3.1 Introduction and controversies

The conservation of modern and contemporary art as a distinct field took shape due to a new set of controversies (see Chapter 27 for earlier controversies). These concerned the varnishing and wax lining of paintings with matte surfaces and the wholesale repainting of damaged colour field paintings, thereby instigating a paradigm shift in the approach to the treatment of contemporary art in the last decades of the twentieth century. More conservators became sensitive to the optical qualities of surfaces and the artist’s original intent (see also Dykstra, 1996). The treatment of contemporary art has become recognized as a sophisticated speciality that must be grounded in the triangular relationship connecting the artist’s original intent, the work itself, and the observer. Conservation professionals should have the widest possible range of methods, approaches, and strategies to assist in the articulation of these relationships.

3.1.1 ‘Crimes against the Cubists’

The practice of varnishing and wax lining Cubist paintings became a subject of sustained discussion due to an article published by John Richardson in the New York Review of Books in 1983 (Richardson, 1983/1996/2004). The objections he raised were not entirely new; a century earlier, some artists inscribed on the verso of their works, ‘do not varnish this painting’, in order to preserve the diffuse reflections from the manipulated surfaces (Callen, 1994). By 1983, a generation of conservators had adopted alternative methods in order to preserve the unique surface qualities of modern paintings. From the discussion in the NYRB it was clear that the traditional practices of wax-resin lining and varnishing as a preventive measure for modern paintings were still in use in the 1980s in the United States as well as in Europe. The issue raised by Richardson in his article had a significant impact, perhaps because he quoted Georges Braque (1882–1963) directly criticizing the treatment of one of his Cubist paintings. In several letters to the editor, important figures from the art world including Angelica Rudenstine, Robert Rosenblum, and John Golding sided with the critique of Richardson (Keck, Lank et al., 1983/2004). In one letter the British restorer Herbert Lank commented,

That these malpractices were, and often still are, tolerated points surely to a visual illiteracy that cannot just be blamed on restorers and art publishers. Even with Cubism we have had seventy-five years to get it right.

(Keck, Lank et al., 1983/2004)
This comment begged the question: why did it take this long for the significance of the opacity, matte-ness, and three-dimensionality of abstract geometrical surfaces of modern paintings to finally receive a canonical response from the institutional world of modern art? Why had the voice and intentions of the artists about the surface appearance or the intended effect of their paintings on the viewers been ignored or underestimated for over a century?

There is also the technical dilemma; the surface grime or dust that may have penetrated the absorbent, vulnerable surfaces of unvarnished modern paintings may be impossible to remove without irreversible changes to colour and surface characteristics. However, this may also be true for the removal of a varnish layer applied later to protect the surface. One alternative to protective varnishing is the use of glass or Plexiglas glazing. Although glazing may obstruct the viewer’s perception of the surface characteristics, it may be the best solution because it preserves the parallax gaze – the gaze of a modern observer who moves along the painting and thus experiences the surface from different angles. This experience differs from that of the viewer who perceives an illusory space through the window frame of classical painting and who seeks the best position where repressing of the surface may be necessary to achieve the illusion of space and depth.

3.1.2 Barnett Newman’s surfaces and their impact on the viewer

Another controversy occurred in 1986–1990 regarding the restoration of the wide monochrome red central section of a seriously damaged painting by Barnett Newman (1905–70), *Who’s Afraid of Red, Yellow and Blue III* (Hummelen, 1992; Klaster, 1992; Van Winkel, 1992; Van de Vall, 1994 #2461). The entire red section of the painting had been overpainted during the treatment. The question then emerged as to whether the painting had been destroyed by the overpainting or had the ‘function’ of the painting been re-established (the position taken by the director of the Stedelijk Museum). The significance of the varying surface characteristics of Newman’s paintings was scrutinized and discussed. Numerous professionals and connoisseurs believed that the original surface characteristics had been lost in the red section of the painting. However, repression of the surface by the observer was also seen as a necessary condition for the viewing of Newman’s paintings. Could the painting be considered a ‘concept’ which could be re-executed or re-enacted, or was the painting a ‘fetish’ that would never be the same after the attack? These issues were discussed fervently defending or attacking the overpainting.

Discussion next focused on the interpretation of a 1958 photograph of Newman and an unidentified woman. In this photograph both persons are looking at the five-metre-wide blue painting *Cathedra* from a very short distance (ca. 50 cm) (see Figure 3.1).

The photograph could be interpreted as Newman’s own recommendation to the viewer; he had tacked a paper to the wall of his second exhibition at Betty Parsons in 1951 noting: ‘There is a tendency to look at large pictures from a distance. The large pictures in this exhibition are intended to be seen from a short distance’ (O’Neill, 1990). This recommended short viewing distance could have a significant impact on the interpretation and restoration of Newman’s paintings and the optical qualities of the wide variety of application and types of paint used by the artist.

**Figure 3.1** Barnett Newman, *Cathedra* at the Betty Parsons Gallery in New York (and two beholders). Courtesy of Peter A. Juley & Son Collection, Smithsonian American Art Museum J0112534
3.1.3 Unique and idiosyncratic materials and meaning in contemporary art

Since the second half of the twentieth century, divergent materials and techniques have found their way into the artist’s studio. The artist’s choices and application of non-traditional painting materials have been broadened by the social and historical connotations of selected materials combined with an articulation of the material’s iconology. The changes in the nature of the creation of contemporary art have challenged conservators; major shifts in the conservation paradigm have occurred. Treatment choices for traditional paintings are generally based on the identification of materials and techniques and the classification of the works in relation to stylistic movements, offering a somewhat common ground for conservation methods. There is little common ground for the treatment of contemporary works. Instead, conservators must understand and acknowledge the artistic intent and idiosyncrasy of the works as key signifiers for research and conservation treatment. Moreover, they encounter an entirely different set of conservation problems arising from the use of non-traditional materials and their inherent processes of decay and change.

Some striking examples of the complexities of the conservation of contemporary art through the use of materials with inherent meanings include:

- the use of sand and organic materials such as wood and pieces of textile by the Dutch Informel group
- the application of materials with iconological connotations such as lead in the paintings by Anselm Kiefer (b. 1945) or elephant dung in the work of Chris Ofili (b. 1968)
- the ‘alchemy’ of pigments in paintings by Sigmar Polke (1941–2010)
- the use of blood during rituals in the work of Hermann Nitsch (b. 1938).

These examples demonstrate how complex the relationships among the almost unlimited arsenal of painting materials and their intended meanings and unpredictable behaviour have become (Bandmann, 1969; Marontate, 1994; Van Saaze, 2001; Wagner, 2001).

3.2 Documenting artistic intent

If the artist is still alive, it is now a widely accepted approach for conservators to seek a dialogue with the artist in order not to neglect or negate the artist’s intentions when researching or treating the work of art. There is a strong tendency to honour the artist’s voice, but at the same time many conservators acknowledge that other ‘voices’ will also influence decisions for individual works of art, depending on context, time, and circumstances. The more complex the work of art, the more interest there is in exploring the network of relationships between the work and all of its ‘stakeholders’ (Foundation for the Conservation of Contemporary Art, 1999; Wharton, 2005: 173–4). Documentation plays a key role in this process.

3.2.1 Early initiatives

A letter of 1939 sent by the Committee of Paintings of the Community of Amsterdam to a number of artists who sold their paintings to the Stedelijk Museum, represented an early attempt to honour artistic intent and to avoid ill-informed treatments (as had happened with the varnishing of nineteenth-century paintings). The artists were asked to provide technical information in a questionnaire noting for 'possible cleaning, varnish removal, lining or restoration, the knowledge of the used material and the working practice by the painter is of great importance for the future preservation of the work'
(Amsterdam, 1939). This questionnaire demonstrated a far-sighted initiative to collect primary source information from artists. In the twenty-first century, however, conservators would regard these listings of material-technical data from a broader perspective and would document their application in relation to other works in the artist’s oeuvre, their intended behaviour over time, and the impact of conservation treatments on the intentions of the artist.

In Germany the first attempt to question artists systematically about their materials and techniques dated back to Büttner Pflünder zu Thal in the early 1900s (Weyer and Heydenreich, 1999: 385). In 1977, Heinz Althöfer began an initiative to collect information from living artists and developed new research directions for the conservation of modern and contemporary art (Althöfer, 1977). Other early initiatives to collect and archive information and documentation from living artists were carried out by Danielle Giraudy (1972) and Erich Ganzert-Castrillo (1979) among others (Hummelen and Scholte, 2006).

The Artist’s Techniques Data File (ATDF)

Following a conference on the conservation of contemporary art at the National Gallery, Canada in 1980, and in discussion with other conservators including Christoph von Imhoff and Rustin Levenson, Joyce Hill Stoner began to collect information from conservators about artists’ techniques. The goal of the Artists’ Techniques Data File was to alert conservators to the importance of conducting further investigations before applying traditional conservation treatment techniques to twentieth-century art (Stoner, 1984, 1985). For example, Abstract Expressionist Robert Motherwell (1915–91) had told Betty Fiske (who had served as his personal assistant before entering the profession of conservation) that he had bought back and destroyed one of his paintings which he felt had been ruined by the application of a varnish by a conservator. The first 304 entries in this file were placed on an early database system at the Ralph Mayer Center of the Winterthur/University of Delaware Program in Art Conservation in the 1980s. (The Center had been named for the artist Ralph Mayer, author of The Artist’s Handbook of Materials and Techniques (first edition, 1940) who had recently died.) Information was collected from different ‘stakeholders’: primary source information not only from artists but also from art historians and conservators, including information from technical investigations. ATDF was to be available to the international conservation community. Unfortunately, because of technical and economic reasons the project was not continued in Delaware, but the original ATDF archives were sent to the Tate Gallery in London, the Getty Conservation Institute in Los Angeles, and the National Gallery of Art in Washington, DC.

The Menil Artists Documentation Program

Former Menil Collection chief conservator, Carol Mancusi-Ungaro began filming artists in discussion in front of specific works (Mancusi-Ungaro, 1999). In 1990, furthering this initiative, the Menil Collection established the Artists Documentation Program, with funding from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation (see http://www.menil.org/collection/artistdocumentation_temp.php).

The International Network for the Conservation of Contemporary Art (INCCA)

In 1999, The International Network for the Conservation of Contemporary Art (INCCA) was established, and by 2008 the network included 150 partner institutions, the majority located in Europe and the United States. Members of INCCA use http://www.incca.org/ as their communication platform. The aims of establishing a network for the conservation of contemporary art were twofold:
1 to share knowledge and information (especially unpublished information) for conservation purposes, and
2 to collect primary source information from artists’ archives or artists and their representatives.

Using the internet, the INCCA founding members began the creation of a shared knowledge base called the INCCA Database for Artists’ Archives. The database is accessible for members as well as students (under the supervision of a member). In principle, the archives contain metadata records (similar to a library system for published resources) keyed by the artist’s name. The records are searchable in various ways, and a built-in thesaurus helps users to find information across the artists’ archives and their various content types. Contemporary paintings, for example, are represented in the INCCA database with research and treatment reports on sensitive surfaces, monochrome paintings, acrylic paintings, mixed media, assemblages, coatings, wall paintings, framing and re-stretching, extra large paintings, overpaintings, etc., from a large number of contemporary artists. Documentation resources (reports, interviews, etc.) and references to scientific analyses, collections of samples or spare parts, material fact sheets, are included.

A distinctive feature of a metadata system is that records of the database can describe the full spectrum of heterogeneous information resources which INCCA members create, collect, and archive in their own institutions. Members who wish to access an information resource must send a request to the information keeper who can then send the document. In the future much of the documentation will be accessible online. When INCCA began, there were concerns regarding copyright issues, but recent developments such as ‘fair use’ and ‘creative commons’ have made it possible for members to publish their documentation within the database or link information to the records from their local websites. There are also advantages implied in using metadata as an information exchange format:

• the ability to describe resources other than digital information (e.g. sample materials or spare parts), and
• metadata stimulates the communication among peers which is needed to obtain the resource itself.

The aspects of communication and collaboration make INCCA more than just another information network; a registry of INCCA members – including their areas of expertise – is built in to the archives database.

INCCA does not interfere with local documentation systems nor does it dictate what kind of documentation should be added to artists’ archives. The content of the archives is user-generated and thus consists of fragments of the existing knowledge domain about contemporary artists, contemporary art, and conservation. It is a flexible tool for information-sharing and follows the normal practices of artists and conservators. Over time it is hoped that the contents will expand and evolve, and INCCA will become part of the collective memory of conservation. It is one of the commitments of the host of the network, the Netherlands Institute for Cultural Heritage, to preserve the archives which are carefully collected by its members. The content is deeply rooted in the dynamics of the conservation practice of its members; the richer the archives are, the more they will represent a plurality of perspectives which can help conservators make substantiated and well articulated conservation decisions today and in the future.

3.2.2 Contemporary documentation practice

Conservators of contemporary art need to consult the archives of living artists or recently deceased artists for a number of reasons.
• Standard protocols or traditional conservation methods may no longer be appropriate for idio-
syncratic works made of fragile or temporary materials that depend on in-depth knowledge and
understanding of the artist’s motives and expectations.
• For an articulation of the relationships between the intended meaning and the re-installation of
certain works, conservators need to have access to the documentation of earlier installations and
artists’ conceptual points of view.
• With regard to conceptual or process-based works of art – when no physical evidence remains
– documentation may be the only source on which this articulation can be based. Here documenta-
tion plays the crucial role of keeping these works alive (Buskirk, 2003: 15–16; Hummelen and

Artists’ archives

An ideal archive would include a wide spectrum of relevant resources, such as recorded interviews,
notes taken from varying communications (e.g. telephone calls, emails, or letters), documentaries
made of working techniques and artistic processes, professional reports on treatments, installation
manuals, technical investigations, material fact sheets, reports of scientific investigations, and more.
In reality, however, the scope of artists’ archive will depend largely on the host institution’s archival
practices and the involvement of individual conservators and other staff members who feel the need
to collate such documentation (which may or may not include information relevant to conservation
decision making). Strategies vary, from collecting artists’ questionnaires and interviews with a focus
on information, to creating ‘artists’ boxes’ which may actually contain sample materials and other
realia provided by the artist (e.g. the artist boxes at the Fabric Workshop and Museum of Philadelphia,
http://www.fabricworkshopandmuseum.org/collections/) or collected during conservation (Hummelen
and Scholte, 2006).

Artists’ interviews

Some conservators have established long-term relationships with artists and may collaborate with the
artists during conservation treatments and (re-)installation activities. These exchanges may also include
recorded interviews with the artist or his/her representative, such as a personal assistant, executor, or
studio technician.

Interviews with artists may discuss several works or the entire oeuvre of the artist. The artist could
first be invited to speak freely about all stages of the creation of the work(s) of art in order for the con-
servator to learn about the concept and meaning behind the use of materials and techniques and their
intended appearance and effect on the beholder. The more factual information (materials and processes
used, technical information, etc.) should be the second step. A successful interviewer will pay attention
to the process of communication, observation, interpretation, and verification, especially with regard
to verbal expressions. The artist should be invited to recollect the creative process as accurately as pos-
sible, but the information should then be carefully checked through other information sources. Ideally
an artist’s interview would be conducted near relevant work(s) in order to increase the chances for the
artist to remember the creative process more specifically.

Recording an interview on film or video provides important additional visual information, not only
with regard to the recorded visual information of the works, but also because the artist may be more
expressive in body language than in verbal expressions (Mancusi-Ungaro, 1999). For the preparation
of an interview as well as for its future accessibility, it is important to identify what the purpose of the
discussion was, its content, the participants and their professional roles, and the interviewee(s) and their professional roles. Additional annotations by the interviewer may clarify future interpretation and verification. Maintaining the original recordings is important as these testimonies may provide the opportunity for future scholars to form their own interpretations. Such recordings may be stored in the conservator’s files or the archives of local museums or artists’ foundations together with other resources which would, ideally, provide a knowledge base for understanding the artist’s practice in relation to conceptual motives.

**Media and information technologies**

Apart from the professional need to document and collect information, there are technological reasons for a remarkable increase of documentation material in the twenty-first century. The broad accessibility of recording media such as photo and film/video/digital cameras facilitates rapid imaging of the works of art from different perspectives. Recording time-related phenomena, such as the fabrication of works of art and restoration or (re-)installation processes provides knowledge to the professional that cannot be readily described as text. Watching the artist at work may provide deeper insight or add a different perspective to hearing only the artist’s voice during an interview. Another reason for the increase of documentation is the rise of information technology in conservation practice, discussed by Salvador Muñoz Viñas (2005) as ‘informational conservation’.

Aside from conservators and other professionals who are involved in documentation, the artists themselves sometimes recognize the importance of well-structured documentation and, in collaboration with museums, galleries, and universities, have become active partners in creating archives of their works (e.g. Donald Judd and the Judd Foundation, www.juddfoundation.org). However, museum information systems may not always provide necessary documentation modules for storing the complex information of an ideal artist’s archive. The topic has been addressed in the first decade of the twenty-first century by various international collaboration projects, and guidelines have been created for managing heterogeneous archival material (e.g. www.inside-installations.org; www.variablemedia.net; www.docam.ca).

### 3.2.3 Conclusion

Artists’ archives can be a valuable resource for articulation and discussion. Based on Figure 3.1, of Newman and his female companion in front of *Cathedra*, it appears that part of the intended meaning of the painting may be found in close viewing of the surface. If there had been a filmed recording consisting of shots from different perspectives (with the public included) it might be more possible to (re)construct the subtle relationship between the painting’s surface, its spatial coordinates, and the beholder. If, in addition, there had been a recorded artist’s interview about the painting and its installation, the conservator or curator could have a better understanding of the intended appearance of the work, its impact on the beholder, and the painting’s ‘ideal installation’.

The richer artists’ archives are, including artist’s information as well as information from conservators, artists’ assistants, curators, technicians, gallery owners, etc., the more informed the decision-making process can become. The controversies in the 1980s surrounding ‘Crimes Against the Cubists’ and the restoration of Newman’s painting were aggravated by a lack of research into these processes as well as the absence of systematically collected documentation; this may be why we needed ‘75 years to get it right’.
Appendix: Selected examples of twentieth-century documentary sources for artists’ practice, by Erma Hermens

**Artists’ writings**


**Interviews or direct observations of artists painting**

ARTnews: the ‘paints a picture’ series. Between 1949 and 1969 the magazine ARTnews published more than 90 articles about artists creating a work, authored usually by another artist or an art critic. (At least seventy of the artists were painters, including: Albers (Nov. 1950), Albright (Summer 1950), Bishop (Nov. 1951), Gene Davis (April 1966), Stuart Davis (Summer 1953), de Kooning (March 1953), Dickinson (Sept. 1949), Diebenkorn (May 1957), Dubuffet (May 1952), Evergood (Jan. 1952), Feininger (Summer 1949), Grosz (Dec. 1949), Hockney (May 1969), Hofmann (Feb. 1950), Katz (Feb. 1962), Kline (Dec. 1952), Lamm (Sept. 1950), Mitchell (Oct. 1957), Pollock (May 1951), Porter (Jan. 1955), Rauschenberg (April 1963), Reinhardt (March 1965), Resnick (Dec. 1957), Rivers (Jan. 1954), Shahn (May 1949), Tamayo (Oct. 1951), Twombly (May 1953), and Andrew Wyeth (March 1950).)


Crook, J. and Learner, T. (2000) *The Impact of Modern Paints*. Tate Gallery Publishing. (Includes interviews with and/or discussions of the techniques used by Peter Blake, Patrick Caulfield, Richard Hamilton, David Hockney, John Hoyland, Roy Lichtenstein, Morris Louis, Bridget Riley, Frank Stella, and Andy Warhol.)
COLLECTING AND ARCHIVING INFORMATION FROM LIVING ARTISTS


Fig, J. (2009) *Inside the Painter’s Studio*. London: Princeton Architectural Press. (Interviews with 24 artists including Bleckner, Close, Fischl, Gonik, Mehretu, Morley, Pearlstein, Rockman, and Tomaselli. Each is asked ‘What kind of paints do you use?’; studio images are included for each.)


For Tate interviews see: http://www.tate.org.uk/research/tateresearch/majorprojects/interviews.htm

A film initiative by Robert Mc Nab: http://www.artistsonfilm.co.uk/

For a major central archive for contemporary art and interviews in Germany see: http://www.moderne-kunst.org/archiv/info/sammlungsauftrag.html


**Archives**

There are many institutional archives such as the Archives of American Art at the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, DC (http://www.aaa.si.edu/), originally founded in Detroit in 1954 by E.P. Richardson. The Archives joined the Smithsonian in 1970 and contain films, photographs, audiotapes with artists’ interviews, and artists’ papers.
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