

Helmut Börsch-Supan

Visual Value and Original Substance

Interest in fine art has recently increased to an astonishing degree. Museums are well attended. Significant exhibitions lure the masses. There is a lively, even frightening amount of art tourism. A flood of art books is breaking over us. It is a boom time for the eye. A seed has sprouted, and simultaneously there is growing concern that the things one loves so much that one constantly seeks their presence may be getting worn out like the favourite doll of an unreasonable child.

Is all this only a hectic bustle, steered by a ruthless industry and promoted by people's short-sighted happiness, fixated on the moment, or even cultural policy targeting a demonstration of power, or is it a pursuit of learning that could eventually lead to humanity nurturing what they love in order to preserve it for future generations? Apparently, it is a mixture of both and perhaps further things; however, the pressing question is how the destructive forces behave towards the protective ones. The tremendous movement that has been launched is a part of general consumer stress imposed on us. Not only empty stomachs must be filled, but also empty time and empty heads. If possible, everyone should travel everywhere and in addition as many works of art as possible should be transported to exhibitions. There is public funding for this. This is what the automobile industry, road builders, the German Federal Railway, airline companies, the hotel sector, art transport companies, ambitious museum directors, and many others to boot, wish for.

This vortex with both good and bad effects that many profit from is only created by originals, or what is believed to be original. They alone possess the magnetic force to attract the masses. Mind you, they must be famous or be connected to something famous. Publicists have ways of making something famous. Advertising is at play in this hustle and bustle.

Apparently for many people it has become an aim in life to see as many important cultural heritage sites as possible, to have been in many significant places. The number of those who have resolved to study world literature and who therefore sit in their rooms, environmentally friendly, and read one book after another as Kant did, is far smaller. One believes one can grasp a work of fine art in a moment, whereas reading a book is time-consuming. That most pictures in earlier times were created for life-long contact is buried in oblivion. The viewing habits of film are transposed to old works of art. Therefore, it seems works of fine art qualify as appropriate filling material for hectic times. Enjoyment of art is associated with mobility, which is considered essential to so-called quality of life nowadays.

In addition, the visible is something concrete, whereas to many the immateriality of thought does not seem as suitable for filling heads. However, it is not this alone that has people rushing from one attraction to the next. He who has travelled far has a say, and is respected in a society which behaves in the exact same manner.

Perhaps there are deeper motives. To have stood at a historic place and encountered a famous work of art – Mona Lisa or Nefertiti – removes some of the inanity of one's own paltry existence. This is what used to set throngs of pilgrims into motion. What is happening today in art tourism has similarities with this. The nature of exhibitions is rooted in the cult of relics. The art scene has a pseudo-religious character. Churches complain that art has become an ersatz religion and museums have become temples. Cologne's inhabitants, who always had a special sense for reality and zeitgeist,

consequently placed their new museum construction next to the cathedral and also addressed it in terms of form. Rembrandt and Van Gogh are sacred, and the museum expert can suddenly please himself in the role of a priest.

The magic power of old paintings confers prestige if one possesses or at least apparently possesses them, whereby the dignity of age and a name to relate to the picture matter more than actual artistic quality. This explains why members of government and high officials borrow paintings from museums to decorate their offices. An old piece of art is used to demonstrate contemporary political culture.

Great churches also increasingly attract visitors. There are pilgrimage sites where believers and art tourists mingle. Certain architectural monuments are able to cope with this onslaught because they were intended for this from the beginning, even if streets, parking spots, souvenir shops and restaurants disfigure the surroundings. Cologne Cathedral is not endangered by the mass of visitors, but rather by corrosive air to which tourists' car exhaust fumes only contribute a small proportion. Sanssouci Palace however, was not erected for a million visitors to pass through annually. The destruction of such works of art is merely a matter of time. The most significant and most precious palace buildings are being devastated, precisely because they are precious. This is what spurs conservationists into action.

At the reconstructed Charlottenburg Palace, a building that is largely a copy and a much more robust work of architecture than Sanssouci Palace, it is easy to see how continuous strain for different purposes makes substance age rapidly. Apart from visitors who merely view the palace, there are also receptions, concerts and film shoots. Rooms that looked painfully new after reconstruction, now already seem wilted. They do not have the patina of age that would spare them. In the so-called historical rooms crowds of visitors can be channelled due to limitations on the number of employee guides and the size of groups here, while in the other rooms where visitors have the freedom to look at works as long as they want rather than rushing by, overcrowding occurs that not only makes concentrated viewing impossible, but also endangers the objects. The temperature and humidity spiral out of control, artworks are touched, and where as it does not enter through unsealed windows, barely imaginable grime is carried into the rooms and settles on tapestries, furniture and paintings. Anyone who climbs a ladder and runs a hand over frames and ledges is appalled at the layers of dust that lie there. Thus, after a short time freshly renovated rooms look like a family has dwelt there for a generation. If one were to clean the rooms and works of art to a homemaker's norm, the gold would soon be rubbed on the picture frames. Luckily money for cleaning staff is short.

It would be easier to accept these conditions if this large audience made every endeavour to benefit educationally from palace visits. But it is precisely spacious estates that encourage simply walking through them. One wants to have seen everything and sees nothing. It is certainly laudable when youth is led to art, and a palace visit opens their eyes to the collaboration between art and history, but that can only occur with an intelligent introduction. However, successes are seldom achieved here. Everyday life looks different. Adolescents who would rather visit a disco are herded through the palace by unknowing teachers on their obligatory visit to Berlin. They trot through the rooms with peeved expressions, looking for opportunities to vent their aggression. One is glad when these young people, whose vitality is otherwise delightful, leave the building. Of course, for statistics this invasion is always a good thing. For many museum directors

statistics are the measuring stick of their success. Cultural authorities can only be impressed by them. Removing thresholds becomes an act of democratisation, in and of itself something positive, and should lead to floodgates opening, since one likes to use them to demonstrate people's highly intellectual level. However, people who do not know how to use their eyes themselves, cannot comprehend that it does not suffice to entice masses into museums; rather, they must also be taught how to see.

Things are counted but not weighed or considered. What a visitor sees, and how he is enriched by what is seen, cannot be superficially measured. It could only be read in a rise in the general level of education, and this would emerge in the careful treatment of historic monuments.

Large gatherings entail other adverse effects. It happens repeatedly that groups who are given a palace to party in, do not really enjoy it if they cannot behave badly: smoke in spite of a ban on smoking, stamp cigarettes out on the floor, throw butts into Chinese vases, let glasses fall and crush the shards into the parquet. It might curtail their pleasure in these activities if they were reminded that the floor was renewed after 1945. Neither the tourists strolling through the palace, nor the guests, who are meant to be honoured by catering service and chatter at receptions in historic, courtly ambiance, see much. Some see all kinds of things, others almost nothing. The party guest who is engrossed in a painting would not only miss the canapes, sparkling wine and speeches, he would bother the crowd that wants entertainment. In a high-class restaurant only the simple-minded would desist from table talk to listen to the musician playing a Mozart sonata in the background. A certain degree of carelessness in the treatment of old things is in good taste. Here the privileged guest with manners meets the bored secondary-schooler with none.

I overstate somewhat. Of course, there are receptions where guests know to savour the palace ambiance and an atmosphere can then arise in which history comes alive and artistic works speak more clearly than otherwise.

New museum buildings are already set up for superficial behaviour towards art. Stirling's Staatsgalerie in Stuttgart, the Wallraf-Richartz-Museum and Museum Ludwig in Cologne, the latter a great success with regard to urban development and surely of great architectural appeal, are museums in which to stroll around. They are built in such a way that there

is nowhere to pause; rather one is propelled onward by ever new and interesting vistas. Only in this way can the masses be managed. The place swarms like an anthill.

Regarding the planned Historic Museum for Berlin, one of the main people responsible for the project quite rightly spoke of "throughput". After all, thousands of years of German history must be digested in a maximum of two hours.

It is enticing to appear to master great historic periods in art history and history, which represent a burden with their plethora of not only happy events, which indeed hopelessly overwhelm the individual, by offering a panorama overview from the commanders' hill of ignorance.

The growth that all collections tend toward helps to distribute the masses on the one hand, but on the other hand the spaciousness of museums promotes fleetingness of perception. The exhibition value of a work of art is high; however, what the viewer absorbs is minimal. If one compares the museum-going public in Cologne to the flood of people window-shopping along the Hohe Straße, the difference in their behaviour is not that great.

Herein lays the predicament of museums, which represent epochs that are too vast -- sometimes the history of European painting from the Middle Ages to the present -- and simultaneously want to be a treasure house and proud display of a public art collection.

The treasury tolerates only originals, it wants to overwhelm with the inexhaustible abundance of magnificence, but art history would be better learned from books with well-selected reproductions than from a random compilation of originals.

Certainly, exhibitions strive to present more narrowly focussed areas of art history and to offer concentrated subject matter. However, since it has become known what stresses and danger sensitive works of art are subjected to at exhibitions, lenders have become ever more reserved, so that it is precisely the most important objects, the ones that could effectively portray a subject, that are missing in exhibitions.

There is a radical position on these questions regarding the wear and tear on art: Art is no longer transported. Museums become vaults or high-security installations. Paintings are sealed behind glass. Whatever can be put into display cases goes into them. Everything that is otherwise endangered is replaced by copies.

Draconian measures arouse awareness, but various objections can be raised against these expensive methods. Creating a bank-vault or treasure-house atmosphere calls attention to what is precious and worthy of protection in artworks, but it robs them of their natural vibrancy. The Mona Lisa in the Louvre is so glassed-in and mounted in bank teller architecture that its astronomical insurance value is immediately apparent. This is exactly what attracts tourists standing in clusters in front of it, while a few metres further the much more beautiful Virgin of the Rocks hangs unprotected and receives relatively little notice.

In fact, one can hardly see the Mona Lisa properly, but that is exactly what constitutes a part of her fascination. Insuperable removal is a characteristic of cult objects.

One will only ever be able to imbue a certain number of artworks with the aura of priceless value and hence particular value in this way, and it would be a kind of cynicism that stands in conflict with the works themselves if one were to systematically create ever more such magnets -- something which would doubtless be possible with the help of advertising, and which is in the interest of the art trade and of all those who want to make works of art into objects of dizzying monetary value. When the curator allows himself to be drawn into other groups' business games, his attitude towards the public goes askew; still, he must know these games. It seems to me that the radical path of constructing treasure-houses is not viable, above all for the broad category of art of middling quality that is strewn throughout the country and should remain so.

As a trained expert the curator must represent the position of reason in relation to the public. He must convince and warn with arguments. This means dismantling the pseudo-religious veneration of art and replacing it as far as possible with insight. This is how streams of visitors should be influenced. The only valid argument for restricting the public availability of art that is publicly owned is conservation.

A trained eye perceives far more in a facsimile, even a modest reproduction, than does an untrained eye in an original. However, the intensification of exhibition value depends not on education alone, but on receptiveness, which is dependent on mood and atmosphere. Someone who is capable of enthusiasm can experience more from an art postcard than can an obtuse viewer standing before the original. What would be the ideal for a curator charged not only with the material preservation of artworks, but also with preserving their spiritual impact? For if the latter no longer takes place, if no-one takes them in, this simultaneously means endangering their substance. (Commercialisation is always only a makeshift solution, though doubtless many things are only saved from demise because they bring high prices on the art market.) The work of art is characterised not only by spatial ambience -- as is self-evident in the case of buildings of historic importance -- but also by the living context that consists in the viewing and contemplation of what has been seen.

We desire a prudent and judicious public, who when dealing with artworks recognises

more and more the necessity to use them carefully, and who on the basis of these insights is willing to go without and to let itself be satisfied with the perceptions gained through reproductions.

This enhanced faculty of recognition then leads to a new quality of encounter when standing before the original. In this way the fulfillment of the educational mandate meshes with the protection of artworks. However, this is only possible when the encounter with the original continues to be permitted, yet is felt to be something unusual and special.

This educational and consciousness-raising work would have to be tied to an emphatic portrayal of the

damage caused by art tourism. While many denounce the destruction of nature by our society's living habits, too few point out that these attitudes also threaten cultural monuments. We handle artworks as heedlessly as we do nature.

One should harbour no illusions as to the difficulties of changing the public's behaviour. Since the public sphere goes hand in hand with democracy, every other reason for limiting access is justifiably rejected. Some considerations on the topic of exhibition value (Schauwert) and originals can be helpful for curators' argumentation vis-a-vis the public and politicians. The visitor wishing to see Dürer's drawing of his mother at the print gallery in Dahlem is shown a facsimile under glass; he who notices that it is a reproduction gets to see the original. The Albertina, which possesses excellent facsimiles of Dürer's main works, likewise shows these facsimiles to visitors who want to see Dürer.

This method is not very refined, but it serves to protect those valuable works which, precisely because they are so valuable, are requested most often and are therefore most endangered. A visitor who crosses the threshold of the Albertina and wants to see Dürer drawings already belongs to the elite among the public. He expects to see something special. What happens?

A Dürer drawing contains an inexhaustible message. The excellent facsimile offers almost everything the original does, except its originality – a quality that is missed only by the trained eye and by the person who knows he is dealing with a facsimile. The untrained eye only takes in a fraction of what Dürer communicates in his drawing, nevertheless an experience occurs: I have had a Dürer drawing in my hands, and a mysterious spark was transmitted. Thus, the exhibition value that is conveyed is twofold: it consists of the insight into an artistic thought and the peculiar feeling of a direct encounter with genius through an object. The first can be comprehended rationally; the second is something irrational that nevertheless cannot simply be dismissed offhand. The emotion one feels in the room where the genius was born in Beethoven's house in Bonn is no mere sentimentality of which reasonable people should feel ashamed.

The visitor who views the Dürer facsimile is normally unaware of two things. Firstly, that he is confronted with a facsimile rather than the original, and secondly – and this is much more important – that he could read much more from the page if his eyes were trained. If he should notice that he has been deceived in the second type of exhibition value, then he could be richly rewarded in the first type.

However, only a small proportion of the public wishes to gain insight by viewing the artwork, wishes to engage in the sensual work of discovering in it and in its relations to the time and place of its creation an entire cosmos. Practice is required in order to do that, and probably something else as well. Certainly, it is possible through educational work to enlarge the circle of those who really see, through to what degree I admit I cannot say. A significant proportion only wants to experience the more or less strong shiver which is connected to a famous name in relation to the original. If the name is there, then associations flow momentarily, earlier experiences and knowledge come together in a perception that clouds any critical and receptive viewing. This vague perception is

assumed to be the electrifying encounter with the work of art. An excellent work of a lesser known artist will have less effect than a mediocre one that is wrongly attributed to a great artist. One would like to count oneself and others among the class of those who are in the know. Seeing something new whilst travelling signifies as much as filling out a prescribed framework. One will never be able to shake the self-awareness of such people by seducing them into the adventure of recognition whose beginning is the admission of not knowing. One must then ask whether it is permissible to force them into this adventure and to take away their security. Is it not as if one were to push a non-swimmer into the deep end of the pool?

As to the public's expectation that its artistic experience is taking place before an original, one can respond that, as far as I can see, they do not object when fragile sculptures outdoors are replaced by copies while the originals are moved into museums. The Braunschweig Lion is one example. Everyone can see that sculptures are not merely threatened by our corrosive air, they are already disintegrating. They remain visible when they are moved to a museum; indeed, they are imbued with the aura of enhanced preciousness and enrich the treasure-house. Lay people can hardly distinguish the copy from the original, and the ability to duplicate is more in keeping with the essence of sculpture than with that of painting. In addition to this, the broader public is strangely insensitive to sculpture. It expects to encounter the shiver of genius far less from a sculpture than from a painting. In the case of Nefertiti, it seems to me that apart from the age and the fact that a queen is represented, it is above all the paint that makes the bust a star, and that raises it high above Andreas Schlüter's equestrian monument of the Great Elector, whose suitability as a jungle gym and whose lack of status as a masterpiece I can observe from my office window almost daily. It would probably signify a valorisation of the monument if it were put into an interior room. One would not even need to replace it with a copy in front of Charlottenburg Palace, since this was not its original location and the monument does not actually suit the site. It is not only common sense, but unfortunately also the indifference of the public with regard to these sculptures, that make it possible for curators to take protective measures without any great resistance.

An example of this indifference is the fate of Johann Gottfried Schadow's frieze for the Mint, sculpted from drawings by Friedrich Gilly. A highly important monument of neoclassic sculpture, the most important in West Berlin, it was incorporated into the wall of a retirement home near Charlottenburg Palace, after it had already been put into museum custody in 1935. To date it has not been possible to recover this work, although it was determined to be the property of the Prussian Cultural Heritage Foundation. It will be far more difficult to withdraw delicate originals in palaces, churches and museums from the public realm and replace them with copies, as in this case the endangerment is not so obvious, since interior rooms are deemed to be a sufficient safeguard and because explaining the causes of endangerment amounts to making an accusation against the public. When art in outdoor spaces is destroyed, the public that takes an interest in art will always be able to put the blame on others. An excellent example of this is environmental protection. Of course, one drives around the corner in order to participate in a meeting of environmentalists. Who starts with his own self when it comes to changing certain lifestyle habits?

If one wants to enforce certain measures one must proceed very skillfully in a psychological sense. Original wallpaper or wall coverings should be taken down, conserved, and replaced by copies long before they are completely threadbare. Admittedly, the problem of storage will always arise with such things.

But there is much that cannot be preserved in this way. In general, mural paintings cannot be dismantled and replaced by copies. With especially significant works – Da Vinci's Last Supper for example – one can resort to draconian measures, but not with mediocre decorative painting of the 18th century, even though it may be worthy of

protection as a document and perhaps as part of an important ensemble.

In many cases only curbing visitor traffic can help to slow the progress of wear and tear. Effective slowing will have to suffice. An absolute stop cannot be achieved, since the moral force on which conservation depends comes from the cautious use of things. Only reasonable, restrained, gentle *use* can prevent things from being *used up*. Careful treatment, which springs from a feeling of responsibility and simultaneously strengthens that feeling, can only be learned if the fragility of things is made obvious. Replacing the original with a reproduction or a copy can lead to even more careless habits of use.

The real root of this evil lies in the mentality of consumption, which is forcefully promoted by the economy and does not stop at goods that are irreplaceable once they have been used up. Here art and nature are united again, in this case as fellow sufferers.

Consumer mentality is deeply rooted in the average Western European citizen's sense of being. His value is measured in terms of his ability to consume. The customer is king. Whoever is a customer is a King. The generally accepted concept of democracy is based on this. Everyone is king and can make demands for himself. Public property, which most artworks are, means that everyone can consume it. It is not apparent to everyone that public property also places obligations on the public. For the average citizen, caring for and carefully using things is not the King's affair, but that of a subordinate servant, and no-one wants to be that. Wastefulness is part and parcel of ruling the roost. The ability to squander enhances lifestyle just as much as does consumption. Among the superabundance is the immeasurable richness of art, which is barely perceived.

Hence in spite of career conservationists and certain other helpful instruments, artworks that are publicly owned are often more endangered than those in private hands, since a private owner, to the extent that he is insightful and responsible, treats the artworks carefully, not only due to their material value, but also for the sake of tradition. He will not use them up, but rather use them; not only to view and comprehend them to be sure, but also as an embellishment to himself. This value, which one could call representation value, exists alongside exhibition value and here again, it adheres above all to the original. In the case of public property, such careful use is only to be taken for granted when the public understands itself as a community, as a unit, and not only as the sum of a number of individuals. In a city this is quite possible. Its citizens are proud of their property and take care of it. However, it is difficult to convey this feeling of responsibility to the masses of tourists who converge from all directions. Here it is the egoism of the individual, who wants to experience a sensation for his money, that prevails. Places that live off of art tourism face a problem, of course. Should they accept the rapid deterioration of their substance for the sake of economic advantage, or should they care for the substance and impose limitations on tourism?

I would like to make a few suggestions as to how wear and tear on artistic monuments can be slowed down. Attempts should be made to regulate visitor flows. Advertising for palaces and museums that are already overrun should be halted. We should stop seeing it as a process of democratisation when the number of visitors, rather than the quality of their impressions, constantly increases. The addiction to achieving record numbers at exhibitions and hence to overfilling rooms should be warned against. Raising entrance fees is not a particularly suitable method of containing the boom, since it affects the least affluent. If visitors are to be limited, then let it not be the ones with less money, but those who are incapable of developing a sense for art. Philistinism should not be grounds for discrimination, as long as the philistines do not destroy anything. What seems meaningless to me, however, is to stimulate visitor statistics with free admission to museums, which only encourages superficial "throughput".

Visitor flows could be influenced by making the more robust artistic monuments attractive through advertising. It would be important to awaken interest in newer works. This can only be done in collaboration with the media. People must be made aware of how visitors

endanger artworks, but preferably without resorting to an unfriendly system of barriers. On the contrary, an atmosphere of openness should be used to awaken feelings of responsibility. In this connection it is especially important to seek discussions with cultural officials, in order to convince them of the necessity of far-sighted concepts. Curators and cultural officials often have differences of opinion, because as historians the former are used to thinking in longer periods of time, whereas cultural officials primarily strive for momentary successes and only reluctantly take into consideration the destructive effects that initially useful innovations can have.

What would be very helpful as a clear signal of commitment to conscientiousness would be for governments to refrain from using historic buildings for purposes of representation to the degree that this occurs in some places, and thereby demonstrate publicly how valuable substance is being worn out. However, it is difficult to conduct disputes between wisdom and power, if power does not have some wisdom and wisdom does not have some power. Sometimes civil courage is required, which is not particularly widespread in these parts.

At hotspots of art tourism, it is necessary to offer the most comprehensive, objective information possible in the form of slide shows, photo exhibitions, but also texts and guided tours for every type of visitor, because the intellectual efforts of curators and their helpers teach respect and guide towards seeing. Demands must be made of visitors. Rather than pulling artworks down to a low public level, as is often the case on palace tours, the public must be raised to the higher level of artworks. I do not mean by this that one should go over the visitors' heads.

The connection between conservationist and pedagogical activity has the advantage that the curator can use the authority that he wins as an interpreter to push through his protective measures. A curator who only pays attention to securing art is quickly suspected of wanting to retain art for a small circle of experts. He will easily be pushed aside by those who want to expose everything to prattle and wear and tear. The tendency to concentrate ever more works of art in large centres, in order to constantly demonstrate one's receptiveness for culture anew, should be discouraged for different reasons. Even though conservation treatment is better in big cities, it is important to distribute art heritage and museums throughout the entire country to develop a general sense for the care of cultural heritage. To be sure, decentralisation causes higher costs, including personnel costs, but the educational effect is greater than in giant, over-run museums. Perspectives for the glut of young art historians would be opened up here, perhaps not brilliant perspectives, but very meaningful ones.

To be sure, it is a concern that significant artworks may be subject to particular dangers in less central places, especially in churches. If originals are to be replaced by copies because, for example, a genuine Tiepolo cannot be allowed to adorn a side altar, then such an altarpiece should remain locally and find its place in a small museum. The plundering of the countryside to the advantage of major cities, as was the common practice in the 19th century, was barbarism, even if much was saved by it.

It would be desirable to train copyists so that the general level of copies would be raised once more, so that masterworks can actually be replaced by copies which retain their exhibition value. The widespread disdain for copies, which is a phenomenon of our century, should be counteracted. In my opinion, the particular task of educating the public to treat artworks with care seems to fall to palace museums. On the one hand the proportion of visitors with little interest that only follow the flux of tourists is particularly large here, and hence the threat to artworks is particularly serious. To degrade palaces by removing their significant artworks, as is the practice at certain museums, only leads to the conservation level of palaces sinking and them being run down even more quickly. We have to realise that endangering works of art through heedless treatment of them is not an isolated problem that can be overcome with a bundle of individual measures.

Rather, this problem is just one of many symptoms of a deeply seated temporal illness. Material aids such as shielding oil paintings behind glass and observing Lux values for paper are certainly correct, but conditions can only be improved from the ground up through education and training. This must start early, preferably in schools. Art classes must include, next to a few basics of art history, not only creativity and hence self-development, which often have a destructive effect, but also training for the eye and instruction in the careful treatment of artworks, which also has a social component. Learning to see, winning insight, is ultimately also learning to give proper consideration. As a representative of the museum world at this conference of monuments conservators, please allow me a concluding remark. Museums – and this concerns large ones above all – are in crisis, because we have not yet learned to deal responsibly with the great power that we have gathered and that is continuously increasing. Artworks are bonds and securities; they have become power potential that is utilised for political acts. Increasingly we negotiate with banks when we want to secure something for a museum, and the art dealer with a bank at his back has the ear of the minister more than does the museum director. Cultural policy is a function of economic or even foreign policy. This is due to a basic misunderstanding of what culture actually is. Economic growth is certainly part of it, but under the aspect of care. Care is only possible with circumspection, which includes everything, also nature and above all people. Care is the actual humane activity. It is required now more than ever because the world has become an invalid. This basis should be common to museum officials and conservators. I hope that it is more stable with you than us, so that we can look to you for support.