Who are we?

I mean, who are we as an "association," the CRSA? Perhaps like every other organization we are a disparate group of individuals who just happen to have a commonality,—the CR—and as I see it, a common cause—through the bond of scholarship, a desire to work together to obtain and maintain professional respect, for ourselves and our work (perhaps the type more than the individual project), and be rewarded for the above.

I often have difficulty seeing the CRSA as an association. We lack the foundations—written bylaws and policies, a government of willing and dedicated elected leaders—versus the willing and dedicated volunteers that we have—and a participatory membership responsible to the "cause," which essentially is your own. In this edition of the Forum we take a solid step toward defining our association.

By expanding upon our earlier discussion on scholarship and compensation, or the "scholar and commercial ventures," as it has also been referred to (see the Winter 2005, No. 16 edition), as we do in this Forum, we lay the ground work for our first substantive policy. What we need to do from this point on is to refine the outline that has been developed (see below) and draft it into policy form. I trust that you, the membership at large will make suggestions on refinements and someone or a committee will begin the drafting procedure. Please, either volunteer or simply jump into the discussion—via our listserv or otherwise—to keep the ball rolling.

In our upcoming autumn issue Steven Manford will provide us with additional thoughts on this subject when he broadens the term "scholar" to include other CAA members and art historians.

Another CRSA member is still being coaxed to share his paper on his CR experience—one given at a fairly recent CR conference; with a different point of view, he assures me—for our next issue.

I spoke with a few other members, while at the April CR events, about introducing us to "their artists" in upcoming "By Way of Introduction" columns. I encourage you all to step forward with dates for publication that are convenient for you. (If I don't hear from you, you will hear from me.)

I will remind all of you that we are constantly seeking announcements, legal news, book reviews, calls for papers, etc. Consider the next deadline 9/15: far enough ahead to get this material together now, and late enough after universities reopen to take that moment to send something off to me.

Again on this same topic, it was suggested in the original discussions that we locate a long term institutional sponsor/site for publishing our CRs online. I know of no developments in this area. If anyone has an update on this please share your thoughts via our listserv* and Forum. (*I will include the instructions on how to access our listserv below.)

As a follow up, or perhaps as closure to my exchanges with Amy King, at Arnet, I asked her her thoughts on reconsider-ing the compensation issue. For their part Arnet has decided to fulfill the demands for developing sites on living artists, foregoing historical artists for the time being.

In the previous Forum I mentioned that I would unveil a new format for our "magazine." Obviously this has yet to happen, for reasons that I will discuss in "Editor's Notes."

This special issue of the CRSA Forum, which replaces the regularly scheduled June edition, will also briefly recap the NYU CR conference, "Where Angels Fear to Tread: The Cat-alogue Raisonné and It's Explosive Potential," that was held in April. Ed.

Scholarship and Compensation

I will preface our discussion on scholarship and compensation with comments made by a few colleagues who have chosen to remain anonymous. This will be followed by commentary from three additional colleagues—Adina Gordon, Touran Latham and David Silcox—on the benefits of and potential for compensation.

One member brought up the question: "What is the cost to the scholar when s/he charges" for their scholarship? He clarified his thought by stating:

While I was working on the CR, my motivation was to see every possible painting and let none slip through my fingers. I could not charge then, because that would have been a barrier to those that would have submitted paintings for review. Now that I have completed the CR, my motivation is different. I
now charge a fee that will discourage all the
nuisance requests.

However, during the course of our conversation he suggested that the services provided by a scholar could vary—from a simple opinion to a thorough history (varying fees would apply to varying services). He also strongly suggested that such a document would be accompanied with a liability waiver form. (Peter Stern addressed a similar topic, the submission agreement, during his discussions, and with a hand out, at the NYU conference. A copy of the hand out will be insert below.)

Another member concurs with this approach: her authentication panel does not charge. With respect to auction houses the panel will provide letters of authentication in exchange for transparencies, but only in the cases when a work can be authenticated without a shadow of doubt. Moreover, they consider the sharing of information "a help to the CR and a public service." Their letters of authentication would be difficult to forge; they list the known history of the work as accurately as possible "in the interest of getting the record straight." (Getting the record straight is exactly the point I was making when we were initially addressing the problem of misinformation on the internet. It is better to nip the problem off at the bud than to let factoids replace fact. Ed.) Their letters, like our previous member's, will begin to include a waiver.

Another variation on this theme was shared with us via our listserv. On 12 July Vivian Barnett wrote:

The Catalogue Raisonné Committee of the Société Kandinsky examines paintings, watercolors and objects not included in the four published volumes of the catalogue raisonné if the owner requests that we study the work. The owner must fill out and sign a form of release and indemnity and must make the work available to the Committee for examination (and pay for transportation costs). We meet approximately once a year—usually at the Centre Pompidou in Paris or at the Städtische Galerie im Lenbachhaus in Munich—in order to compare the works with those of Kandinsky. We do not work from photographs and we do not charge a fee for the letter provided to the owner which simply states whether the work will or will not be included in the catalogue raisonné. We do not make copies of our letters of inclusion/non inclusion available. We do not give certificates of authenticity. Owners can contact me in care of the Guggenheim Museum or the Société Kandinsky at the Centre Pompidou.

My solicitation for information on services and compensation from an art researcher outside of the CRSA garnered the following results. This individual stated that her work generally falls into two categories: i) Info sheet for individual work of art. Essentially a 1-3 page "dossier" that encompass a picture specific essay (i.e., beyond just artist biographi-

cal material), as well as documenting exhibition records, references in published material, and adding to the provenance information when possible. $350-450/project.

ii) Targeted research. This is best described as direct fact gathering, and does not involve writing a full blown essay. It could be anything from searching for reviews or mentions of specific pictures in newspapers or magazine articles, gathering copies of an artist's past exhibition catalogues, researching provenance, etc. $50/hour.

Following are the statements we received from fellow members E. Adina Gordon (William MacMonnies), Touran Latham (John Carroll) and David Silcox (David B. Milne), respectively.

E. Adina Gordon ~
Throughout the years that I was taking doctoral coursework and orals, I enjoyed a lively exchange of information on my artist with museum professionals who were working in the same field of interest. (My doctorate research became the essence of my catalogue raisonné of the sculpture of William MacMonnies.) Notwithstanding, it was also at this time that I encountered a devastating attitudinal imbalance: some academics, curators and gallery owners were helpful, while many more were less than forthcoming. The artist's family members were almost all obstructionists. Nevertheless, concurrent with my research, I wrote a major exhibition catalogue on the artist and his wife for a French museum. It was the first catalogue on an American artist printed in French and English, making it accessible to French scholars, and establishing my credentials in the field long before my dissertation was published by UMI [University of Michigan].

Time and again I received requests for information on this artist's paintings and sculpture from the major auction houses and galleries, and occasionally a museum sought my opinion. Until the completion of my doctorate I was always glad to respond in the interest of encouraging scholarly intercourse. Afterwards, I began to realize that it was always give and take: they all took and I gave. I was paid a pittance for a substantial participation in a major book and was forced to supply masses of photographic material without remuneration. When the book was released I discovered that the publisher had not listed me as an author with the Library of Congress. The book, today, is a basic reference work used by all curators of American art in museums, auction houses and galleries.

I began to charge fees for attributions of paintings and sculpture, appraisals, and my opinion on the quality and rarity of bronze and marble sculpture. At least three major museums and galleries flatly refused to pay me implying that they honored my expertise by acknowledging it, and my reward was either a good 8 X 10 black and white photo or a slide. I had no choice but to insist that my expertise has merit as
well as monetary value. In the last three years I have found more colleagues who are sympathetic with my rationale. Nevertheless, there are still a few associates who continue to be offended by my request for remuneration.

I was recently called upon by an auction house to determine the authenticity of a large bronze sculpture. My intention was to charge a fee for the work required to examine the piece and my conclusions. I explained that as a member of the Catalogue Raisonné Scholars Association, I am helping to formulate guidelines for compensation for CR scholars. The gallery owner, representing a client who wished to bid on the sculpture, agreed to pay my fee. I examined the sculpture and rendered a very detailed analysis of this particular piece—the size cast, its relative rarity in the artist’s oeuvre, and the artist’s relationship with the foundry that produced it (all with supporting archival references).

My fee was terribly small for stakes that, ultimately, were high. I charged $500. The work, estimated at $30,000-70,000, sold for $162,000. Wasn’t that a pittance for validating a work of art of this value?

Let me put it to our members this way: Do not allow our work to be underestimated!! As the value of artwork continues to rise, so to should the value of expertise that is provided by the CR scholar. Let us pool our experiences with “commercial ventures” to establish appropriate fee schedules for all areas of work by scholars of minor as well as major artists.

**Touran Latham ~**

When highly accomplished artist, such as John Carroll, are forgotten, and their names and images of their work are eliminated from major art history treatises, we must ask ourselves: What defines notoriety and obscurity, and who or what sets the standards for categorization?

How often is the independent scholar (who endures years of research), who presents a proposal for an exhibition to a gallery or museum, or attempts to document works that are in public, private or commercial holdings, told: ‘Let’s do lunch sometime and talk about it’?

Commercial venues have repeatedly rejected potential sales of artwork by little known artists because, they say, it would not bring them enough profit. What do they tell us is needed in order to develop a market for these artists? A track record that is documented in a catalogue raisonné! And who is to provide them with this? The scholar who is still waiting for that invitation to lunch. Think about it: Is it any wonder why we need policies that support, encourage, and value our work?

**David Silcox ~**

—I do believe that if the CRSA were to adopt a minimum fee for dealers, auction houses, private collectors, or public institutions, I think that it is something that could be sold.

The issue is in making the fee a normal part of business for everyone concerned. This means working out such things as a minimum rate for: a) a verbal assessment; b) a written assessment; c) an appraisal for donation purposes; etc.

Auction houses do this when they go looking for business, and they would pay if they knew up front that a fee was involved. Of course they are not going to offer a fee, and they may baulk initially, but a representation to them and to museums/art galleries, which I would support and help with, would clear the path.

When you present an owner/institution/business with the information up front, you are already more than halfway there. When they say that the normal fees in the industry are, say, $300 plus taxes and reasonable expenses, you can then either waive them, trade them for a transparency, say that they are minimum but yours are $500+ or more, etc. Your written opinion, after all, is used by insurance companies in court, by lawyers dealing with estates, by families dividing assets, and so on.

We just have to get our collective act together and perhaps print up a little brochure setting out the regime that we want to go with and agree upon.

Obviously we are not lacking for diversity of opinion. The information directly below will attempt to bring these thoughts together. I strongly encourage feedback on this topic and suggestions for where to go from here: can a letter or letters be written based upon the below outline for CRSA members use?

**Ed.**

---

**Outline of services rendered and potential compensation.**

Below please find an outline of the services and potential range of compensation for our expertise. The information contained within was gathered from individual members as well as from a meeting that was held on 15 April at the offices of IFAR. Those who attended this meeting included: Sharon Flescher (Exec. Dir., IFAR), Michael Schroeder (Gilbert Munger), Deborah Browning Schimek (Hans Reichel), E. Adina Gordon, Tina Dickey (Hans Hofman), Steven Manford (Man Ray),
and Scott R. Ferris (Rockwell Kent).

**Letter of introduction and purpose:** general opening remarks or parameters (e.g. "This agreement between us constitutes...")

**Types of service:**

1. Writing: full length books or essays; introductions or catalogue entries; editing or reports
   - A. Conditions: sole; co-author; group projects;
   - B. Subjects: historical or contemporary
   - C. Format: print (journal; magazine; book) or online

2. Lectures:
   - A. Length of lecture (in minutes/hours)
   - B. Required equipment (e.g. podium, microphone, slide or power point projection, laser pointer)

3. Collection assessment, and attribution:
   - A. Inspection of object/s (on-site)
     1. determining authorship of art work/s
     2. dating works of art
   - B. verbal or written assessment of a collection or individual object
   - C. Inspection of documentation (on-site)

4. Miscellaneous:
   - A. conferences
   - B. researching archival materials
   - C. interviews, on-site
   - D. the planning of research projects
   - E. the planning, selecting and hanging of exhibitions
   - F. supervising research assistants
   - G. general advising
   - H. preparing verbal, written or media presentations
   - I. essay or report writing
   - J. commenting on, or editing, the substance and/or verbal character of a text

**Specifications for Services:**

1. Length of engagement: time frame or deadline for the work
2. Travel time
3. Travel expense: arrangements, fare, lodging
4. Office/clerical duties: long distance telephone and faxes, e-mail and online, photocopying and collating, other office materials
5. Photographic expenses: photography, slides, transparencies, professional scanning, CDs, DVDs; permission fees
6. Assistance fees: translations, research assistants
7. Legal fees

**Stipulations pertaining to authorship:**

1. Retention of copyright in original work for future republication
2. Full credit in any publication and/or media presentation for which I have consulted

Define differences between entities for which services are rendered:

Services rendered to:

1. colleagues and friends
2. public institutions (e.g. libraries, museums)
3. private collectors, dealers, auction houses
4. insurance companies, appraisers, lawyers, estates, families dividing assets
5. charitable organizations/events

Schedule of fees:

1. Notify client of fee requirement at onset of discussion
2. Provide client with schedule of fees
3. Clarify that expenses are in addition to any given fee

Type of fee, amount and schedule of payment:

1. Time:
   A. Per diem
      i.) amount (e.g. $300-500-1,000-1,500) plus expenses
      ii.) definition (e.g. any eight hour period given to a task; extended hours; plus expenses)
   B. Per hour (e.g. $50-75-100-150-200) plus expenses

2. Per word [writing projects]: amount ($1.50-2.00-2.50-3.00); stipulate a minimum project fee (e.g. $500-1,000-1,500-2,000) plus expenses

3. Per lecture ($500-1,000-1,500) plus expenses

4. Assessment of collection: dependent upon size of collection and therefore time (e.g. first hour or less: $500-1000-2000; additional hours: $250-500-1000) plus expenses

5. Retainer for long term project: used for advisory or supervisory work where it is difficult to estimate time and expenses (e.g. $1,000-3,000-5,000 per month). When the work in any given month (while on retainer) exceeds the amount of the monthly retainer, calculated at the per diem fee, the additional time should be billed as “General Consulting” (see hourly or per diem fee)

6. Legal: expert witness, trial consultation and preparation, litigation support, dispute resolution (minimum fee based upon first hour or less: $250-500-750-1000; each additional hour: $150-250-500); deposition, court testimony ($350-500-750; set minimum hour requirement)

7. Expenses:
   A. Out-of-pocket: examples: photocopying, office materials, photography (slides, transparencies, CDs, DVDs), photography permissions fees, translators, research assistance, long-distance calls, faxes
      i.) limitations: out-of-pocket expenses shall not exceed a percentage (e.g. 15%) of the total consulting fee unless specifically negotiated
   B. Expenses, travel: plane, train, bus, taxi, limo; meals; lodging
   C. Expenses, miscellaneous: travel time, taxes, legal fees

Additional important considerations:

1. Renegotiating agreement if and when circumstances substantially change

2. "Termination fee," should contracted work or event be canceled for whatever reason: stipulate percentage (e.g. 35%-50%-65%) or flat rate fee

3. In the event of any dispute arising out of this agreement: refer dispute to arbitrator (e.g. American Arbitrator Association
in New York City); limit any award to total fee and expenses, plus reasonable interest and expenses
4. Further contact: Submission agreement should note desire for ongoing access to artwork by scholar

The above outline should be reformatted into letter form, using CRSA stationary [being developed], and could be used as a basic "schedule of fees" by any CRSA member. Perhaps someone would care to tackle this project?

Where Angels Fear to Tread: The Catalogue Raisonné and Its Explosive Potential

A recap of the April 16-17 2005 program organized by Lisa Koenigsberg and New York University’s School of Continuing and Professional Studies, with assistance from Nancy Mowll Mathews, and the support of Adelson Galleries, Babcock Galleries, the Catalogue Raisonné Scholars Association, The Hans Hofmann Foundation, Spanierman Gallery, LLC, and The Exeter Group.

The following is a reprint of précis and other documents that were handed out at New York University, as well as updates that were submitted after the event.

Saturday, April 16.

Welcome and Introduction
Lisa Koenigsberg. Sat., 9:30-9:30 am [times noted were scheduled times].

Cassatt Color Prints and Prendergast Monotypes: Problems of the Unique Multiple
Nancy Mowll Mathews. Sat., 9:30-10:10 am.

The color print craze of the 1890s resulted in some of the most beautiful and important prints in the history of American art. Artists like Mary Cassatt and Maurice Prendergast, two Americans living in Paris at the time, were inspired by French styles and art theory to experiment with this medium. Cassatt's series of ten color aquatints, exhibited in Paris in 1891, were on the leading edge of the color print movement; while Prendergast's monotypes of the later nineties and early 1900s represent a flowering of the style in Boston and New York.

My cataloguing of both of these bodies of work took place in the 1980s and resulted in the publication of Mary Cassatt: The Color Prints (1989, with Barbara Shapiro) and Maurice Prendergast, Charles Prendergast: A Catalogue Raisonné (1990, with Carol Clark, Gwendolyn Owens and Cecily Langdale). In the intervening years, I have continued to work in both areas. In this talk, I would like to discuss the process used in compiling the initial catalogues and share with you the directions I've taken since.

Color prints in general occupy a kind of mid-point between the traditional definition of prints and paintings, and these are especially paradoxical because of the deliberate experimentation by both artists. On the one hand, Mary Cassatt subverted the well established European intaglio techniques of drypoint and aquatint with hand inking—what should have been identical multiples into unique near-paintings. Prendergast, on the other hand, made good use of the "monotype's" ability to produce multiple pulls, turning the unique print into a series.

In the Nature of the Beast: The Notion of Multiples and Catalogues Raisonné of Photography
Denise Bethel. Sat., 10:15-10:55 am.

More and more, photographs from many different decades and a variety of countries are becoming a central part of major museum exhibitions, Ph.D. dissertations and the art market. Yet both the scholarly community and the marketplace lack a tool that is essential to the serious study and astute marketing of other forms of art: the catalogue raisonné. Although there has been an explosion in books on photography in the past twenty years, very few of those volumes answer the questions that are addressed in the basic catalogue raisonné: what kind, how many and when. A few pioneering researchers have taken on what may, in the end, prove to be an insurmountable task: to provide comprehensive catalogues of a photographer's œuvre, starting from scratch. The few catalogues that have been produced thus far raise what is perhaps the most important issue of all: what is the ideal form of the catalogue raisonné for photographs? It cannot be in the form of the typical paintings catalogue raisonné, which deals with unique objects: the photogram and the daguerreotype aside, photographs are by their
very nature not unique—they are produced from negatives. Yet it cannot be in the form of the typical print catalogue raisonné, which most often deals in objects that were created as art, in editions, and are intended as multiples: touted as true multiples, photographs from negatives—until recently—are almost never exact duplicates. In some instances, they are not even recognizable as any sort of duplicate at all. Will we need a whole new form of catalogue raisonné for photographs? How, in the end, do we create a catalogue raisonné for photographs from negatives that are best characterized by the phrase "one-of-a-kind multiples"?

**Between Catalogue and Construction Manual: Documenting the Installations of Ilya Kabakov**
Boris Groys. Sat., 11:15-11:55 am [no précis submitted].

**The Lichtenstein Catalogue Raisonné: Select Case Studies in Multiples and Authenticity**
Yolande Trincere. Sat., 12:00-12:40 pm.
—Creation of the catalogue raisonné project by the Roy Lichtenstein Foundation
—The problem of multiples
—The creation of sculpture editions with Gemini, Tyler and Tallix
—Case studies of the 1970's and 1980's
—Conclusions of issues of authenticity and sculpture editions of brass, wood and bronze.

**Lunch 12:40-2:00 pm.**

**Sharing a Database Over the Internet**
Richard Grant. Sat., 2:00-2:40 pm.
This talk will explore the options available to those who wish to have two or more researchers share a database, with particular emphasis on what is required to do so over the internet. The assumption is that the requirements include the ability to have multiple users access the database simultaneously both for inquiry and data entry. The full range of options for sharing data will be discussed, including the simple transmission of copies of files, Virtual Private Networks, use of remote Open Data Base Connectivity and Remote Terminal Support for Remote Desktop and CITRIX. Emphasis will be on the advantages and disadvantages of each approach and what hardware and software must be acquired to use each. There will be an online demonstration of accessing the Diebenkorn database that runs on a computer in Berkeley, CA. It will include a performance comparison between the remote database and a local copy being accessed directly on a laptop computer in the seminar room. Sources of heavily discounted software to support remote operations will be discussed and details made available.

**The Richard Diebenkorn Catalogue Raisonné Database**
Richard Grant. Sat., 2:45-3:25 pm.
This presentation will discuss the history of the Diebenkorn project, how it has been staffed and managed, and how the data has been acquired and captured. Particular emphasis will be given to the criteria used for selection of the database software. Because the project manager, Mr. Grant, was experienced in selection and implementation of software systems in commercial and governmental institutions, it was decided to use the same approach and methodology he had previously used. The team determined that the requirements for a catalogue raisonné are a subset of those for a museum's collection management system. Thus, after an extensive evaluation of museum software, *The Museum System*, a product originally developed in cooperation with the Metropolitan Museum, was chosen for the project. There will be a demonstration of how the data has been catalogued and the tools available to format and output the data. There will be a discussion of the economics of using such a product as an alternative to creating a custom database.

**Break 3:25-3:45 pm.**

**Producing a Catalogue Raisonné for the Web: The George Bellows Catalogue Raisonné**
Glenn C. Peck, Jr. Sat., 3:45-4:25 pm [no précis submitted].
Panel Discussion on Catalogues Raisonné, Databases and the Internet
Richard Grant, Glenn C. Peck, Jr., Peter Rooney, Michael D. Schroeder. Sat., 4:30-5:45 pm. [précis submitted by Peter Rooney and Michael D. Schroeder only].

Peter Rooney

By examining the database of your artist from various angles and crosschecking facts for consistency, interesting discoveries can be made.

We explore such tasks as:
—Conflation of works in the database previously thought to be separated works.
—Approximate dating of "undated" works by means of a chronology of images or an index of signatures
—Identification of works by means of indexes of size (area) and medium
—Examination of dealer's reports to verify present location of works
—Attempted identification of works known only from exhibition lists
—A computer database helps to resolve such questions (examples will be given).

[Peter submitted the following additional information.]

CRSS (Catalogue Raisonné Software System)

CRSS is a series of computer procedures which enable a researcher who is creating a catalogue raisonné to quickly and efficiently record and organize the information required:
—a list of all known artworks by an individual artist
—a description of each work, along with images
—current and previous ownership
—exhibition history
—bibliographic citations

The information is stored as a database—i.e., a group of related computer files. The database can be examined and edited interactively—as data is added or edited in any file, the changes are immediately reflected throughout the system. At any point in the research process, the data is available for review on-screen or in printed reports.

When the data is in final form, a typeset catalogue can be produced, and its format laid out as desired. CRSS will print directly and is also adaptable to desktop publishing programs and photocomposition.

Subsets of CRSS enable an artist, gallery director or collector to compile exhibition catalogues, collection inventories, or an artist's inventory, using the same data already input for the catalogue raisonné.

The artworks database is a system of five primary files: works, images, provenance, exhibitions and bibliography. These primary files are held together by linking files. Linking files enable the researcher to switch rapidly between the primary files at specific points related to the particular work of art being studied. The files are also indexed by title, date, medium, size, etc. The indexes enable the researcher to view and compare the works with each other, and even help to identify works that are not yet fully researched.

The CRSS is net workable, and runs on MS Windows 2000, XP, or similar.

Michael D. Schroeder

The Web offers a new way for art historians to do catalog research and publish it.

Professionals who do not learn how to use this tool where appropriate will be eclipsed.

Professors have an obligation to train the next generation of researchers in Web based information gathering and publication.

The power of the Web in doing catalog research comes from the feedback effect generated when a researcher starts publishing early in the catalog process. This includes other art historians, collectors, dealers and the general public in the information gathering process. Because of popular television shows like Antiques Roadshow, the general public is well sensitized to the potential value in old pictures found in family attics or over grandma's mantel. They will try to learn about such a painting by looking up the artist on the Web. A nascent catalog Web site will be found by the internet search service and the art historian contacted by e-mail. The information exchange that results informs the owner about the work and adds a new work
to the growing catalog. By such a feedback loop the catalog of a little known artist can grow considerably. In the case of my Gilbert Munger (1837-1903) Web catalog at http://gilbertmunger.org, the known body of works has grown over eight years by this technique from about 80 to more than 225.

The advantages of this approach include:

— Involves the public and the profession in gathering information
— Positive feedback loop finds works in attics and letters in old trunks
— Enhanced reader experience: complete source material; no limit on number of images; full text search; active cross references, fresh content
— Reaches a wide audience
— Low production cost
— Vests control with the art historian rather than the sponsor.

Important issues to consider are:

— Arranging for Web publication rights for images at a reasonable cost
— Setting the proper balance between information sharing and information hoarding
— Inadequate and/or expensive tools for such Web publication
— Arranging for the content of Web based catalog raisonné to persist in perpetuity.

Evening at Spanierman Gallery. Sat., 6:30-8:30 pm.
Celebrating the First Two Volumes of the Winslow Homer Catalogue Raisonné

Sunday, April 17.

Mark Rothko: Reason Regained
David Anfam. Sun., 9:30-10:10 am.
— Institutional Control vs. Individual Scholarship
— The Advantages and Drawbacks of Technology
— Authentication and Its Perils
— Facts vs. Interpretation.

Archives Anecdote and Visual Logic: The Hans Hofmann Catalogue Raisonné

This talk explores how anecdote and visual logic bring the archives to life, or the ways in which oral history and biography contribute to authentication. When there's no paper trail, and even sometimes when there is, a work may have to be authenticated by other means: technical analysis or connoisseurship. Nearly every essay in Ronald Spencer's book [The Expert Versus the Object: Judging Fakes and False Attributions in the Visual Arts. See CRSA Forum, June, 2004, No. 14] suggested that scientific analysis is best used as a last resort, which leaves us with visual authentication—murky waters to many, but not to those with visual acumen! Aside from familiarity with the painter's oeuvre, what sort of resources and training develop the ability to authenticate a work by visual means alone? In the case of Hans Hofmann his extraordinary legacy as a teacher held clues to explain the visual complexity of his paintings. The experience of conducting an oral history of his students, and studying painting with them, turned out to be quite helpful in achieving the advanced visual logic necessary to fully explain and authenticate his work. Through oral history and biography, the catalogue raisonné author can assimilate the knowledge of the artist's own community to reconstruct a visual continuum in a body of work and thus encourage a deeper understanding of the creative process.

Break. 10:55-11:15 am.
Revelations and Reconsiderations: New Thoughts on Theodore Robinson

The exhibition organized by the Baltimore Museum of Art, In Monet’s Light: Theodore Robinson at Giverny, offered an unparalleled opportunity to study and compare a large body of paintings by Theodore Robinson, the artist credited with bringing Impressionism to America. Specifically, it followed his transformation from a figural painter working mainly in the American Realist manner into one who became a keen observer of the world around him inspired by his good friend and mentor, Claude Monet. Much about this transformation is recorded in Robinson’s personal diaries which shed considerable light on his artistic intent and the methods he used to achieve them.

The exhibition also benefited the Theodore Robinson catalogue raisonné project in that several individuals, including descendants of the artist, brought forth both works known only through early exhibition and auction records as well as hitherto unrecorded paintings and sketchbooks that deepen knowledge of specific periods, notable his early career in both America and France.

Seeing Double and Other Maladies of the Catalogue Raisonné Scholar
Scott R. Ferris. Sun., 12:00-12:40 pm.

This lecture will address the problems of documenting an artist's oeuvre. For the purposes of this lecture Mr. Ferris, a specialist in the art of Rockwell Kent, will identify several works—paintings as well as drawings—that have confused researchers by their similarity to other works by the artist, as well as, to works by other artists.

Not unlike Monet, Kent revisited a scene on numerous occasions to capture the varying visual effects created by changing atmospheric conditions. Additional confusion has arisen by Kent’s tendency to rework a composition; by his ability and willingness to replicate his own work; and his propensity to reuse compositional titles. If this were not enough to frustrate the catalogue raisonné scholar, Kent’s decades long popularity encouraged other artists to flatter him with imitations, a problem that has become more noticeable with the arrival of online sales and unvetted scholarship.

[Add the following reflection. Ed.]

I began my presentation with two portraits of Kent: i.) as a young student painting outdoors; ii.) seated in his Greenland hut, accompanied by male and female company—the latter most likely being his kifak—“house keeper”—and occasional lover, Salamina. While introducing these images I made an impromptu remark about Kent’s well known infidelities. My reason for mentioning this was because this aspect of his history, as well as another personal characteristic—his sociopolitical foundations—has been used as a measure to gauge his artistic ability, as well as, his contribution to American art history. Unfortunately, as Hilton Kramer made clear as recently as last year, in his “review” of a Kent exhibit at the Farnsworth Art Museum in Maine (“Two Rockwell Kents: A Moby-Dick Etcher And Stalin Admirer.” New York Observer. 9/16/04), the blinders remain on. This ongoing prejudice, in small quarters, has provided additional maladies for the CR scholar. Nevertheless, the prognosis continues to be a slow, steady recovery.

Lunch. Sun., 12:40-2:00 pm.

The Submission Agreement and Other Legal Safeguards for Those Involved in Catalogues Raisonné
Peter R. Stern. Sun., 2:00-2:45 pm.

Peter has provided draft documents—6 pages—that are shared with you at the end of this issue of the Forum, just prior to the membership list. These will be reproduced from the hand outs that were at the conference. This replaces Peter’s précis.

The Protection of the Law: Authenticity and Other Issues: A Panel Discussion

No notes were taken during this presentation.

The weekends program ended with this last panel presentation.

One other conference note. I was informed post conference that all presentations were recorded by Lisa Koenigsberg. Perhaps I am naive but it has been common procedure prior to any lecture that I have given, at any institution, that I am notified before hand that the host would like make such a recording. It has also been common procedure that a copy of the recording
is made available to me, usually at the hosts' expense.

I have expressed my displeasure with Lisa that this has occurred. I have also expressed my willingness to pay the cost of making a copy of the recording, in light of the fact that the expense of putting on this last conference probably exceeded its income.

I am interested in hearing from any other participant of this years or last years conference regarding this topic.

Editor's Notes

This issue of the CRSA Forum has been long in coming for a couple of reasons: i) I am human; ii) CRSA member submissions to the Forum continue to be difficult to acquire.

To elucidate:

i) In short, this past year has been a terrible one for me and my attention has been required every other place than on Our CRSA Forum. And having to prod members for material for the Forum has drained my enthusiasm to produce it.

ii) I began my tenure as editor making it clear to everyone that I was not a professional editor but I could compile Our contributions into a worthwhile publication. That was with the Summer 2002, No. 9 edition, now nine issues ago. I believe I have done that.

Even when my sources of information have changed and the content of the Forum has evolved, I have managed to compile another issue. In fact I have increased the number of issues to three per year versus two (what is a "newsletter" if it isn't a frequent, newsworthy publication?). What we have is not a newsletter but a magazine, of sorts, which is fine, but it still exist on member contributions.

As I have mentioned repeatedly, I am a volunteer, unpaid; contributors, likewise, are not paid.

Who keeps Our Forum alive? A handful of people; here are the names of contributors from the past nine issues: Nancy Mowll Mathews, Steven Manford, Tina Dickey (+CRSA website), Heidi Hornik (CRSA Listserv), Francis O'Connor, Comité Picabia, Alain Tarica, Julian Cox, Touran Latham, Ron Spencer, Charlotte Sholod, David Silcox, Gail Levin, Peter Nesbett, Eileen Costello, Michael Reed, Adina Gordon, Sharon Flescher, Deborah Schimek, and several "announcement" contributors including Gray Sweeney, Michael Schroeder, Peter Rooney, Jerome Saltzer, Lisa Koenigsberg, Adrienne Baxter Bell, Frances Gray, Jeffrey Coven, Joyce Stoner, Amy King. (I may be missing a few people but your contributions are no less heartfelt.)

When edition No. 9 was published we had approximately 97 CRSA members. Therefore, the ratio between the above mentioned contributors and 97 members may sound high. But consider this: Now we have 162 members, so when I try to maintain the same content—at least two full length essays and several announcements and other ancillary materials—in each issue, the ratio of contributors drops. If everyone contributed one essay and one announcement or news, we would have enough material for 27 years (6 essays per year plus numerous newsworthy tidbits), and that's not taking into account our regular membership growth!

I was in fear of having to change the name of our newsletter to the O'Connor/Mathews/Manford/Dickey Forum because these individuals contributed, in various ways, on a regular basis. (I maintained our name, CRSA Forum, by coercing, threatening and other vile means commonly practiced by con-temporary politicians, our membership into submitting materials. In a recent telephone conversation with another of our fellow members I mentioned this concern and he said, "I was wondering about all this Kent material..." Well, the bottom line is: We are what You contribute.

Having said all of the above I wish to announce the end of my tenure as editor of the CRSA Forum with the Winter 2006 issue. In so doing I extend an invitation to any member who is willing to take my place. I will edit the Autumn and Winter issues, provided enough material is sent my way.

Many thanks to those who have contributed; many thanks to those who have acknowledged my efforts. You are appreciated!

Scott R. Ferris

Instructions for accessing our CRSA Listserv

Send a new e-mail message to listproc@baylor.edu and in the body of the text type, Subscribe CRSA-L and your name (e.g. Subscribe CRSA-L Karl Rove).

Once you have subscribed you will receive a "Welcome" message including instructions for unsubscribing.

To send an e-mail message to all subscribers of the CRSA listserv, address your e-mail to CRSA-L@Baylor.edu. Your message will automatically be distributed to everyone on the list.
ARTIST CATALOGUE RAISONNÉ PROJECT INC.

SUBMISSION AGREEMENT

SUBMISSION AGREEMENT, dated as of __________, 2005, by and between the Artist Catalogue Raisonné Project Inc. ("the Project"), and _______________ ("the Owner"), the owner of the following work:

Title/Subject: ________________________________
Medium: ________________________________
Size: ________________________________
Date: ________________________________
Signature: ________________________________

("the Work").

The Project has been established for the purpose of preparing and publishing a catalogue raisonné of the works of Artist (the "Catalogue Raisonné");

The Owner is submitting the Work to the Project and requested that the Project consider the Work for inclusion in the Catalogue Raisonné.

The Project has agreed to consider the Work on the terms and conditions set forth herein;

The parties hereto agree as follows:

1. The Project agrees to consider the Work for purposes of rendering an opinion to the Owner concerning the possible inclusion of the Work in the Catalogue Raisonné. After such consideration and research as the Project, in its sole discretion, shall deem appropriate, the Project shall advise the Owner as to whether (a) it will include the Work in the Catalogue Raisonné; (b) it will not include the Work in the Catalogue Raisonné; or (c) it is unable to reach a decision at this time.

2. The Owner expressly understands and agrees that (i) none of the Project, its officers, directors, employees or agents warrants or guarantees the correctness of the Project's decision; and (ii) the only obligation of each of the Project, its officers, directors, employees or agents with respect to the Work is for each of them to exercise reasonable judgment in considering the Work. Accordingly, the Owner hereby releases and discharges each of the Project, its officers, directors, employees or agents thereof from and against any and all claims, liabilities, losses and damages, and all costs and expenses (including attorneys' fees) related thereto, arising out of, based upon or resulting from the decision (or lack thereof) rendered by the Project concerning the Work.
3. The Owner represents and warrants to the Project that the Owner is the actual owner of the Work and that the Owner has the sole title thereto and right to possession thereof.

4. As part of the submission, the Owner shall provide the Project with:

(a) a transparency or equivalent high quality digital image of the Work, suitable for publication.
(b) all information about the Work known to the Owner, including but not limited to its full provenance and exhibition history, as well as any opinion by any expert or scholar as to the attribution of the Work.
(c) the results of any scientific examination or testing of the Work.

The Owner represents and warrants to the Project that all information provided to the Project is accurate to the best of the Owner’s knowledge.

5. The Owner agrees to defend, indemnify and hold harmless each of the Project, its officers, directors, employees or agents thereof from and against any and all claims, liabilities, losses and damages, and all costs and expenses (including attorneys' fees) related thereto, arising out of, based upon or resulting from any claims asserted by the Owner or by any third party related to the decision (or lack thereof) rendered by the Project concerning the Work.

6. Attached hereto as Forms A, B and C, respectively, are three forms of letters, one of which will be delivered to the Owner. The letter attached as Form A will be delivered if the Project intends to include the Work in the Catalogue Raisonné; the letter attached as Form B will be delivered if the Project does not intend to include the Work in the Catalogue Raisonné; and the letter attached as Form C will be delivered if the Project is unable at this time to reach a decision at this time. If information comes to the Project’s attention which causes it to change the decision expressed in such a letter, the Project may change its decision and may deliver a copy of a substitute letter, instead of any prior letter, to persons making inquiry as described in the next paragraph.

7. The Owner authorizes the Project to make and retain photographs or other copies of the Work. The Project intends to retain in its files a copy of the current letter described above, and to make copies of that letter available at the request of persons who the Project, in its absolute discretion, determines to have an appropriate interest in the Work. Further, the Owner grants the Project an irrevocable non-exclusive royalty-free license to publish photographs of the Work in connection with the activities of the Project.

8. The Owner authorizes the Project to undertake at the Owner’s expense any non-invasive scientific testing of the Work that the Project, in its absolute discretion, may consider to be helpful. Nonetheless, the Project is under no obligation to undertake any scientific testing whatsoever.

9. Circumstances may arise which may cause the Project to doubt or to change its decision, if any, theretofore expressed by it in a letter referred to above. In such event, the Project may, but it shall be under no duty to notify the Owner of such occurrence and deliver to the Owner a substitute letter expressing the Project’s revised decision. The Owner represents to the Project and to the general public that (a) the Owner shall not misrepresent to anyone the
Project's decision as given or made known to the Owner; (b) the Owner will promptly return to the Project the original copy of any letter hereunder for which a substitute letter is issued to the Owner if it is in the Owner's power to do so; and (c) the Owner will use reasonable efforts to advise a purchaser or any subsequent owner known to Owner of any such change in the Project's decision.

10. This Agreement shall be binding upon the heirs, successors and assigns of each of the parties and upon any subsequent purchaser of the Work. This Agreement shall be governed by and construed in accordance with the laws of the State of New York.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have executed this Agreement as of the date first above written.

ARTIST CATALOGUE
RAISONNÉ PROJECT INC.

By________________________

Date:

OWNER:

Print Name:
Address:

Date:

In the event that the Project determines to include the Work in the Catalogue Raisonné, the Project shall describe the ownership of the Work as follows (check one):

____ The Project may use my name as Owner of the Work.

____ The Project shall describe the Work as property of a private collection.

____ The Project shall describe the Work as follows:
ARTIST CATALOGUE RAISONNÉ PROJECT INC.

, 2005

[Owner]

Description of Work:

Identification Number:

You have submitted the above work (the "Work") to the Artist Catalogue Raisonné Project Inc. (the "Project") and asked it to consider the Work for possible inclusion in the forthcoming catalogue raisonné of the works of Artist (the "Catalogue Raisonné").

It is the decision of the Project at this time that it intends to include the Work in the Catalogue Raisonné.

THE FOREGOING DECISION IS BASED UPON CIRCUMSTANCES KNOWN TO THE PROJECT AT THIS TIME. THE FOREGOING IS NOT A WARRANTY OF ANY KIND. NEITHER THE PROJECT NOR ANY OF ITS OFFICERS, DIRECTORS, EMPLOYEES OR AGENTS SHALL HAVE ANY LIABILITY WHATSOEVER TO ANYONE BY REASON OF THE FOREGOING DECISION.

The foregoing decision may change by reason of circumstances arising or discovered by the Project after the date of this decision. The Project may choose to respond to inquiries by individuals or entities having, in the Project's absolute discretion, sufficient basis for making such an inquiry, as to whether any change has occurred.

This letter is subject to the terms and conditions of the submission agreement, pursuant to which it has been issued.

ARTIST CATALOGUE RAISONNÉ PROJECT INC.

By ____________________________
Authorized Representative
FORM B
ARTIST CATALOGUE RAISONNÉ PROJECT INC.

, 2005

[Owner]

Description of Work:

Identification Number:

You have submitted the above work (the “Work”) to the Artist Catalogue Raisonné Project Inc. (the “Project”) and asked it to consider the Work for possible inclusion in the forthcoming catalogue raisonné of the works of Artist (the “Catalogue Raisonné”).

It is the decision of the Project at this time that it does not intend to include the Work in the Catalogue Raisonné.

THE FOREGOING DECISION IS BASED UPON CIRCUMSTANCES KNOWN TO THE PROJECT AT THIS TIME. THE FOREGOING IS NOT A WARRANTY OF ANY KIND. NEITHER THE PROJECT NOR ANY OF ITS OFFICERS, DIRECTORS, EMPLOYEES OR AGENTS SHALL HAVE ANY LIABILITY WHATSOEVER TO ANYONE BY REASON OF THE FOREGOING DECISION.

The foregoing decision may change by reason of circumstances arising or discovered by the Project after the date of this decision. The Project may choose to respond to inquiries by individuals or entities having, in the Project’s absolute discretion, sufficient basis for making such an inquiry, as to whether any change has occurred.

This letter is subject to the terms and conditions of the submission agreement, pursuant to which it has been issued.

ARTIST CATALOGUE RAISONNÉ PROJECT INC.

By____________________________________

Authorized Representative
FORM C
ARTIST CATALOGUE RAISONNÉ PROJECT INC.

, 2005

[Owner]

Description of Work:

Identification Number:

You have submitted the above work (the “Work”) to the Artist Catalogue Raisonné Project Inc. (the “Project”) and asked it to consider the Work for possible inclusion in the forthcoming catalogue raisonné of the works of Artist (the “Catalogue Raisonné”).

The Project at this time is unable to reach a decision as to the inclusion of the Work in the Catalogue Raisonné.

The foregoing position may change by reason of circumstances arising or discovered by the Project after the date of this letter. The Project may choose to respond to inquiries by individuals or entities having, in the Project’s absolute discretion, sufficient basis for making such an inquiry, as to whether any change has occurred.

This letter is subject to the terms and conditions of the submission agreement, pursuant to which it has been issued.

ARTIST CATALOGUE RAISONNÉ PROJECT INC.

By__________________________________________

Authorized Representative
Membership List

Members, please check your personal data to make sure all information is correct. If changes need to be made please let me know directly (as well as updating Nancy Mathews)! Thank you for your assistance with this matter. (What you see is what you've sent to Nancy.)

Artists and CRSA related services are not separately listed in this issue.

Henry Adams  
Chair, Dept. of Art History  
Case Western Reserve University  
Room 103, Mather House  
11201 Euclid Ave.  
Cleveland Ohio 44106  
henry.adams@case.edu  
Thomas Hart Benton  
Dr. Anne Adriaens-Pannier  
Adjunct-Curator, XXth Century Drawings  
Museum of Modern Art  
Museumstraat, 9  
B-1000 Brussels Belgium  
adriaens@fine-arts-museum.be  
Leon Spillaert  
Dr. David Anfam  
Art Ex Ltd.  
Flat 9, Marina 1, 10 New Wharf Road  
London N1 9RT England U.K.  
danfam@phaidon.com  
Mark Rothko  
James B. Atkinson  
117 Town House Road  
Cornish NH 03745  
datholm@valley.net  
Graphic work of Charles A. Platt  
Helen Dickinson Baldwin  
3711 Whitland Avenue  
Nashville TN 37205  
rubertbaldvinrab@aol.com  
Edwin Dickinson 1891-1978  
Vivian Endicott Barnett  
140 Riverside Drive  
New York NY 10024  
vbarnett@worldnet.att.net  
Vasily Kandinsky's Drawings  
Elizabeth A. Barry  
P.O. Box 7907  
Portland ME 04112  
Artgirl5@aol.com  
Robert Indiana  
Adrienne Baxter Bell  
594 Highland Avenue  
Upper Montclair NJ 07043  
baxterbell@att.net  
Charles Caryl Coleman  
Roberta Bernstein, Prof. of Art History  
University at Albany  
225 Novak Road  
Valatie New York 12184  
rmb Bernstein555@aol.com  
Jasper Johns  
Patrick Bertrand  
P.O. Box 10993  

Oakland CA 94610  
giverny@usa.net  
Theodore Earl Butler  
Alain Blondel  
59, rue du Temple  
75004 Paris France  
info@encycilia.com  
Tamara de Lempicka  
Sarah Boehme  
The John S. Bugas Curator of Western Art  
Buffalo Bill Historical Center  
720 Sheridan Avenue  
Cody Wyoming 82414  
sarah@bbhc.org  
Frederic Remington and William Ranney  
Maria Luisa Borras, Art Historian  
Comite Picabia  
Consell de Cent 369  
28009 Barcelona Spain  
Borras@mente.net  
Francis Picabia  
Phyllis Braff  
333 East 55th Street  
New York NY 10022  
pbarr@rcn.com  
Thomas Moran  
Richard H.W. Brauer  
Brauer Museum of Art  
Valpariso University Center for the Arts  
Valpariso IN 46383  
Richard.Brauer@Valpo.edu  
Junius R. Sloan  
Mark L. Brock  
174 Sunset Road  
Carlisle MA 01741  
mark@brockandco.com  
Doris Bry  
11 East 73rd Street  
New York NY 10021  
dbry@earthlink.net  
Stieglitz/O'Keefe  
Debra Burchett-Lere Director  
Samuel L. Francis Art Museum  
1146 North Central Avenue, #523  
Glendale CA 91202  
samfrancisfoundation@earthlink.net  
Samuel L. Francis, Canvas, works on paper  
Pierre Calte, President  
Comite Picabia  
26, Rue Danielle Casanova  
Paris France  
archives@comite-picabia.com  
Francis Picabia  
William A. Camfield, Prof. Emeritus,  
Dept. of Art & Art History  
Rice University  
1117 Milford  
Houston TX 77006  
bille@rice.edu  
Francis Picabia  
Dr. Joseph Carlton  
Two Sutton Place South  
New York NY 10022  
jrcarltn@aol.com  
Edward Moran  
Allesandra Carnielli, Exec. Dir.  
Pierre & Maria Gaetana Matisse  
Foundation  
1 East 53 Street, 4th floor  
New York NY 10022  
aacarnelli@pmgml.org  
Yves Tanguy - Paintings & works on paper in color  
Gerald L. Carr  
608 Apple Road  
Newark DE 19711  
gcarr@dpt-net.com  
Frederic Edwin Church  
Claudia Carson  
29 Park Hill Avenue  
Norwalk CT 06851  
coleja@yahoo.com  
Computer Data Bases  
Julie Coleman, Curatorial Assistant  
Buffalo Bill Historical Center  
720 Sheridan Avenue  
Cody Wyoming 82414  
juliec@bbhc.org  
Frederick Remington/William Ranney  
Heidi Colsman-Freyberger  
The Barnett Newman Foundation  
654 Madison Avenue, Suite 1900  
New York NY 10021  
hcf@barnettnewman.org  
Barnett Newman  
Peter B. Cook  
4 Humboldt Street  
Cambridge MA 02140  
peterbook@comcast.net  
John Folinbee, N.A. (1892-1972)  
Eileen Costello  
Matthew Marks Gallery  
235 Mulberry Street, #4  
New York NY 10012  
ecostello@mail.utexas.edu  
Peter Cain; Brice Marden
Ralph Schneider  
47 St. Paul's Place  
Hempstead NY 11550  
rschneiderprints@aol.com

John R. Schoonover, President  
Schoonover Studios, Lts.  
1616 N. Rodney Street  
Wilmington DE 19806  
studios@dcn.net  
Frank E. Schoonover

Michael D. Schroeder, Asst. Dir.  
Microsoft Research, Silicon Valley  
1065 La Avenida  
Mt. View CA 94043  
mds@microsoft.com  
Gilbert Monger

Charlotte Sholod, Curator  
Dreyfuss/Glicenstein Estate  
1520 York Avenue, Apt. 3J  
New York NY 10028  
csholod@earthlink.net  
Glicenstein

David P. Silcox  
Massey College, Univ. of Toronto  
70 Montclair Avenue, Apt. 402  
Toronto, Ont, Canada M5S1P7  
david.silcox@utoronto.ca  
David B. Milne

Patricia Siska  
55 Payson Avenue, #6F  
New York NY 10034  
psiska@earthlink.net

Donald E. Smith  
5431 39th Street, N.W.  
Washington DC 20015  
The Prints of Emil Ganso

Wendy Snyder  
88 Lexington Avenue, #9E  
New York NY 10016  
wendysnyder@earthlink.net  
Sam Glankoff

Regina Soria  
78, via P.A. Micheli  
Rome Italy 00197  
reg.soria@tiscali.net.it  
Elihu Vedder

Melissa Webster Speidel, Curator  
Thomas Moran Catalogue Raisonne Project  
631 Portofino Lane  
Foster City CA 94404  
melissa@cyberlynx.com

Oil Paintings of Thomas Moran  
Ronald D. Spencer  
Carter, Ledyard & Milburn  
Two Wall Street  
New York NY 10005  
spencer@elm.com  
Attorney active in CR matters

Peter R. Stern  
McLaughlin & Stern, LLP

260 Madison Avenue  
New York NY 10016  
pstern@mcLaughlinstern.com  
Attorney active in CR matters

Joyce Hill Stoner  
Professor & Paintings Conservator  
Winterthur/Univ. of Delaware  
Program in Art Conservation  
Winterthur Museum  
Winterthur DE 19735  
jhstoner@udel.edu

Consult / Andrew Wyeth, J.B. Wyeth, N.C. Wyeth projects

Robert K. Tarbell  
1810 Rittenhouse Sq. Apt. 901  
Philadelphia PA 19103  
tarbell@camden.rutgers.edu  
William and Margaret Zorach

Mary Thorp  
Harry Bertoia Research Project  
P.O. Box 352  
Rock Cave WV 26234  
thorpcodesigns@juno.com  
Harry Bertoia, sculptures & monotypes

James Francis Trezza  
39 East 78th Street, Suite 603  
New York New York 10021  
jt@trezza.com  
19th & 20th Century Authenticators

Dr. Yolande Trincere  
Roy Lichtenstein Foundation  
55 West 11th Street, Apt. 1F  
New York NY 10011  
yetphd@cs.com  
Roy Lichtenstein

Patricia Truty-Coohill  
Prof. Of Art History  
Siena College  
Creative Arts Department, Foy 306, 515  
Loudonville Road  
Loudonville NY 12211  
truty@coohill.com  
Leonardo da Vinci in America

Ashley Waechter  
Gerald Peters Gallery  
1011 Paseo de Peralta  
Santa Fe NM 87501  
aaWaechte@Gpgallery.com  
Taos Society of Artists: Blumenschein, Critecher

Jayne Warman  
11 Normandy Road  
Bronxville NY 10708  
jswarman@earthlink.net  
Cezanne's paintings & watercolors

Robert S. Warshaw, Esq.  
501 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1803  
New York NY 10017  
rwarsaw@fifthavenuelaw.com

Jeffrey Weidman, Senior Librarian  
Public Services & Collection Dev.  
Spencer Art Ref. Library
The Nelson Atkins Museum
4525 Oak Street
Kansas City MO 64111
jweidman@nelson-atkins.org
William Rimmer

Deborah White
1968 Arbor Court
Charlottesville VA 22911 7255
millerproject@earthlink.net
Alfred Jacob Miller, William Robinson
Leigh

Guy Wildenstein
19 East 64th Street
New York NY 10021 7042

Gertrude Wilmers
Special Research Associate
International Foundation for Art Research
14 East 90th Street
New York NY 10128
gwilmers@sprintmail.com
Cornelis Schut

Barbara A. Wolanin
Curator for the Architect of the Capitol
7807 Hamilton Spring Road
Bethesda MD 20817
bwolanin@earthlink.net
Arthur B. Carles, Constantino Brumidi

Gerd Woll, Senior Curator
Munch-museet
P.O.B. 2812 Toyen
N-0608 Oslo Norway
gerd.woll@munch.museum.no
Edvard Munch’s Paintings

Erin Wright, Research Assistant
3581 Ocean View Avenue
Los Angeles CA 90066
erin@ederuscha.org
Edward Ruscha

John Yau
Assist. Prof. of Critical Studies
Mason Gross School of the Arts
33 Livingston Avenue
New Brunswick NJ 08901
jyau974406@aol.com
Norman Bluhm, Paintings

Dr. Judith K. Zilczer, Curator Emerita
Hirshhorn Museum & Sculpture Garden
2351 North Quantico Street
Arlington VA 22205
zilczerj@verizon.net