska from Poland, who I last met at an ICOM meeting last year when she had just entered her ninetieth year. There are, of course, many others of that pioneering generation who established objects conservation as a science and a philosophy in the 1930s, 40s and 50s. To Tony Werner I owe a special debt of gratitude for appointing me to the British Museum and to Robert Organ a big ‘thank you’ for emigrating to the USA via Canada and, thus, creating a vacancy at the British Museum for me to fill. Of all the advice that I have had from these and others, I remember and practise a tip from Tony Werner, who said that whenever travelling abroad, it was essential to buy a bottle of Scotch at the airport and drink a generous measure at bedtime. This has the dual effect of making you feel good and of disinfecting the stomach in case the local water comes from a fishpond rather than a reservoir. Well, Tony, I have followed your advice religiously and the only place that I have succumbed to the indigenous microbes is in that temple to efficiency and cleanliness, Berlin.

In thinking of Harold Plenderleith, I am reminded that in his youth he met the elderly Gustav Rosenberg from the National Museum in Copenhagen, who was one of a very small band of late nineteenth-century pioneers of archaeological conservation which included the legendary Friedrich Rathgen who wrote the first truly scientific book on archaeological conservation. If only these pioneers had written their memoirs, how much richer would our history be, and if they had been frank and revealing about their associates, how much more interesting.

The Forbes lecture is named after Edward Waldo Forbes, who was born in 1873 and died in 1969, and who is credited with laying the foundations of scientific conservation in the USA. He became director of the Fogg Art Museum at Harvard in 1909 and retired in 1944; during this period he enormously enriched the collections of paintings and antiquities by his own generosity and by ‘twisting the arm’ of friends and acquaintances. In 1971, the Fogg Art Museum held an exhibition to commemorate Forbes’ life’s work, and one-third of the catalogue is devoted to Edward Waldo Forbes: Herald of Conservation. What an apt title. *The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary* defines ‘herald’ with three meanings, and the one of interest to us is ‘a forerunner’ or
‘precursor’. He had the vision, when director of the Fogg Art Museum, to realise that the embryonic science of conservation then being practised at the museums in Berlin and Copenhagen should be the basis for the future care of antiquities and works of art. The result was the recruitment of a radiologist called Alan Burroughs and a chemist called Rutherford John Gettens. The latter worked at the Fogg from 1933 to 1952 (with a break for war service) and then went off to the Freer Gallery at the Smithsonian, where his work on, among many other topics, Chinese bronzes is justly famous.

Apart from creating the right atmosphere for scientists to lay the basis for the “new conservation”, Forbes was instrumental in founding the journal *Technical Studies in the Field of the Fine Arts*, which was published between 1932 and 1942 and was itself the herald of *Studies in Conservation*, which began publication in 1952 and is still going strong. Of course, you all know that *Studies* is the journal of IIC and Forbes was member No 16 of our august institution.

Edward Waldo Forbes died three years after I joined the British Museum but I never had the privilege of meeting him. We do, however, have one thing in common: we both attended the same Oxford college, though his matriculation in 1900 preceded mine by 61 years! It, therefore, gives me particular pleasure to have been invited to deliver this Forbes Prize lecture.
A Brief Biography of Joyce Plecters

By J.E. Molly Seegers

In our times it is quite rare that an individual would remain at one institution for the entirety of their career. The work that Joyce Plecters accomplished during her tenure at the National Gallery, London proves that extraordinary accomplishments can be achieved within a supportive work place. Her pioneering work laid the foundations for a new field of study: the inspection and analysis of paintings, with a special focus on the materials and techniques of the medium.

In fact, she has been called the “founding mother of technical art history.” Art historians were influenced by Plecters’ work in that they were compelled to provide scientific analysis of paintings instead of anecdotal, educated commentary. Her writings enabled the conservation profession to publish with authority the implications of their findings within the narrative of art history.

On April 13 of 1927, Rosa Joyce Plecters was born in a small town south of Birmingham, England. She chose to study sciences during her time at the Royal Holloway College of London University. In 1949, at the age of 22, Plecters was hired by Mr. F.I.G. Rawlins to work in the scientific department of the National Gallery which only had two other employees at the time. Her talent and skills were immediately recognized by her colleagues. Through her work, Plecters was able to combine two of her greatest passions: science and paintings. Her first tool of inquiry was the microscope, analyzing miniscule cross-sections from paintings and coming away with tremendous insights into the pigment makeup and the artist’s method of application; she contributed immensely to her field. Although many of her writings are published as articles in journals, they could have been published as books in their own right. The article, “Cross-Sections and Chemical Analysis of Paint Samples,” which she wrote in 1956 for IIC’s peer-reviewed journal Studies in Conservation is constantly referenced and cited as the authority on examination and interpretation of cross-sections.

Plecters was admired and well loved by her colleagues and friends. Although she took on a heavy load of work, writing
for various publications and traveling to be a consultant in Europe and America, she remained, as John Mills noted, “light-hearted and good-humoured.” Plesters was far from being a cloistered practitioner; after the 1966 and 1967 natural disasters in Florence and Venice she helped set up conservation laboratories in the cities. Venice held a special place in her heart.

She contributed to the Venice in Peril Fund’s conservation of Tintoretto’s paintings in Madonna dell’Orto and became enamored with the artist, subsequently writing three separate articles on the National Gallery’s collection of his work.

Plesters was also one half of a conservation power couple; her husband, Norman Brommelle, was a well-known conservator. They met while working at the National Gallery, and they married in 1959. He went on to become the keeper of conservation at the Victoria & Albert Museum and a long-serving IIC secretary general.

Plesters had a particular affinity for cooking and gardening, so it is fitting that in 1987 she retired to Città di Castello in Italy where she enjoyed pursuing her hobbies. She also continued to write, consult, and participated in professional conferences after she retired. Her passing in 1996 was a very sad occasion for those who knew and cherished her.

Joyce published over 40 articles in 5 decades. To see a compiled bibliography, click HERE.

Molly Seegers is the Museum Archivist at Brooklyn Museum. Previously, she worked at MoMA Library, FIT’s Special Collections and College Archives, Frick Art Reference Library, and Rockefeller Archive Center. She graduated from Haverford College with a B.A. in Sociology and from Pratt Institute with M.S. degrees in Library and Information Science and the History of Art and Design.
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Celebrating 70 years with Slaughter and May

The first meeting of what was to become the Council of IIC took place at the National Gallery in London on 6th June 1950. The business conducted included the election of the first Fellows and the establishment of arrangements for the transfer of funds to and from the United States. In attendance were IIC’s solicitors, Sir Hilary Scott and A.M. Bell, from Slaughter and May, then as now a pre-eminent London firm, founded in 1889.

Sir Hilary Scott, later president of the Law Society of England and Wales, was one of a generation of Slaughter and May partners who had, during the Second World War, been seconded to the top-secret “Special Operations Executive” to apply their considerable intellects to the co-ordination of non-military, clandestine resistance abroad by means of sabotage and subversion. A.M. Bell became a partner in the firm shortly after the first IIC meeting, so, on that occasion, can only be supposed to have been most anxious to impress Sir Hilary and his new clients.

Slaughter and May are still solicitors to IIC and have, over the years, advised on a wide variety of structural changes, contracts, intellectual property, employment and governance matters. Contrary to what might be the usual expectation of a corporate law firm, all work has been undertaken pro bono: free advice over seventy years (bearing in mind that lawyers don’t come cheap) must count as a significant contribution to the work of our organisation. The relationship does, moreover, seem to be enhanced by the genuine interest in the work of IIC taken by our advisers, many of whom have pre-law academic backgrounds in history, the arts or science. Former Slaughter and May partner Helen Griffiths remembers being delighted when the IIC file was handed to her in 1999: she had always somewhat regretted not following early enthusiasms into a career in heritage, so IIC seemed a perfect client and a refreshing contrast to the oil exploration companies which had also landed on her desk. On retirement in 2016, Helen was co-opted onto the Council of IIC.

Recent conversations with Slaughter and May have, of necessity, been conducted virtually, highlighting how both organisations have moved on from the meetings over long lunch and cigars which characterised the early days. IIC now works with Slaughter and May internationally, and their advice is increasingly valued as IIC consolidates its global and diverse outlook in a rapidly changing environment and one in which sound legal footings are increasingly important.


Sir Hilary Scott. Image courtesy of Slaughter and May.
ACE OF CARE FOR HERITAGE IN CROATIA

By Ksenija Škarić, Sandra Lucić Vujičić, Žana Matulić Bilač, Goran Nikšić, Jelena Zagora

In admiration, respect and gratitude to the founders of IIC, and everyone who has been part of its global network up to the present day, the IIC-Croatian Group wishes to contribute to this celebratory year and share experiences of its own development with the global community. The issues that IIC focuses on seem to mirror our own; we now see, in retrospect, that our foundations were built on a similar basis. It is difficult not to remember, on this occasion, that our first steps as an institution also took place in a post-war situation.

All the founders of the IIC-Croatian Group experienced the war in Croatia from 1991 to 1995. Countless works of art were evacuated from churches and museums targeted by shelling and were stored, first in improvised depots, most often in ordinary cellars, and then in the national “hospital” for artwork in Ludbreg. Through complex international and professional cooperation with Bavarian colleagues—who held out the first hand in rescue and provided financial assistance—we departed from earlier habits formed in our traditional conservation workshops and learned to think about wounded heritage sites as a whole, from handling to storage. When the war ended and as we emerged from the socialist model, we found ourselves facing the contemporary global approach to heritage, and the profession had to stand on its own, new, two feet. It did so by strengthening the national institute and its staff, establishing professional studies, shaping the legal framework for heritage protection and private practice, and involving all to participate in the process. We learned and grew individually, painstakingly but rapidly, through a series of national and international workshops (including ICCROM’s and other courses) but most importantly, we worked on networking and pooling our resources.

IIC-Croatian Group was founded in 2009 as a response to the need to integrate the strengthened, but fragmented, body of professionals.

In the eleven years of the group’s work, we have undertaken a wide range of activities: from organizing heritage science conferences, lectures, workshops, panel discussions and professional visits, to supporting individual members in the publication of reviews, professional and critical texts on our website, in News in Conservation and at IIC congresses. The challenging year 2020, the year of the pandemic and the devastating earthquake in and around Zagreb, highlighted the demanding activities carried out by the group’s members based solely on enthusiasm and volunteering. We launched a volunteer project that provides professional assistance to owners of earthquake-damaged heritage by recording damage, collecting data, and documentation in the forms of photographic and written material which will help with renovations in the future. Additionally, we began to compile a list of Croatian researchers in heritage science including a national survey to build profiles of professionals and students. We began to focus even more on making connections between generations and professions, which we had always

considered to be of paramount importance. Therefore, it seems fitting that our contribution here also includes two personal stories: a retrospective from the point of view of one of the founders of modern architecture conservation in Croatia and a perspective on these new times by a young expert.

Ksenija Škarić, Sandra Lucić Vujčić, Žana Matulić Bilač

. . . . .

AGAINST A ROUTINE APPROACH - FOR RESPONSIBLE AND INFORMED ARCHITECTURAL CONSERVATION

Split and Diocletian’s Palace have long been a testing ground for the application of conservation principles, but they are also an example of divergence from these principles due to the influence of a mythical, idealized image that has been built for centuries. At the turn of the 20th century, local experts were strongly influenced by the Vienna conservation school and the Central Commission, which gave guidance on how to approach architectural heritage, primarily monuments of antiquity. Despite declared sound conservation principles, in practice most interventions focused on purification, i.e. isolation of Classical monuments, which was further encouraged by Italian experts during World War II. In the post-war period, Croatian conservators continued these earlier practices, most often making decisions based on aesthetic and other unscientific criteria. The widespread use of modern materials and constructions (especially cement and reinforced concrete) often resulted in irreversible damage to the original structure.

Unlike the study of conservation, which in the past quarter century has been available at several universities in Croatia, the only option for architectural conservators is still to study abroad. Knowledge is acquired through practice, where mistakes are inevitable, and there is hardly any exchange of professional experiences, especially with foreign experts. Frequent changes in laws, as well as favouring the private sector, have transformed the conservation service into predominantly an administrative mechanism that has increasingly less time and interest in direct contact with heritage. Due to ignorance, indecision or unwillingness to take responsibility, this often makes for restrictive decisions postponing the solution for an uncertain future.

Therefore, through four decades of working on architectural conservation, I have relied on knowledge acquired in teamwork, studying foreign literature, attending architectural conservation studies in York, visiting domestic and foreign construction sites and professional gatherings. Convinced that sound conservation principles are best spread by examples of good practice, I have advocated for minimal and reversible interventions, the use of traditional materials (especially slaked lime) and also modern technologies (including the first use of lasers for stone cleaning in Croatia). I believe that responsible conservation work is never a set routine, so it must be preceded by thorough documentation and in-depth

Left: Exploring the churches of the Dalmatian hinterland as a part of the IIC-Croatian Group activities in 2017. (Image by: Lana Kekez) Centre: Group meeting organised by IIC-Croatian group (Image by: Ivana Sambolić)
analysis of the situation. In the long run, conservation in Croatia will be of high quality only if we introduce better education for conservators including all those involved in the conservation of architectural heritage. Their work must be on the same level of value as our monuments, a large number of which have been recognized as part of the heritage of mankind.

Goran Nikšić

A VIEW OF THE DALMATIAN EASEL PAINTING HERITAGE WITHIN THE CONSERVATION TRADITION AND NEW RESEARCH OPPORTUNITIES

The history of care for movable cultural heritage in Croatia was marked by insufficient research. Nevertheless, the professional community united behind their efforts towards evaluating authentic heritage context, reaching a model of care rooted in a tradition of conservation continuity originating from the 19th century and the activities of the Vienna Central Commission.

A large part of Croatia’s easel paintings still bear their historical layers, which is a rare and underexploited advantage. Although conservation activities in Croatia are increasingly focused on preventive protection, current research is not yet sufficient to move forward with treatment. On the other hand, accumulated analytical data on original techniques and materials, mostly derived from many years of restoration activities, encourage consolidation and statistical processing, in step with contemporary global efforts.

Working with canvas paintings, I have gained the impression that this is one of the areas least studied in Croatia. Interdisciplinary networking of conservator-restorers, art historians, archaeologists, heritage-science researchers and experts in various applied artistic and technical fields, started by the IIC-Croatian Group, could be a platform for change, collaboration and new opportunities to re-examine these and other important subjects. Specifically, the methodology and local tradition of wax-resin lining canvas paintings—which was not completely abandoned until the last decade—requires a new understanding of the ethical, aesthetic and material issues of this treatment, as well as fresh insights and international exchange of knowledge. In the process of accepting that part of our traditions cross over into the framework of European conservation history, this is one of the more important tasks that await my generation.

Jelena Zagora

For the full version of the article in English and Croatian click HERE.
FRENCH SECTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR CONSERVATION: ECHOES OF A STORY

By Georges Brunel, Daniel Alcouffe, Bertrand Lavédrine and Ségolène Bergeon Langle

The French Section of the International Institute for Conservation was created between 1982 and 1984. At the beginning of the 1980s, there was limited dialogue between the various players involved in its upkeep including scientists and curators. While no dedicated space existed for such exchanges, two laboratories would regularly involve restorers in their research work. The first was the Centre for the Research into the Conservation of Graphic Documents (CRCDG), created in 1963 by Françoise Flieder as a research unit of the National Centre for Scientific Research (CNRS) and housed in the National Museum of Natural History. Then came the Historical Monuments Research Laboratory (LRMH) under the authority of the Ministry of Culture, which was set up in the outbuildings of the Château de Champs in 1967, which was at the time under the leadership of Jean Taralon.

IIC’s 1984 Congress, Adhesives and Consolidants, held in Paris, gave Françoise Flieder and Marcel Stefanaggi (Jean Taralon’s collaborator) the opportunity to set up a platform for exchange for these professionals with the creation of the French Section of the IIC. Françoise Flieder was the SFIIC’s first chair and Marcel Stefanaggi its general secretary. Françoise Flieder was succeeded by Régis Ramière de Fortanier, Max Polonovski, Daniel Alcouffe, Georges Brunel, Elisabeth Moggetti and Roland May.

On the organisation’s daily life, the atmosphere which prevailed and a few key events in its history, let us first read Daniel Alcouffe’s account of his time as chairman and head of the Louvre’s department of works of art:

“I was elected chairman of the SFIIC—which at that time had about 350 members—for a three-year term in March 1995. It must be acknowledged that the general secretary, Marcel Stefanaggi, was, along with his cheerful, discreet and efficient obstinacy, the inspirer of decisions and a true leader. It was a great pleasure to work with him. The SFIIC members attended the annual general meeting, received a newsletter that kept them informed about the life of the association, and those most active took part in the working groups, some of which (stone-plaster, furniture, photography) were particularly dynamic. The most spectacular events were the Study Days. On the initiative of the stone-plaster group, the 7th Study Days were held in Poitiers on 9th–10th May 1996, the theme being the Desalination of porous materials, a choice in connection with the restoration of the façade of Notre-Dame-la-Grande. Participants from eight countries spoke at the event. The 8th Study Days were held in Chalon-sur-Saône (23rd–24th October 1997), under the shade of the Nicéphore-Niepce Museum. They gathered 200 participants and were dedicated to a particularly unusual topic at the time: Information technology and the conservation-restoration of cultural heritage. Stands were set up to enable various organisations to showcase their work and projects. I remember that I was accompanied by a computer specialist from the Board of French Museums, Marcel...”
performed a miracle every time: publishing the presentation texts at the very same time the Study Days took place, as per the IIC’s biennial congress practices.

"No periodical specifically devoted to restoration existed in France at the time, and so the launch of a journal was a major event, made possible thanks to the kind support of Jean-Pierre Dalbéra, head of the Research Mission at the Ministry of Culture. His deputy, Jacques Philippon, a member of the SFIIC, received a grant from the Ministry to support the journal’s publisher. The board of the SFIIC opted for Errance, which specialises mainly in archaeology. It was based in Paris, on the Île Saint-Louis, and led by Frédéric Lontcho. A memorandum of understanding was signed on 26th February 1996 between Errance and the SFIIC. My predecessor, Max Polonovski, came up with the magazine’s wonderful title, Coré, a contraction of the first syllables of the French words ‘Conservation’ and ‘Réstauration’. The scientific direction of the journal was entrusted to a committee of fourteen SFIIC members. Coré, destined for a fairly large audience, was to be 64 pages long and would appear twice a year. The first issue, devoted to photography and coordinated by Giulia Cucinella-Briant, was published in September 1996. There were more than 400 subscribers at the beginning of 1997.

Jack Lang, Ministry of Culture (1981–1993). From left to right: unidentified person, Marcel Stefanaggi, Sfiics general secretary; Catherine de Maupeou, Directrice du Conservatoire; Jack Lang, Ministry of Culture. © D. Bouchardon / LRMH
“When French law established competition between companies in the field of restoration, the SFIIC, reacting to the concerns of conservators and curators, organised an information meeting on 25th March 1997 at the Louvre auditorium to discuss the application of the French Code of Public Procurement to conservation work. It thus acted as an intermediary between the world of heritage specialists and the Ministry, which had sent a representative to present at the meeting.”

CONSERVATION-RESTORATION AND INTERDISCIPLINARITY

From the outset, the SFIIC has asserted an interdisciplinary approach. The working groups account for its main and regular activity. These groups focus on materials such as stone/plaster/earth, textiles, wood, mural paintings and gilding. Annual meetings are held to communicate on work themes and to encourage exchange and reflection. These meetings are an echo of the professional activity and remain very much appreciated by conservators and curators.

While the practice of advanced specialities leads to the creation of closed environments, meetings during Study Days, which have often been held far from Paris and take the form of short trips, have encouraged mixing between practitioners from distant and diverse fields. Friendly interactions then leads to intellectual discussions, and friendships built up over dinner later facilitate a dialogue which must be fostered in a workshop or on a building site.

PUBLICATIONS

Since 1988, 15 volumes of Study Days have been published. The collection of these proceedings offers a constantly updated panorama of the research, problems and work carried out in the various fields of cultural heritage, including those less explored.

Before taking on a new form in 2020, there were 31 Coré issues from 1996 to 2016. Within each issue the majority of the dossiers were devoted to reviewing some areas of heritage and some specific types of objects, such as painted ivory works (no. 5, 1998), weapons (no. 12, 2002), scientific instruments (no. 17, 2006) or moving works (nos. 19 and 20, 2007-2008). A few have been dedicated to methodological problems such as reproduction and multiples (no. 22, 2009) or methods of sorting out collections (no. 31, 2016). About every other issue contained a section called “Portrait” in which a tutelary figure of restoration was highlighted.

The 2001 book titled Preserving the works of our heritage: A précis on preventive conservation, is a collective work; the list of authors includes more than 40 names. This publication testifies that the members of the SFIIC are devoted to safeguarding and maintaining even minor heritage,
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those objects which, while precious in various ways, are
part of the decor of daily life or serve a variety of func-
tions: furniture in religious or public buildings; collections
inherited by private individuals or collected by curious
enthusiasts; and souvenirs which foster the awareness of
belonging to a particular family, village or country. You
will not find anything reminiscent of the collections of reci-
pes peddled by so-called specialists and sellers of absurd
drugs. Rather, it seemed necessary to help as wide a
public as possible to adopt the basic practices of prevention.

Thus, through its publications, the SFIC has tried to reach
a wider audience than just restoration professionals. This
is a difficult undertaking. Maintaining and safeguarding
the real cultural heritage is still a young discipline, which
needs to secure its methods and have its specific charac-
ter recognised by the authorities and the general public.
Ultimately, the public will decide on the fate of its cultural
property, and it must therefore be made aware as well as
possible of the realities involved in the concept of conser-
vation-restoration. This is the undertaking to which the
SFIC is dedicated.

https://sfic.com/

Authors Georges Brunel and Daniel Alcouffe are former chairs of the SFIC. The article
was also written with the collaboration of Bertrand Lavédrine, former IIC Fellow, and
Ségolène Bergeon Langle, IIC Fellow.

For the full version of the article in English and French click HERE.
Looking Back: Grupo Español de Conservación (GE-IIC)

Camino Roberto, Current President, GE-IIC

I remember perfectly when I joined the Spanish Group of the International Institute for Conservation; it was 1999. Recent graduates knew that everything that developed in the GE-IIC was synonymous with quality. Since then it has continued to grow, obtaining the National Prize for Restoration and Conservation of Cultural Assets in 2011, forming working groups and creating the Ge-Conservation magazine.

Only a few years ago, it was unthinkable to organize conferences and courses virtually, but COVID-19 has driven us to change the way we contact and communicate with one another, providing us with access to people and places in the world that would otherwise be inaccessible. The #geicdesdecasa conferences which we started during confinement, have opened up the society to many Spanish-speaking countries, where interesting and important contacts have been established. This capacity to reach a greater number of professionals from other countries in the world has shown that there is at least some positive value to be harnessed from the misfortune and continued negative impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic.

After our first year of service, this current board is still excited to move our legacy forward and remains happy to collaborate with the IIC. We would also like to reach our 70th anniversary like IIC to which we wish many more years of quality work and our best wishes.

To accompany this celebration we have collected testimonies of some past presidents of the GE-IIC, as well as testimonials from other key people in the development of the GE-IIC. Thanks to them, to the partners and the daily work, the Spanish Group of the IIC continues to collaborate in the conservation of cultural heritage by bringing together many professionals in the sector.

Congratulations.

Emilio Ruiz de Arcaute, Board member, GE-IIC (1996-2000)

In 1996 after the XI Congress for the Conservation and Restoration of Cultural Assets took place in Castellón, and after unsuccessful attempts to redirect the situation, we decided to create a new regional group under the IIC.

In that group was Rosaura García Ramos (Seville, May 9, 1956 - Vitoria, March 26, 2011), who held the presidency of the GE-IIC in one of its first terms. These were hard times, due to the lack of means, but at that time we laid the foundation for what is now our group and cemented its presence in Spain by organizing our first congress in Valencia in 2002.

........
Ana Laborde Marquez, Secretary, GE-IIC (2000-2010)

The first thing that comes to my mind is that time in the late 80s, when a group of young conservation-restoration professionals wanted to change things, seeing an opportunity—coinciding with the democratic transition—to take our work out of the studio and give it the consideration it deserved. We were young and idealistic. Leandro de la Vega and Miguel Ángel Rodríguez Lorite were our leaders at that time. The GE-IIC was the instrument to develop the projects that the rigidity of governmental administrations did not allow us to undertake. The main merit of those years was to create a structure that would bring together professionals, who were otherwise scattered and isolated, as well as to design a quality training program that was affordable and available to everyone. It was a time when there was no training offered by public institutions, but under the coordination of Rocío Bruquetas and the impetus of Charo Fernández we managed to organise courses and conferences throughout the Spanish peninsula in addition to launching a non-institutional magazine open to all professionals involved in the conservation of cultural heritage.

Rocío Bruquetas, President, GE-IIC (2003-2007)

I was president of the GE-IIC between May 2003 and spring 2007, in the company of a board of directors formed by Pilar Ineba as vice president, Ana Schoebel (later replaced by Ana Carrassón) as secretary and Charo Fernández as treasurer.

When I accepted the presidency, the Spanish Group of the IIC had already pushed through the difficult first years, common in the initiation of many new associations. The successes we achieved going forward were undoubtedly thanks to those who paved the way before us. The previous board had managed to triple the number of members, and we aimed to continue this expansion with an interesting offer that took into account professional needs not covered by public institutions…[including]…the organization of the second conference of the GE-IIC, held in Barcelona in November 2005 under the general title of Research in Conservation and Restoration of Cultural Heritage. The venue for the congress was the historic auditorium of the University of Barcelona, in collaboration with the Museum of Art of Catalonia…As a result of this conference, it was evident that there was a great demand for a scientific journal that would serve to disseminate new scientific advances in the field of cultural heritage conservation. It was at that congress that the Ge-Conservation magazine was created among a group of attendees.

Pilar Ineba, President, GE-IIC (2007-2011)

From 2007 to 2011…we…offer[ed] a wide scope of courses and conferences so that those of us who work conserving or studying our heritage could continue to train without excessive personal expense. We disseminated the results on the GE-IIC website, trying to carry them out in different areas of the peninsula, avoiding centralism, and bringing the results closer to professionals.
Among the activities carried out are the continuity of the conferences organized by the Altarpiece Group, which was created and coordinated by Ana Carrasson and the undersigned. Different courses were organized such as "Illuminated Manuscripts: Past, Present and Future", biannual congresses on contemporary art, and our relationship with Portugal was started.

Ana Calvo, President, GE-IIC (2011-2014)

There are two moments that I remember with special emotion from my relationship with the GE-IIC. The first was the creation of the magazine Ge-Conservación; the initial issue was published in 2009 after many ups and downs. The magazine was an idea that we had proposed on numerous occasions to highlight the advances in our profession and to improve scientific communication. And it is wonderful to see how it continues to be a prestigious forum in the field of conservation. The second moment was the granting of the National Prize for Restoration and Conservation of Cultural Assets of 2011 to the GE-IIC, which I had the honour of collecting as president of the association.

But there were many more things at that time: working groups, meetings, specialized courses, the congress, Quality Criteria in Interventions, in 2012, and so on.

It has been a lifetime surrounded by wonderful professionals and friends who have also granted me the honour of the “Reserva Award 2018”. These things come with age!

Diana Pardo, President, GE-IIC (2014-2019)

I still remember when we met to organize a new presidency. To the question, “do you think the GE-IIC can be presided over from outside Madrid?”, GE-IIC answered, “Of course it can”. It was the first time GE-IIC was run outside of Madrid, and that was the uniqueness that marked the years in which I presided over our association.

We were beginning to emerge from the great economic crisis of 2008-2014 resulting in the financial support from institutions, foundations or companies down to practically nil... Recovering that support was one of our most arduous goals.

Our work culminated with the congress held in September 2018, And then? Control and maintenance of cultural heritage, a sustainable option, which placed special emphasis on the need to implement prevention strategies as a priority so that the management of our heritage is approached from a sustainable perspective... We closed the congress with the delivery of the GE-IIC Awards: Young, Crianza and Reserva. This was the first call for awards, organized with the intention of promoting the work of young researchers in heritage conservation and to recognize the work of professionals in this discipline.

For the full version of the article in English and Spanish click HERE.
AN INTERVIEW WITH ANDREW ODDY

Excerpts from Andrew Oddy, interviewed by Hero Lotti on 15 February 2002 (with clarifying edits by Andrew Oddy)

Below are excerpts from Hero Lotti’s FAIC Oral History interview of Andrew Oddy on 15 February 2002. We hope you enjoy his entertaining and candid memories as much as we do. Like so many movers and shakers in IIC’s history, during his years of service, Andrew pushed our organization forward for the better.

AO: ...you probably know [that], until very recently, getting onto the IIC Council meant that the existing council thought you would be a good person, and [then] they asked you if you would like to stand [for election]. There was no mechanism for the membership to nominate anyone. So basically, a certain number of council members had to retire in rotation, and the existing council would decide who it wanted and invite them, and there’d be an election when the names would be put to the membership, but there was no real competition. So if you’d been invited, you got in ...a process which I’m delighted to say we have changed recently.

So I did six years on the IIC Council... [W]hen they asked me if I would stand, I said: “Well, if you ask me to stand, the first thing I shall want to do is to change the rules ...to make it ...possible for council members only to [serve] two three-year terms and then stand down, rather than three terms.” Because people up ’til then were... automatically [on the council] for nine years unless they retired, and I felt that [this] was too long. It didn’t give enough people a share in running the IIC. And so Teddy Hall... who I think was the President at the time...said: “Yes, that’s fine by me.” And so they invited me on and... within the first year we’d changed the rules so that people could only stay on [Council for] six years instead of nine. That was ordinary council members ...not officers...

HL: And when did your involvement with the IIC begin?

AO: I became a Council member of IIC in 1990 and, as I said, I then set about changing the rules... I came off in 1996 and then, two years ago, I decided [to stand for president as] I was unhappy with the lack of participation by the members as a whole in the election of officers. Now... in recent years [it has changed]. There has been much more of a consultation process. It wasn’t just the Council deciding who should be the next Council, but there was not [even] an open voting system. And so I stood for president a year ago against the ‘official’ candidate who the Council had decided it would like as president. I decided to stand, because I wanted to change things so that there was a much more open system of election of Council members, among other things. And as you know, I was elected, and we have now changed the system [of] voting for Council members so that we now call for nominations, and we call for nominations from geograph-

tical areas, because we must have a geographical spread. So the election [was held] six weeks ago in January...it was at the very end of January. We’d had an election...a postal election...for, if I remember rightly, a European candidate, a USA candidate, and a “rest of the world” candidate... [T]here was no UK vacancies this time... We called for nominations. We got one nomination for the rest of the world and three for Europe and I think we had three for the United States. I can’t just remember now. And then... the fellows did a postal ballot. Now this was fine, as far as it goes. It was open and above board, and anybody could stand if they were a Fellow, and the Fellows voted for them.

The problem is that the fellowship is only about one sixth of the membership, and so it’s hardly democratic when the ruling body is being elected by one sixth...I think it’s one sixth...or it may even be one tenth...no, it’s one tenth, I think, of the membership. Anyway, it’s a small fraction of the membership. And I would like to see this changed... [We are] discussing in Council [about] whether we [should] introduce... a professional members category or whether we just set about trying to widen the fellowship, so that people get to be Fellows much earlier in their careers... It looks as though [we are] probably going to go down that route, although we are going to introduce a junior or student category, which will be somewhat cheaper, in order to try and get people to join IIC when they first come into the career. But we are looking at changes. So I did a spell on the Council in the early ’90s, and then I became president just over a year ago.
JOHN ANTHONY MICHAEL BULL, FIIC (1931-2020)

By Sarah Bull

John was born on 17th January 1931 in Bristol, England. After Bristol Grammar School, he studied Fine Art and Cabinet Making at Royal West of England College of Art, where he met his future wife of 64 years, Anne. On 12th November 1956, he began working as a junior restorer at Bristol City Museum and Art Gallery starting the Monday after his marriage to Anne.

Over the next year, Hans Schubart, the director—who had studied under Helmut Ruhemann in the 1930’s—taught John everything he knew and felt that he had a special talent for the work. He persuaded John to apply to the Tate Gallery for the newly created role of assistant restorer in February 1958.

When John left Bristol, his brother David, who had also studied at the Royal West of England College, followed in his brother’s footsteps and took the position under Hans Schubart. Some time later, he also left Bristol for London to work at the National Gallery. The brothers were already on parallel paths to eminent careers in paintings conservation.

John spent six years at the Tate Gallery, working with Percy Williams, Alexander Dunlave (overlapping for a year) and Bruno Heimberg. Upon resigning his position, Tate Director Sir John Rothenstein wrote to John, “…I don’t think I need to tell you that I personally regret your departure….The Chief Restorer (Stefan Słabczyński) has always given me an excellent account of the conscientiousness of your work.”

In the spring of 1964, John set up in private practice in Wimbledon. David Bull’s studio was already established in a parallel road, 5 minutes walk away. In South West London there was quite a community of paintings conservators at this time. John’s next studio was a converted printing press at the end of the garden where a snooker table in the workroom doubled as a workbench. Fridays became regular snooker nights with Peter Newman and Robert Shepherd (who was in partnership with David). Games of boules on Wimbledon Common, with David, Robert and Richard Watkiss, were played in the summer.

John went into partnership with Katharine Reid, the daughter of Sir Norman Reid, director of the Tate Gallery. They specialised in the conservation of Modern paintings. At the forefront of the profession, John developed techniques to restore paintings that were created with challenging modern materials. In constant communication with British artists of the day, his approach was able to encompass their techniques, concepts and intentions. Over the years he tutored many assistant restorers who went on to have successful careers around the globe.
In 1977 John was asked to make several trips to Tehran by the British Council, in conjunction with the opening of the Tehran Museum of Contemporary Art, overseeing the arrival of pictures and carrying out any necessary treatment. The timing with the Iranian Revolution 1978-79 meant that the collection of Western Art has only been able to be displayed for short periods since then.

In 1981 John collaborated with Peter Newman, picture re-liner, to restore Bryan Organ’s portrait of Lady Diana Spencer after it was vandalised whilst on show at the National Portrait Gallery. He collaborated closely with Bryan who became a life-long friend.

John’s enduring association with Lord Kenneth Thomson began in the 1970s. His son David became a close friend, sharing many and varied interests. John worked on their collections and became an expert on the paintings of John Constable; by the end of his career he had worked on an extraordinary number. Through this work he became great friends with expert Ian Fleming-Williams; they also shared a passion for Schubert.

Conservation in the Bull family has become a family trait. John worked with his brother David and his wife Teresa Longyear on the Annenberg Collection in Rancho Mirage,
California. He often collaborated with his daughter Sarah (paper conservator) on projects. John’s client base was extraordinarily broad, from private family collections of Siegfried Sassoon to Modern British artists including Patrick Heron, Bridget Riley and Richard Hamilton (who engendered his passion for Porches). John worked for the major auctions houses and West End galleries. His daybooks are a catalogue of world class paintings and collectors. Visits to the studio in Wimbledon by artists, collectors and dealers were the daily norm often concluding with a convivial and delicious meal provided by Anne, given rave reviews by all who came.

During 1995—after a long, demanding and often stressful career—at the age of 64, John suffered a major stroke that cruelly affected the use of his right hand as well as his speech and language. But one of his assistants remarked that he could do more with his left toe than most people could with both hands. Over time he determinedly learnt to use his left hand with great skill, and he returned to work. Culminating in 2003 at the National Gallery London, at his brother’s old easel, he restored Ruben’s Massacre of the Innocents at the specific request of Lord Kenneth Thomson.

John adored planes, trains and automobiles. The latter particularly resonated. He was devoted to sport cars and shared the passion with friends. Professional drivers would often accompany John and share the experience. Scale models lay scattered within the studio, the Spitfire and Bugatti being his favourites.

Classical music cassettes and CDs were ever present in the studio. The joy of discovery seemed endless, and every hour taken with works of art was accentuated by this form of beauty. The aura within the studio was sublime. One sensed the deepest communion amongst human spirits.

John continued to work until 2015. After which he had time, at last, to indulge in his life-long love of drawing and painting. Inspired by David Hockney and the natural world in rural Gloucestershire, he also mastered the use of his iPad for drawing and painting. His oeuvre includes pictures in the style of Constable cloud studies, Van Gogh ink drawings, Cézanne watercolours and Morandi paintings.
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Over Time: the IIC-Student & Emerging Conservator Conferences 2011-2019

By Mariana Escamilla and Charlotte Hoffmann, with Jo Kirby Atkinson and Mikkel Scharff

The IIC-Student and Emerging Conservator Conference (S&ECC) offers an open platform for young professionals to network with peers and experienced professionals while discussing relevant topics of the profession. Unlike most conservation conferences, the IIC-S&ECCs do not aim to present recent research; rather, their goal is to help develop emerging conservators and to promote the enthusiasm of students.

At the core of these conferences is the fact that they are set up, structured and carried out by students themselves. Although supported by IIC and the host institution, the students are responsible for everything from organization and budget to the finalisation of the event. The first IIC-S&EC conference was held in 2011 in London. Since then the conference has been held every two years; 2013 in Copenhagen, 2015 in Warsaw, 2017 in Bern and 2019 in Cologne. Although the participants have always been international, students located further away from the venue are able to join and discuss through the live online broadcasting of the conference.

By establishing a forum where these discussions can take place, IIC instigated a tradition that students look forward to every other year. In this article honouring the 70th anniversary of IIC, and as active participants of various past IIC-S&ECCs, we would like to tell the story of how this all began, including interesting and relevant discussions from these conferences. Finally, we will outline which future discussions might be relevant for the rising generation.

The Beginning

To find out more about the beginnings of the IIC-S&ECC, we interviewed Jo Kirby Atkinson and Mikkel Scharff. Both were part of the team that shaped the first IIC-S&EC conference in 2011 and have been involved in the organisation of the conferences ever since.

Q: How did the idea develop?

Mikkel: “I think the idea of setting up a separate S&ECC conference in London in 2011 took off from the Istanbul meeting [2010 Congress] […] some students approached the IIC office to discuss the possibility.”

Adam M. Klupš, at the time studying for an MA in conservation at the University College London, was one of the students participating in this meeting.

Jo: “He was struck by the fact that there was no conference or other event to help students of conservation and conservators just starting their careers and contacted the IIC office with the idea of organising something, under the auspices of IIC. This would be different from the usual run of student conferences where students present their final year projects.”
Participants talking between sessions at the 2013 IIC-SECC in Copenhagen. Photograph by Mikkel Scharff.

IIC-SECC 2019: Participants during the visit to the Rautenstrauch-Joest-Museum Cologne (Image: TH Köln - CICS - LOC - David Bijan Andree)

Meaghan Monaghan speaking during a session of the 2013 IIC-SECC in Copenhagen. Photograph by Mikkel Scharff.
Q: How did the first team of students organise the event and what was their goal for this first chapter?

After the idea was brought to IIC Council, a small group—including Graham Voce, Mikkel Scharff and Jo Kirby Atkinson—further developed the idea together with the students.

Mikkel: “During the winter 2010-2011, the student group got organized to set up a formal organisation, planning the event itself, budget, location, possibility of web-casting the conference live, discussing the possibility of producing transcripts of sessions to be made available afterwards.”

Jo: “From the start, though, the whole point was that the students should organise the event, not the IIC office or Council members: we could, however, advise and make suggestions if people got stuck.”

Adam Klupš dedicated a lot of energy to the planning and shaping of the conference together with the co-organisers Kathleen Froyen and Marie Louise Liwanag, University College London, and Francesca Lemass and Liz Ralph, Camberwell College of Arts, London. Integral from this first conference was the plan to give students abroad the opportunity to participate in the discussion by commenting or asking questions on-line, via social media.

Mikkel: “Other ideas that grew up were the content of the sessions, their number (three), length, number of panelists, time of day for each of the sessions – giving possibility to have early and late sessions to accommodate possible participants from North America to Australia participate.”

Mikkel: “[...] after this second conference I felt quite sure that the initiative was to continue ... as it did in the following biennial S&ECC conferences.”

THE PAST AND THE PRESENT

Jo: “[...] students or newly qualified conservators attending such an event will recognise that some of the questions asked or discussed are not new; other people have had the same worries in the past.”

Despite the very different themes of the conferences, as well as the speakers’ backgrounds and specialties, various discussions return to almost every IIC-S&ECC. As the profession has progressed with time, so has the discourse equally developed. The reappearance of certain topics in these discussions highlights how the profession has or has not grown in different directions.

One of the most discussed topics during the conferences is unpaid internships and low salaries and how these have affected the profession and its diversity:

Sarah Staniforth (Warsaw 2015 Session 3): “Unpaid internships are impacting the lack of diversity in the profession. [...]”

Audience Member (Warsaw 2015 Session 3): “[...] it was said that what makes the difference when we all have the same qualifications and skills is people showing extra passion by doing (unpaid) internships, but the thing is that I would argue, that that actually shows extra wealth or privilege and that [...] is making the profession for [...] people with means and potentially less meritocratic.”

The conclusions in this regard have always encouraged the future generations to enhance the visibility of the profession, making the need for the conservation profession clear, as apparently, the profession still has not gained sufficient acknowledgement even from within the museum environment:
Tiarna Doherty (Warsaw 2015 Session 3): [...] I have been shocked, personally, by how so many colleagues in museums still do not understand what conservators do [...] this is something we need to work very hard at.

Johanna Philipps (Cologne 2019 Session 2): “[a recurring topic is] frustration about the low salaries after years and years of academic training. Emerging conservators are rightfully upset. What does the low salary say about the recognition of our work - of our profession? Where does the conservator stand in the hierarchy of the museum? How do we collaborate with other departments if we are not regarded as equal players? Who gets the credit for our work? [...] Make sure you are mentioned on publications [...] be stringent like people in the sciences are [...] engage in art technology and research [...] we are still seen as manual labourers”.

Amber Kerr (London 2011 Session 2) “ [...] an advantage that emerging conservators currently have is your knowledge of new media and how to communicate with it.”

This discussion is directly linked to the recurring topic of the acknowledgement of the profession and existing hierarchies in museums and other institutions:

Tiarna Doherty (Warsaw 2015 Session 3): “What is so difficult for us now, is that conservators are expected to be everything. Recently, I had a meeting in Washington DC with leaders in our field [...] to talk about how we can develop programs for conservators in management and leadership. [...] comments that the number one skill that distinguishes us as conservators in the museum profession is our ability to assess and treat objects.”

The low salaries and the lack of work placements after graduation, compared to students in other fields, worldwide, has been a recurrent topic. Strangely, these points do not seem congruous with the apparent need for conservators as well as the high level of education and standards that the profession requires.

The need for an accreditation system to comply with professional standards worldwide has also been mentioned at least once in every conference, setting the example of Icon’s accreditation system forward. An international accreditation of conservators would be a solution for this. However, there are different approaches and standards in different countries, and the organisation of such accreditation processes takes time and funds to accomplish.

Velson Horie (London 2011 Session 1): “A little dream that I have is that I would like to somehow get together a way of collaborating and co-ordinating the professionalisation efforts of different countries such as the ECCO standards, as well as the [Icon] PACR standards that are divergent. But it took 15 years in UK. It’s going to be a generational change worldwide. So you [the younger generation] can do it!”
The “you can do it!” approach is the core aspect of all these conferences so far, empowering students and emerging conservators, motivating them to stand up for their professions and work towards a positive change in the near future.

Renate Poggendorf (Bern 2017 Session 3) “If you think circumstances of this profession are not yet satisfying, do something to change them. It needs effort, but it’s possible.”

RELEVANCE OF THE CONFERENCE FOR STUDENTS AND EMERGING CONSERVATORS

After almost 10 years, it is clear that the contributions made during these events have marked the careers of both participants and organisers. Students and emerging conservators participating in past conferences have been able to establish contacts and even arrange internships in private studios and museums. Participants have also been able to network with other students or emerging conservators from various programmes to establish alliances and friendships that continue over the years. In time, this has helped to develop a larger sense of community for the profession. It is – as Jo stated in the interview – an “[…] invigorating experience the students receive when attending such a conference […]”.

For the student group organising the conference, the S&CCs offer essential experience in the planning of an international conference.

“The experience of organising an event is of lasting value. It gives a person confidence in his or her own abilities; confidence in approaching people; confidence in public speaking, at least to some extent; confidence in expressing ideas.” —Jo Kirby Atkinson

“Probably the most important aspect is the experience the group of students get when arranging such a conference - and for fellow students and participants to be able to participate in such a self-made event.” —Mikkel Scharff

THE FUTURE

This conference format represents a unique opportunity for finding and discussing new perspectives and for building up fruitful new relationships with fellow students and experienced professionals. We can securely say that this forum has transformed into an event that students around the globe look forward to, and we certainly hope that the format is preserved for many years to come.

Especially during these challenging pandemic times, the next conference in 2021 might be even more focused on online and web-casting tools. Nevertheless, the networking and profession-supporting focus of the event will remain. The discussions on how training and the profession have evolved through the current situation might be of particular interest. Furthermore, we expect topics such as sustainability, outreach and the further development of the profession to remain relevant topics in the coming conferences.
To see the videos of the past IIC-SEC conferences and discussions, click on the boxes below:
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Charlotte Hoffmann studied conservation of paintings, sculptures and modern art at the Cologne Institute of Conservation Sciences (CICS). In her master studies, she investigated the partial browning of green paint layers in 17th-century landscape paintings. This research led to her interest to study materials, techniques and colour change in green paint layers in 17th-century paintings. She is a PhD candidate in the Graduate Research Programme ‘Changing Frames’ since September 2020.
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MUST HAVES: CONSERVATION PUBLICATIONS

We live in a time when looking back at the history of IIC and of the conservation profession can also include looking back at a long and rich history of quality publications which have withstood the test of time. It is wonderful to see so many of these books authored and compiled by IIC founders, leaders, and members.

This list of ‘must haves’ was put together with the help of several conservation educators from around the world. It is by no means complete, but offers a good start to any conservator’s personal library. To further whet your appetite, we have included five mini-reviews which illustrate the intimate relationships we often form with cherished publications.

We hope you will feel inspired to become reacquainted with some of these books and possibly add a few more to your own shelves.

1942: Painting Materials: A short encyclopedia, by Rutherford Gettens
1944: Metals in the Service of Man, by Arthur Street and William A. Frelich
1948: Caring for your Pictures, by George Stout (Columbia University Press)
1963: Theory of Restoration (Teoria del Restauro), by Cesare Brandi
1966: The Conservation of Antiquities and Works of Art, by Harold Williams
1967: The Materials and Techniques of Paintings, by Kurt Wehlte
1968: The Cleaning of Paintings: Problems and Personalities, by H. P. Hartnett
1971: Artifacts: an introduction to early materials and technology, by C. L. Karp
1978: Museum Environment, by Garry Thomson (Taylor & Francis)
1984: Conservation of Wall Paintings, by Paolo Mora, Laura Mora
1987: Materials for Conservation, by Velson Horne (Taylor & Francis)
1990: Elements of Archaeological Conservation, by Jane Cronyn
1993: Measured Opinions, Gerry Hedley (UKIC)
1994: Preventive Conservation: practice, theory and research, Pippa White
1998: The Restoration of Paintings (Handbuch der Gemaelderestauration), by Volker Wiegand
1999: Risk Assessment for Object Conservation, by Jonathan Ashley
1999: Modern Art, Who Cares?, ed. By IJsbrand M.C. Hummelen
2002: Preserving What is Valued, by Miriam Clavir (UBC Press)
2010: Trade in Artists’ Materials, ed. by Jo Kirby, et al. (Archetype, London)

All book images in this article were provided by the publishers as listed above.
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HISTORICAL AND PHILOSOPHICAL ISSUES IN THE CONSERVATION OF CULTURAL HERITAGE

Edited by Nicholas Stanley Price, M. Kirby Talley Jr and Alessandra Melucco Vaccaro
Review by Sharra Grow

Some of my fondest memories from grad school at the Winterthur/University of Delaware Program in Art Conservation are of our monthly reading seminars held in the paintings conservation studio. These intimate gatherings were always scheduled in the evening, gathered around the center table with just the paintings conservation students (two or three of us), possibly an intern or assistant professor, and our advising professor Joyce Hill Stoner.

We read and discussed many books and articles, from Measured Opinions by Gerry Hedley, to the National Gallery London’s Art in the Making series, but the book I remember—and still refer to—the most is the Getty’s Historical and Philosophical Issues in the Conservation of Cultural Heritage. As a thoughtfully curated collection of essays, the book provokes discussion and debate; it seemed as though it had been written just for our evening gatherings.

Do you remember the first time you read Alois Rieg’s essay “The Modern Cult of Monuments” in which he lays out his values of monuments (beginning on page 69, for anyone who needs a refresher)? This essay became so fundamental to me that, even though I only had it in English, I included the essay in a conservation workshop I organized in Lima, Peru.

I also owe a great debt to the authors in Part VII of the book which is devoted to patina; this, of course, includes essays by Philippot and Brandi in particular, as well as the underlying contentions between Hell and Ruhemann, which can be felt through much of this section. I have read these essays countless times, and the margins are filled with my own notes and underlining of concepts that became the foundation of a paper I presented on “dirt”. In fact, the seed was first planted for the most profound concept at the heart of my paper while I read Paul Philippot’s “The Idea of Patina and the Cleaning of Paintings”. My small script in blue pen, written in the margins of page 374 reads, “CLEANING OF PTGS = SUBJECT TO THE ARTISTIC TASTE OF THE TIME”.

Aesthetic philosophies and tastes will continue to change and evolve, and perhaps what we consider today to be an unacceptable amount of dirt on an Andy Warhol Brillo Box may be considered treasured patina one hundred years from now. Who’s to say how conservation practices and preferences will change in time? I only hope we still have this great book and reading seminars to ground us.

THE ORGANIC CHEMISTRY OF MUSEUM OBJECTS, 2ND EDITION

By John Mills & Raymond White
Review by Angela Caira

The Organic Chemistry of Museum Objects by Mills and White has become a reference text for those interested in deeply understanding the composition of objects of an organic nature found in collections. In a short number of pages, the authors have managed to describe the chemistry, properties and some historical characteristics of these materials in clear language.

The publication structure introduces the reader to the main chemical concepts of a material before entering the subject of their characterization and identification through analytical methods, which include different radiation and chromatographic separation techniques. The following chapters discuss a large number of materials grouped into chemical classes: oils and fats, natural waxes, bituminous materials, carbohydrate, proteins, natural resins and lacquers, synthetic materials and dyestuffs and other coloured materials.
Within these groupings, descriptions range from general to specific—from how amino acid chains are made to the complex composition of polysaccharides, which are described at a level that is easy to understand, consistent with the rest of the book. Given their complexity and common presence in museum objects, the chapter dedicated to natural resins and lacquers is more extensive; perhaps this is also to be expected considering the major research conducted on the characterization of natural resins by the authors during their careers, working mainly on paintings from Europe. Asian lacquers—their characterization and the methods used—are also described. However, it is mentioned that this subject, less familiar to the authors, remains under investigation, and some references of significant updates are given. Likewise, synthetic materials have been updated from the first edition, adding more information (although, within this area of conservation there is still a lack of data about polymers).

Many of the materials described in this book are used mainly as treatment materials; this illustrates a different point of view, suggesting that conservation processes and treatments become part of an object’s material nature. Along the same line, the authors describe the properties of some oils and synthetic materials even though they have not yet found them used in museum objects.

The last two chapters of the publication focus on the investigation of deterioration processes, although they are only briefly explained, giving just a brushstroke on the possible agents of deterioration and their consequences. Among the methods described for the analysis of materials and their degradation, GC-MS and HPLC stand out. Details about their use are given, including sample preparation and interpretation of results, showing some graphs from case studies that help the reader become familiar with this type of chromatograms.

This book can be used as a reference when looking for general information (and in some cases, more specific information on those materials which the authors have placed more emphasis). The notes and cited bibliography to which they refer are studies of great importance in the areas of technical art history, heritage chemistry and conservation.
Materials for Conservation
By Velson Horie
Review by Ana Vega Ramiro

Most conservators are, by now, familiar with the book Materials for Conservation by Velson Horie. It has probably come in handy to us all more than once, and as a student I have used it endlessly. It is a fascinating book that unravels the properties of conservation materials and how they affect the treatment of the objects. The book is wisely divided into two parts. The first targets the science of materials, such as polymers or solvents, and when they should be used for conservation treatments. The second part focuses on specific materials, which makes this book great, not only to have on hand as a quick data base, but also as a starting point when studying a material, since it contains an extensive bibliography.

To begin with, I would like to point out that there is already an interesting book review about the 2010 edition of Materials for Conservation, written by Alison Murray. Hence for this review, which is part of the News in Conservation celebration of IIC’s 70th anniversary, I would like to add part of an enriching conversation I recently had with Mr. Horie.

His perspective on the book does not differ much from the reader’s perspective, since he considers the “main role of MfC is translating data and information from technological and scientific sources into the language and applications of conservators”. He recalled that it was a “tremendous amount of scanning and editing of information – resulting in an idiosyncratic output.” For him “the major lacuna is natural materials, since it is only in the past 30-40 years that scientific understanding of the long observed behaviors has developed about these, much from food and medical science, and only some of those advances were incorporated”. He also adds that if there is a new edition, “it will probably be a multi-author book, with an interventionist editor who can weave the strands of new knowledge into the range of conservation activities”.

From my point of view, one of the most controversial treatment steps in conservation has always been the cleaning, especially when it concerns varnish removal. That is why, as an emerging conservator, I deeply appreciate the “Solvents” chapter, which helps me understand the process of this treatment while giving insight into the many parameters that have to be controlled in order to dissolve a material. As Horie says, concerning the solubility charts “There are too many variables for an algorithm to be constructed (at least until the “big data” revolution in conservation). So the data supplied is a starting point for understanding the changes, which will never be completed. The most important input is that of the observant and aware conservator”.

As a highlight in this conversation, Velson has another major concern which is that he “and others had the stability and opportunity to develop and test-drive expertise over decades. This stability has been whittled away for many. But it is always down to individuals to explore the field in new directions.” I suppose this is not a topic that only concerns him, as many students and emerging conservators see the same problem. We are starting out in the conservation field with many innovative ideas that need the support of experienced conservators. This will not only help us as individuals, but will make way for new research and improvements for the field.

Finally, I would like to add some ideas for inclusion should there be another edition. First, as already mentioned, is to continue updating the book with new information, advances and studies in the field. In addition, this last decade has produced many studies about the use of gels during treatment, so it would be a perfect idea to add a section dedicated to types of gels, their characteristics and properties. Finally, due to recent IT advances—this is a call to conservation specialists—I think it would be quite the upgrade to create an algorithm that helps conservators determine which solvents would work best for individual surface cleanings and other treatments.
**THEORY OF RESTORATION**

By Cesare Brandi

Review by Anastasiya Mogucheva

In front of you lies a stunning book by a great man, Cesare Brandi; a brilliant analyst and philosopher. During his work as director of the Central Institute for Restoration in Rome, he wrote several works focused on the restoration field. One of them is *Theory of Restoration* which was first published in 1963 and has not lost its relevance; on the contrary, it has confirmed the well-known saying, "not everything that is new is talented, but everything that is talented, is new."

Throughout his life Cesare Brandi (1906-1988) observed his world as an intellectual working in the field of art and addressing issues of its preservation and restoration. His reflections on aesthetics and ethics through the issues of restoration practices leads the reader to interesting discoveries regarding the structure and appearance of a work of art. Inevitably, with Brandi, questions will arise: what are we restoring—marble or an antique statue? Do we need a Renaissance painting to look the way it did when it was first created, or do we want to see the patina and feel the distance of time and space which separate us from its creator? And what is more valuable— aesthetics or history?

To achieve answers to such questions, Cesare Brandi emphasizes that investigation and in situ analyses should take priority when evaluating your work. However, many conservators know that their work is often judged solely by the reintegration because that is what is visible to the viewer. Brandi touches on this aspect in the chapter "The Potential Oneness of a Work of Art". The ideas in this chapter have many good strategical thoughts to which we can refer.

When reading this book, we plunge into the depths and intricacies of the author’s thoughts. It is not so easy to get through them, but when you reach the end, you can feel that you yourself have become a subversive intellectual. Indeed, in this world not everything is a straight line, and so the author’s thoughts create new connections, linking our disparate world with the harmony of art.

What this book does not do is give guidelines on how to restore art. Rather, this book holds inspirational content on how to understand our own steps and decisions, especially in reference to history. In Italian conservation, and in other conservation institutions, this book is still a “must-read”, as it acts as a foundation during discussions about procedures that will follow in practical restoration.

This book will make you think, empathize, get involved and try to find the answers yourself, thus confirming the idea that art is only as important as the attitude towards it. We feel time in a continuum, and it makes us endlessly ask the question that Cesare Brandi was so concerned about; what is the phenomenon of artistic creativity? The author aims to have a dialogue with his reader, so as you read, be prepared to spend time with the smartest of interlocutors.

---

**THE MUSEUM ENVIRONMENT**

By Garry Thomson

Review by María Paula Arthur

At a time when conservation was still developing as a field, Garry Thomson hoped in his preface “that this book may do a small amount to correct the aim of science in conservation”. Now fast-forward almost 40 years, and not only has this book underpinned the development of environmental
management, but it is still being referenced today (a quick and informal search shows me it’s been cited over 1200 times). So, why is that?

The Museum Environment was first published in 1978 and revised in 1986 as part of the Butterworth-Heinemann Series in Conservation and Museology, in association with IIC. Rooted in a growing awareness of the importance of climate control, this book brought together all the then-current research related to the effects of environmental factors on museum objects; essentially what would soon be developed under the category “preventive conservation”.

It was, in fact, while taking my first conservation course at university that I first read fragments of Thomson’s book (back when I had no idea what a lux was, no inkling that thermo-hygrometers existed or that they used a bunch of hair to measure RH or that ozone could be generated by electrical equipment).

This book is structured in two parts; we follow our main protagonists—namely light, humidity and pollutants—mostly through a museum exhibit setting, and explore the relationship between the environment and various kinds of heritage objects.

In the first part, the author touches on the potentially damaging effects of these environmental factors by explaining the scientific facts behind decay and how they actually affect museum objects while at the same time providing us with principles and strategies for environmental control so that those effects may be prevented or at least minimized. Because this part was written for a general audience, explanations are very simple and straightforward (a fact that my student self was very grateful for at the time).

Now the second part is where things get more technical and science-oriented, with multiple charts and calculations. We are warned, though; the author prefaces the book by acknowledging that this section is intended for workers in the field of conservation research, and so it is assumed the reader will have some background on these topics. That doesn’t mean, however, that it is hard to follow; as with the first part, we gradually arrive at more complex subjects through friendly and accessible language, including examples and analogies.

Admittedly, there are some specific points in the book that have become outdated since its publication, and inevitably so. Seeing as technology is growing exponentially, and devices are being regularly upgraded, mentions of pieces of equipment available at the time were bound to become obsolete. For instance, while exploring the topic of computers in environmental control, floppy disks are suggested as the preferred means of permanent storage data. Here we are four decades later; digital data storage has skyrocketed with the use of clouds, and we are preserving floppy disks as heritage objects. The same goes with some general level guidelines and specifications which are constantly being revised, updated or questioned, as defining environmental standards continues to be a subject for debate.

What is still relevant, on the other hand, is much broader. Aside from the scientific facts, the main ideas supporting the book remain aligned with the ethical principles and criteria for conservation that we still follow today. I also found the last chapter interesting, in which Garry ventures to imagine the future of environmental management; he briefly acknowledges the undesirable amount of energy and expense required to maintain environmental conditions and hopes the trend will lean “towards simplicity, reliability and cheapness”. A very pertinent suggestion, as sustainability is an on-going concern currently being discussed worldwide, and which even had its own session in last month’s IIC 2020 Edinburgh Congress.

It is this lasting relevance and popularity that sticks out the most to me. The Museum Environment played a key role in providing a much needed summary and starting point for both environmental management and research. And it did so with a rational and accessible approach so it could reach both bigger and smaller museums. Its foundation seems so strong that it is easy to adapt it to newer times and circumstances, and so we find ourselves coming back to it.
**Sharra Grow** is editor of *News in Conservation*. She has also worked as a modern and contemporary paintings conservator in several NYC museums and private practices for over a decade, having received a master’s degree from the Winterthur/University of Delaware Program in Art Conservation. Sharra now looks forward to getting to know the west coast conservation community, having recently moved to the Bay area, just outside of San Francisco, California.

**Angela Caira** is a conservator of cultural heritage based in Madrid and is a master’s student of paintings conservation at the University of Gothenburg. She specializes in the treatment of polychrome sculptures and easel paintings and is also interested in the application of analysis techniques and imaging.

**Ana Vega Ramiro** is a conservator of cultural heritage and an MSc student in conservation, specializing in paintings. She is currently researching gels for cleaning water-gilded surfaces as part of her master’s thesis. Ana previously received a BA in conservation and restauration of cultural heritage at Universidad Complutense de Madrid.

**Anastasiya Mogucheva** was born in Kyiv, Ukraine. She has an education in fine art from the Florence Academy of Art. In 2019 Anastasiya received a bachelor’s diploma in art conservation at the Art Academy in Kyiv. Currently, she is a master’s student at Gothenburg University in the science of conservation.

**María Paula Arthur** is a conservator based in Buenos Aires, Argentina. She has recently graduated from Universidad Nacional del Arte, where she also works as a teaching assistant. She has done research on Argentinian basketry and ethnographic collections and will hopefully continue her studies soon.
C CONGRESSES SINCE 1970

By Joyce Hill Stoner

I was appointed managing editor of IIC’s Art and Archaeology Technical Abstracts in September 1969. A year later I attended my first IIC Congress which focused on stone and wooden objects and was held in New York City, mostly in the Metropolitan Museum of Art auditorium.

Larry Majewski, my professor at the NYU Institute of Fine Arts Conservation Center, introduced me to some of the prominent attendees, including Caroline and Sheldon Keck, who seemed to me to be quiet and elderly. (I was suddenly surprised at Caroline’s salty language a few years later at an AIC meeting; I believe Sheldon was not well in 1970.) Larry introduced me to the great Hanna Jedrzejewska, then the AATA regional editor from Poland, and over the years I got to know most of the other international editors at the IIC congresses. There were many papers given by Polish conservators; I learned that they were required to present a paper in order to be allowed to leave to attend the meeting, and IIC kindly abetted this.

I flew to Lisbon for the game-changing 1972 Congress, Conservation of Paintings and the Graphic Arts, which introduced BEVA and PVA heat-seal linings, and I met Gustav and Mira Berger—from that point on Mira would be in the aisles passing out samples of Kleenex lined with non-staining BEVA as a feature of many congresses. Herbert Lank spoke about MS2A, and Margaret Watherston assertively addressed cupped and cracked paint. I heard my first gloriously illustrated lecture about cross-sections by Joyce Plesters, and my trip included visiting London and photographing Joyce by her microscope as well as Jim Murrell with his miniature paintings. I learned at some point that Joyce (married to Norman Brommelle, the forceful IIC Secretary-General for THIRTY years: 1958-1988) had gerbils named “Victoria and Albert.” Apparently, it was a great prize for British conservators to have one of the offspring gerbils, which were named appropriately for the historical princes and princesses. The congress wives (Mrs. Gettens, Mrs. Buck, and Mrs. Stout) had special activities of their own and enjoyed having my film-critic husband Patrick join them for excursions.

1975 was in Stockholm, themed Archaeology and the Applied Arts, with focus on the recovered warship Wasa. My memory is that we had a very smoky barbecue right beside the Wasa and watched the continuing spray of polyethylene

Above: The AATA Editors (late 70s/early 80s). Left: Joyce Plesters in London at her microscope (1972). Images courtesy of Joyce Hill Stoner.
glycol over the timbers. I met dear Kazuo Yamasaki, the AATA regional editor from Japan, while out window shopping. At a reception, one regional editor saw me coming and visibly backed away—she knew she hadn’t sent anything in for two years! I got to know wonderful Giorgio Torraca, regional editor from Italy, who assured me that many northern Italians had red hair as he did. He soon became a hero for taking on the computerization of AATA, funding additional abstractors, and imagining an interconnecting international abstracting network; this materialized more fully about a decade later under the aegis of the Getty Conservation Institute when Jessica Brown replaced me as AATA managing editor.

I’ll skip ahead to IIC Brussels in 1990, on Cleaning, Retouching, and Coatings, where I gave my first IIC talk, co-presented with Wendy Samet on our treatment of Whistler’s Peacock Room, including new cleaning methods. We were the second talk of the conference and had flown over the Atlantic the night before after plane connection problems (also resulting in my baggage being lost for four days), and the first speaker doubled her time! Wendy’s fingernails were buried in my arm while this first speaker went on and on. Norman had stepped down two years earlier, after his 30-year reign, and there was no triangle “ting” to rescue us.

We did eventually give the talk, and the Congress continued with a profession-enhancing presentation by René de la Rie who introduced new low molecular weight synthetic resins and ways to doctor our old favorites, dammar and mastic, with hindered amine light stabilizers such as...
Tinuvin. The assistants in the light booth who were managing the double-slide projectors did not speak English and mixed the left and right projectors. I remember René calling out “changez les diapositives!” To make matters worse, the podium had only a button for ONE of the projectors; speakers had to wave their arms to signal a slide change of the other. Sadly, our comparative double slides were not always in pairs.

Two more IIC congresses were life changers for me: Dublin 1998 starring then Secretary-General David Bomford and the new world of technical art history. The theme of Painting Techniques: History, Materials and Studio Practice inspired eye-opening papers, many presenting the fruits of in-depth (often doctoral) study of particular artists by paintings conservation colleagues. My younger (by then teenage) daughter and I happily shared a dorm room at Trinity College. And then there was IIC Bilbao 2004, Modern Art: New Museums, with the amazing “starchitecture” of the Guggenheim Museum Bilbao and the Puppy by Jeff Koons. Nearby restaurants served a dessert recreating the structure of the Museum with curved candied panels and the puppy on the side, decorated with shredded coconut.

It has been 50 years since my first IIC Congress, and I wouldn’t have missed a moment.

Joyce Hill Stoner, PhD, studied conservation and art history at the NYU IFA, has taught paintings conservation for the Winterthur/UD Program in Art Conservation for 44 years, and founded and directs the UD doctoral program in preservation studies.
Two Congresses and Two Nights to Remember

By Graham Voce FSA

IIC’s biennial congresses, arguably the greatest of IIC’s events, are the result of much work behind the scenes and produce events and publications that are discussed and remembered (and referred to) for many years afterwards. Whether because of the quality of the papers, posters, presentations and discussions (all carefully selected for their great research, their relevance and their projected lasting importance) or because of the opportunities for networking and renewing of friendships with colleagues old and new, these are hugely enjoyable events. (And from an organisational point of view, the expenditures of time, adrenaline and the exhaustive planning are always worthwhile!)

Having been intimately involved with the organisation of eight of these events, from 2006 to 2018, many stories along the way come to mind. I have two such memories in particular that are worth recording and relating here.

The first of these was at the 2010 Istanbul Congress, “Conservation and the Eastern Mediterranean”. This was the first time that an IIC event had been held in Istanbul, and the Sabanci Foundation, IIC’s partners, generously supported the event and its venues.

At every congress, as you will have seen from the 2020 conference in Edinburgh, there is a Forbes Prize Lecture (in 2020 this was a hugely rewarding lecture by Norman Tennent). The stated purpose of the Forbes Prize Lecture is “to recognise outstanding work in the field of conservation”. In 2010 the lecturer was Professor David Lowenthal, (1923-2018) writer of the seminal book on heritage and conservation The Past is a Foreign Country (1985) and in 2015, The Past is a Foreign Country Revisited (reviewed in the August 2016 News in Conservation Issue 55, p. 16-17).

David Lowenthal presenting his Forbes Prize Lecture at the 2010 Istanbul Congress with a bandaged arm and black eye. Photograph by Mikkel Scharff.
So, to Istanbul: at this point David Lowenthal was aged 83 and had made the long journey to Istanbul to present the lecture as well as to spend a few days with the international conservation community at the Congress. Then-IIC President Jerry Podyany introduced Professor Lowenthal onto the podium. And Professor Lowenthal appeared with his arm in a sling, a patch on his eye and a rather large bruise on his forehead. In his haste to get across the road from his airport taxi to his Istanbul hotel, he had been knocked over by a car in the street. Swift first aid had been deployed and medical checks revealed no breaks, but some bruises... that was the evening before his lecture. In the event, Professor Lowenthal was bright, engaging and wonderfully enthusiastic in his presentation. His lecture was fascinating and rewarding, covering a range of heritage and conservation topics from unconventional points of view, challenging and providing new interpretations for conservation from a unique and fascinating angle.

Professor Lowenthal also enjoyed attending the Congress dinner held later that week in one of the cavernous Byzantine underground reservoirs. It was a privilege not only to hear Professor Lowenthal speak, but also to witness his positive life force, brought to bear in all his endeavours.

Scrolling forward to 2018, we are now in Turin. The Congress dinner this time was in the incredibly grand setting of the Savoy palace of the Venaria Reale in the wonderful Galleria Grande. The palace is home to the 2018 Congress partners, the Centro Conservazione e Restauro (CCR) and is a few kilometres outside of Turin itself.

Having been bowled over by the tour of the impressive workshops (and works) of CCR and a tour of the main rooms of the palace itself, we all then retired to the Galleria Grande for the dinner itself, a wonderful evening of local cuisine and wines. But all good things must come to an end, and we had to get the hundreds of participants into their buses and coaches to return to the centre of Turin for the following day’s events! However, the conversation and the food and wine enjoyed meant the people really did not want to go... So how does one break up a party that everybody is enjoying?

The answer is, with something spectacular.

As time for the coaches and buses to depart was upon us, we asked the organisers to press a few buttons, and the spectacular happened! Lights, music and fountains exploded into the most wonderful display in the Palace courtyard outside the Galleria Grande. The Galleria was quickly emptied onto the monumental Palace steps and into the courtyard to witness the music, the fountains and the lights as they changed, danced and entranced. Sadly, that had to come to an end too. As we ushered people into their coaches and buses to get back to congress business, we knew this too had been a night to remember.

Graham Voce was IIC’s Executive Secretary from 2004 to 2020. Having studied both landscape architecture and English literature to BA (hons) degree level, and having been involved in television’s Grand Designs series, Graham is a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries of London and a member of a number of heritage organisations.
Some recollections of IIC at 70 years old

By David Bomford

As a former editor of Studies in Conservation (1981-1991) and past Secretary-General of IIC (1994-2003) many events and changes frame my recollections of the Institute. Overall, the greatest difference between the beginning of the 1970s, when I first joined, and today is the universal transformation from print and paper to digital. Then, our filing cabinets bulged with blurry carbon copies of letters, documents and faxes; today, of course, we take invisible digital storage for granted.

Naturally, this change was reflected in the production of journals and pre-prints for conferences. One of the great rituals in the quarterly making of Studies in Conservation was the painstaking paste-up of pieces of printed text, figures and diagrams on to the template of a Studies page, to be sent off to the printer. This was carried out by Perry Smith, Executive Secretary of IIC, who was the heart and soul of the Institute for all the time I was there and beyond. Perry made everything happen, calmly, expertly, irreplaceably. In any memories of IIC of this period, the reader must imagine her presiding over the little suite of offices in Buckingham Street, seemingly effortlessly running an international membership organisation in 60 countries across the world.

Until 1981, Studies in Conservation was, remarkably, edited by a single person, the last solo editor being the late John Mills. From 1981, a team of two and then three took on the task—Andrew Oddy, Norman Tennent and myself. Of course, the papers we were reviewing arrived as typescripts in various states of presentation—and, indeed, preservation, after delivery by postal services at home and abroad. Since those days, the editorial board has increased enormously, reflecting the great expansion of conservation and conservation science, the number of papers submitted, and the huge international spread of contributors.

While Secretary-General, I was involved with six conferences over a decade: Ottawa, Copenhagen, Dublin, Melbourne, Baltimore and Bilbao. In each of those cities, tireless individuals and groups began putting together the roster of venues, local arrangements, trips and parties as soon as the previous conference had ended—a huge amount of work. The London team would arrive a few days beforehand along with the preprints (to be placed in the locally designed and produced conference bag—always an object of critical discussion) and firmly crossed fingers hoping everything would go smoothly—which it almost always did. The preprints and the delegate list were eagerly seized upon at registration as a preview of the delights and challenges, both intellectual and social, that would soon follow.

The protocols of IIC congresses were, in those days at least, particular. The proceedings would be graciously opened by the President on the first morning and closed by the Secretary-General on the final afternoon with (it was hoped) a

witty speech that thanked, flattered, praised, reminisced nostalgically about the week that had just gone, anticipated the brilliance of the meeting and the exoticism of the venue in two years’ time, and finally bid a fond adieu to friends old and new. It goes without saying that much thought beforehand went into these studiedly impromptu remarks.

The Forbes Prize, awarded each congress in memory of Edward Waldo Forbes, had an original ritual that was seldom observed: the invited lecturer should, according to tradition, speak without notes and without slides. This only happened once in my recollection, with Caroline Keck at Oxford in 1978, in a delivery of such sustained censure of unnamed—but certainly identifiable—colleagues that it left her audience stunned. Forbes lecturers since then have tended to be less confrontational.

IIC has so much to celebrate over its first seventy years. It is a privilege to have played a part in the middle years of its history so far.

David Bomford has been senior restorer at the National Gallery, London; Slade Professor of Fine Art at Oxford University; associate director for collections and acting director of the J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles; and head of conservation and European art at the Museum of Fine Arts, Houston. He is currently a trustee of the Victoria and Albert Museum.
Delia Parker (left) and Ione Gedye (right) working in the Technical Department of the Institute of Archaeology in its original location at St John's Lodge, London. By UCL Institute of Archaeology - Hoyle, Brian (2012), From Archaeology International 15, 127–132. DOI:10.5334/ai.1518, CC BY-SA 4.0, https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/index.php?curid=30505962
IIC and Me

By Velson Horie

1970s conservation was a small community. By the end of my archaeological conservation training, 1975, at the Institute of Archaeology in London, I had met a goodly proportion of the UK conservators. This was not an accident; Ione Gedye, who had started the course in the 1930s, became the first secretary of the UK Group of IIC in 1958 and its fixer. She ensured that IIC lectures were held in the Institute, complete with Christmas parties, and that her students attended.

There were none too subtle suggestions that students should sign up to IIC and the UKG-IIC. So I did and never regretted that involvement. These early connections opened doors to the leaders of conservation in the UK and abroad—Tony Werner, Gustav Berger and Robert Feller to remember but a few. Having already discovered while doing chemistry at Bristol University that I am a joiner, I also signed up with ICOM-CC.

I came out of the Institute less than impressed with the state of conservation. I was asked not to attend chemistry lectures because I kept correcting the lecturer. I was appalled by ethical standards at one London museum where I saw a conservator routinely cutting up original fragments of lapis lazuli to fit into a reconstruction. When I arrived in Newcastle, I found recently conserved iron objects disintegrating to dust in cupboards and Degas gouaches exposed to 10,000 lux. I rescued an 1850s engineering drawing of a locomotive from a skip outside a museum. Later I saw a collection of Egyptian bronzes which had been stripped to near destruction (at least the ones which had survived). My thought piece “Do conservators read – or write?” is apparently still being used in conservation courses. There was good practice, but it was not normal.

Although IIC’s UK and American groups had been set up around the same time to aid recruitment, they steadily developed local activities and their own identities. By 1977, UKG-IIC had its own refereed journal, The Conservator. In 1979, UKG-IIC separated formally from IIC, creating the United Kingdom Institute of Conservation (UKIC).

After a couple of years providing services to a wide variety of museums in the north of England (from lace to armoured cars), I joined the UKG-IIC committee as publicity officer, whose aim was to draw conservators into the fold and raise standards through meetings and publications. My next job, at Manchester University, provided freedom to research, develop, publish and lobby. In a number of fields, I was able to question established practice. One realisation was that conservation needed to establish its credibility in the eyes of other disciplines. Most conservation studies were being published in unrefereed conference proceedings. One shining exception was IIC’s Studies in Conservation (SIC) whose refereed papers were included in respected citation indices. But SIC was distributed primarily to members of IIC so was not seen by or available to other fields.

While UKIC was establishing its presence and identity, so was everyone else. The conservation world received increased funding, status and numbers, but it was fracturing. In 1980s Britain there was a burgeoning number of organisations for conservators: Scottish Society for Conservation and Restoration, the Institute of Paper Conservation, the Natural Sciences Preservation Group to mention just a few (of the 10+) which later came together in the Conservation Forum. This trend was not very professional, as pointed out by Andrew Oddy in 1998. Something similar was happening on continental Europe. The time had come to establish a professional status for conservators, initially through a working party within UKIC which created a set of professional standards and a fast-track accreditation of established conservators in UKIC. This initiative led to the Professional Accreditation of Conservator-Restorers in 2000 (now Icon Accreditation) which
facilitated the consolidation of a number of these bodies into the UK Institute of Conservation (Icon) in 2005. Significant figures in this movement were David Leigh and Carole Milner.

Meanwhile, IIC continued in its role as a learned society, providing high quality conferences and publications, but remained largely unresponsive to the ferment and changes in the conservation community worldwide. Its membership continued to decline. SiC was externally published from 2003, but its publisher, James & James, did not have much penetration in the academic library market and charged IIC a large fee. In 2006 I moved from the Manchester Museum to the British Library and in 2009 from the Icon Board of Trustees (and Chair, Academic Publications Panel) to IIC Council as Treasurer (2009-2018). IIC was making a loss, so my primary task was to reverse the trend which meant changes to our publications, mainly by changing the publisher of SiC to one which paid IIC the fee. Maney provided much needed penetration into the academic market, increasing the citation index and thus sales. It also achieved the digitising of all the back copies of SiC, Reviews in Conservation, and the Congress Proceedings; all valuable resources for conservators. More than in many other disciplines, the history of conservation defines the current problems that conservators must tackle. Maney provided such good service that it was taken over by Routledge, which continues the good work. The stronger financial position enabled the appointment of an Executive Director, acknowledging the increased demands being placed on working conservators who are now less able to devote days each week to running IIC. The essential upgrading of IIC’s online offerings became affordable. It was satisfying to have proposed a succession of changes to the Articles of Association bringing them more in line with current good practice.

IIC continues to develop and change at an increasing rate, along with rest of the world. Being part of the change is far more interesting than just being carried along by it—and more productive. So I do not regret those initial subscriptions to UKIIC, IIC and ICOM-CC.

For all who want to improve conservation, get involved.

Velson Horie is a strategic planner with an international reputation in conservation, publication, research, and teaching, and has project managed a £20m museum renovation. He has focussed primarily on organic materials, such as paper, polymers, preserved animal skin and movie film. The distance learning course Chemistry for Conservators aims to increase standards and expectations in conservation. He has upwards of 80 publications, including Materials for Conservation. www.horie.co.uk
47 Years of Entanglement

By Jonathan Ashley-Smith

I converted from chemistry to conservation on 1st January 1973. The day I started work at the V&A in London was the day that the UK finally joined the European Economic Community. It was also the last New Year’s Day that was not a public holiday in England. My boss was Norman Brommelle, who at that time was in his second stint as Secretary General of IIC; a term in office that lasted from 1966-1988.

Brommelle encouraged me to join IIC, and some years later he was responsible for my nomination as IIC Fellow. My documentation of my early membership was severely compromised when all my copies of Studies in Conservation and Art and Archaeology Technical Abstracts were stolen. I had temporarily put them in a lock-up garage in boxes marked as containing computer equipment. The thief who broke in must have thought he had struck lucky, which in a way he had.

I succeeded Brommelle as head of the V&A conservation department in 1977. I now had my hands on a budget and eventually got ‘round to attending IIC congresses. I went to the meetings in Washington (’82), Paris (’84), Bologna (’86) and Kyoto (’88). The first time I spoke at a congress was in Ottawa in 1994. The subject of the conference was preventive conservation, and the title of my presentation was “Let’s be Honest - Realistic Environmental Parameters for Loaned Objects”. This is a title I have returned to 26 years later for the IIC “Conservation and Philosophy Symposium” (26-27 November 2020) where I have called my contribution “Let’s be honest- Part 2”.

I became involved in the politics of the conservation profession in the late 1970s. I was on the committee of the United Kingdom group of IIC (IIC-UKG) when, against Norman’s advice, we decided to follow the example of the American Group and become independent of the parent body. I became vice-chairman and then chairman of the newly formed United Kingdom Institute of Conservation (UKIC).

The next time I spoke at an IIC congress was in Melbourne in 2000. The title of my talk was “Developing Professional Uncertainty”. I eventually let ‘uncertainty’ take over my life. In 2019 I spent three months at the Getty Conservation Institute researching the subject, and later that year signed a contract to write a book on the effect of uncertainty on decision-making in conservation.

In 2002 I was flattered into putting my name forward to be Secretary General of IIC, not realising that there would be no competition and that flattery or coercion are the only ways of finding a volunteer for this post. Since I had already
followed in Norman Brommelle’s footsteps by being in charge of conservation at the V&A, drinking too much and putting on weight, the step to IIC Secretary General seemed natural enough. I wrote a short piece for the IIC Newsletter outlining my ambitions, one of which was to change the nature of large meetings, away from the historic pattern of catching up with old friends in nice cities around the world, toward a system that might mean more people could afford to attend. I proposed to Council that the subject matter for the next congress was much more important than the beauty and cultural significance of the venue, but was told I had no idea what I was talking about. It took eighteen years, the development of instant video communication and a world-wide pandemic to make the congress more globally accessible.

During my three-year tenure as Secretary General, I oversaw several changes at the IIC office in Buckingham Street. Perry Smith, who had been Executive Secretary since 1973, retired and was replaced by Graham Voce in 2004. I gave the farewell speech when Graham retired at the beginning of 2020. The period 2003-06 also saw the early stages of the introduction of computer systems under the idiosyncratic guidance of Tim Padfield. The timing was such that I was in post for the Bilbao Congress (‘04) without having been involved in any of the preparatory administration. In Bilbao I nearly caused a diplomatic incident. At a press conference before the meeting I remarked that conservation was sometimes used as an excuse to deny politically sensitive loan requests. This was reported in the local newspaper the next day as the expert saying that Picasso’s Guernica painting was fit to travel from Madrid to the Basque country.

I was involved in the enjoyable stages of preparation for the Munich (‘06) Congress; the trips to inspect the venue, the sites for the evening festivities and road-testing the day trips. But I had retired before the hard work of the actual event. I had, however, acted as chair of the technical committee selecting papers for the conference. It was in that capacity that I was invited to hammer the tap into a barrel of beer at a ceremony during the congress dinner. I was told that an expert should be able to complete the job with one blow. I needed three strikes, and beer spurted all over the place. I had been instructed that when the job was finished I should cry out “O’zapft is!” (roughly translated as ‘it is tapped!’), which would be the signal for the drinking to begin. I was so flustered by my ineptitude that I forgot this and had to be pushed back on stage to make this traditional declaration. I have since read that one mayor of Munich needed 19 blows with the mallet to achieve what had taken me a mere three.

To bring my entanglement with IIC up to date, I chaired the technical committee for the London (‘08) meeting, but after that I didn’t attend another biennial congress until Turin (‘18). The subject matter was preventive conservation, organised with the aim of showing how the field had progressed since 1994. It left me thinking that progress can be very slow and not always desirable. At the 2018 AGM, the notion of Special Interest Groups was discussed. This resulted in me joining forces with David Scott to form the Authenticity and Ethics group. There are very few postings from this group on the IIC Community pages. The “Philosophy” symposium at the end of November, organised by David, is the first real sign of any activity; progress can be very slow.
Top Left: Graham Voce in untypically casual dress at the Congress administration desk, Munich 2006. Bottom Left: The previous Secretary-General David Bomford unwittingly included in Jonathan’s politically unwise opinion. Right: Jonathan showing manual dexterity at the barrel tapping ceremony, Munich 2006. (Images courtesy of Jonathan Ashley-Smith)

Jonathan Ashley-Smith studied chemistry to post-doctoral level at the universities of Bristol and Cambridge. He started his conservation career in 1973 at the Victoria and Albert Museum and has worked as conservator, conservation scientist, manager, teacher and research supervisor. He was visiting professor at the Royal College of Art 2000-2010.
Due to the rapidly evolving situation regarding Covid-19, many event details are changing. We are trying to update these listings as much as we can, but readers should contact event organizers directly for the most up-to-date information on specific events, conferences, workshops, etc. Thank you, from the IIC Communications Team.

CALLS FOR PAPERS

Space and Time-Joseph Beuys’ Installation Art, Its Presentation and Conservation
16-17 September 2021
Kassel, Germany
Submission deadline for papers: 22 January 2021
For more information write to: t.kraemer@museum-kassel.de

International Conference-Curation and Conservation: Dress and Textiles in Museums
21-22 October 21
Turin, Italy
Paper submissions due: 15 January 2021
For more information visit: https://dresshistorians.org/cfp-turin-2020/

CONFERENCES, SYMPOSIUMS

Achieving Excellence in... (digiTIPS)
15 December 2020 (10:00-14:00 EST)
Online
For more information visit: https://www.imaging.org/Site/IST/Conferences/DigiTIPS/DigiTIPS_Home.aspx#AchievingExcellence and registration: https://www.imaging.org/Site/IST/Conferences/DigiTIPS/DigiTIPS_Home.aspx?WebsiteKey=6d978a6f-475d-46cc-bcf2-7a9e3d5f8f28&hkey=b4545a8d-82e4-4bb9-acce-0c1fc18e971e#LIM2020_Content=3#LIM2020_Content

Uboat: The U505 Submarine: Conservation Giving Breath to Untold Stories
Midwest Regional Conservation Guild & Chicago Area Conservation Group Lecture Series
6 January 2021
Online
For more information visit: www.chicagoareaconervation.org/membership

7th Architectural Finishes Virtual Conference
14-15 January 2021
Online, Israel
For more information visit: https://afr-shimur.vii.events/coming-soon/

Exploring Buddhist Manuscript production: Materials and Merit
Midwest Regional Conservation Guild & Chicago Area Conservation Group Lecture Series
20 January 2021
Online
For more information visit: www.chicagoareaconervation.org/membership

Collaborative Study of a Roman-Egyptian Mummy Portrait at the Detroit Institute for the Arts
Midwest Regional Conservation Guild & Chicago Area Conservation Group Lecture Series
3 February 2021
Online
For more information visit: www.chicagoareaconervation.org/membership

Revealing the Splendor of Audubon’s The Birds of America: The Materials, Techniques, and Conservation of a Masterpiece
Midwest Regional Conservation Guild & Chicago Area Conservation Group Lecture Series
17 February 2021
Online
For more information visit: www.chicagoareaconervation.org/membership

SR2A 2021-9th International Conference on Synchrotron Radiation and Neutrons in Art and Archaeology
22-24 February 2021
Online/Getty Center, Los Angeles, USA
For more information visit: https://sr2a2021.org/

SHAKE in Conservation Talks: Big Research in Tiny Speeches
25 February 2021
Brussels, Belgium
For more information visit: www.shakeinconservation.be/conervation-talks-2021

Icon Textile Group Emerging Professional Event 2021
March 2021 (final dates TBD)
For more information contact: Kelly Grimshaw kellygrimsaw@hotmail.co.uk and visit: https://www.icconservation.org/content/icon-textile-group-emerging-professional-event-2021
Conservation: Out in the Open
Icon Textile Group Spring Forum 2021
April 2021 (Date TBD)
Brighton, UK
Find more information here: https://www.iconconservation.org/content/icon-textile-group-spring-forum-2021

American Society of eighteenth-Century Studies (ASECS) 52nd Annual Conference
8-10 April 2021
Toronto, Canada
For more information write to: daniella.berman@nyu.edu and cmculp@stanford.edu

Computational approaches for technical imaging in cultural heritage (7th IAAAI meeting)
8-9 April 2021
The National Gallery, London, UK
For more information contact: artict@ng-london.org.uk and visit: https://research.ng-london.org.uk/external/ARTICT/Computational%20approaches%20for%20technical%20imaging.html

Study Day: Conservation of Ceramics in the Open Air (IGIIC)
15 April 2021
Faenza, Italy
For more information visit: http://www.igiic.org/?p=6293

AIC Annual Meeting
11-15 May 2021
Jacksonville, Florida (USA)
For more information visit: https://www.culturalheritage.org/events/annual-meeting

12th Baltic States Triennial Conservator’s Meeting
RESEARCH.DILEMMAS.SOLUTIONS
26-29 May 2021
Vilnius, Lithuania
For more information visit: http://conservation2020vilnius.ldm.lt/

Terra 2021 13th World Congress on Earthen Architectural Heritage
8-11 June 2021
Santa Fe, New Mexico, USA
For more information visit: https://www.terra2021.org/website/8033/

12th International Conference on Structural Analysis of Historical Constructions (SAHC 2020)
29 September-1 October 2021
Barcelona, Spain
Visit the webpage for more information: http://congress.cimne.com/SAHC2020/frontal/default.asp

COURSES, WORKSHOPS

Image Permanence Institute
Environmental Management Workshops
11-14 January 2021
Online (deadline for application): 17 December 2020
For more information visit: https://www.imagepermanenceinstitute.org/ and contact Christopher Cameron: cmcpph@rit.edu

Chemistry for Conservators (IAP)
12 January – 12 May 2021
Online course
For more information visit: https://academicprojects.co.uk/courses/chemistry-for-conservators-online-course-january-may-2021/

Image Permanence Institute
Environmental Management Workshops
8-11 February 2021
Online course (deadline for application: 21 January 2020
For more information visit: https://www.imagepermanenceinstitute.org/ and contact Christopher Cameron: cmcpph@rit.edu

2021 International Course on the Conservation of Earthen Architecture
13 February-12 March 2021
United Arab Emirates, Oman
Deadline for application: 15 July 2020
For more information visit: https://www.getty.edu/conservation/our_projects/field_projects/earthen_arch_course/course.html

Workshop on Asian Papers and Their Applications in Paper Conservation
15-17 June 2021 (tentative)
The British Library, London, UK
For more information visit: https://www.minahsong.com/workshop
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