

FOREWORD

The papers collected in this volume comprise the 10th publication of *Postprints* published by the Objects Specialty Group (OSG) of The American Institute for Conservation of Historic and Artistic Works (AIC). The papers were either presented during the annual OSG session or as posters at the annual AIC meeting in Arlington, Virginia in June 2003.

The papers are organized as they were presented in the OSG program in two sessions, followed by the objects-oriented poster submissions.

The theme of the morning session was *Creativity in Objects Conservation*. This session naturally fell into several sub-themes. The first three papers examine the development and evolution of new approaches and ideas to objects conservation issues. The paper from Bischoff, Bustamente, Reedy, Corbett, and Walton, examine the transfer of electrochemical cell testing as a methodology that can be used to scientifically assess the suitability of exhibition and storage materials. The paper by Buenger examines the developing use of DNA analysis for biohistorical research on cultural and historical objects and the development of ethical guidelines for such research. The paper by Odegaard, Boyer, Huber, Kaplan, Kunioka, Moreno, Podsiiki, Sadongei, Smith, and Zimmit, examines the process of testing and developing protocols for the examination, storage, and handling of objects previously treated with pesticides. The next two papers form the theme of consultation and interaction in conservation projects and how that can provide fertile ground for the development of more inclusive and sensitive conservation strategies. The paper by Johnson, Heald, McHugh, Brown, and Kaminitz looks at the program that was developed at the National museum of the American Indian (NMAI) to consult with native peoples on the handling, care, conservation, and preservation of Native American cultural materials. The paper by Davidson looks at the value of consulting colleagues in different disciplines to introduce methods and materials in use in objects conservation to that of the preparation of fossil dinosaur remains. Three papers form the theme of examining past treatments and conservation practices as a way of informing the present and future of our profession. Ravenel's paper on the conservation of the Doll collection at the Shelburne Museum shows how practices that were once seen as novel at the time, and have since become standard practice, are so important in documenting our methods and materials for future re-treatments and reassessment. The paper by Carlee and Carlee examines the preventive conservation program that was implemented in the state of Alaska in the 1970's and how that program cost-effectively improved museum practices and the preservation of the cultural and historical collections of the region. The paper by Williams looks at the survey of the study collections at Colonial Williamsburg as a way of assessing past conservation treatments and methods over a 75 years time span. The final two papers from the morning session examine the theme of questions raised and questions answered during diverse conservation treatments and projects. The paper by Meyers examines the questions raised during the washing / desalination of low-fire ceramics from Native American archaeological sites and its implications for the use of this practice by conservators. The paper by Arenstein, Brady, Carroll, French, Kaplan, McGrew, Merritt, and Williamson on moving the collections of the National Museum of the American Indian from Brooklyn, NY to Washington, D.C., shares knowledge gained during the organization and implementation of a major relocation and rehousing project for an entire collection.

The afternoon session presented various objects conservation tips with a more focused series of presentations with a panel discussion on inpainting. These papers ranged from Holbrow's tips on loss compensation and inpainting of several objects treatments at the Williamstown Regional Conservation Lab to Russell's paper on loss compensation and surface of Spanish polychrome wood sculptures. Koob presented a paper on tips using epoxies and casting and molding

materials in the treatment of glass objects while Peachey's paper showed the advantages of using dental molding compounds to record surface morphology on underwater shipwrecks in a zero-visibility environment underwater. The NMAI staff (Arenstein, Carroll, French, Kaplan, McGrew, and Williamson) presented tips on the use of cyclododecane as a temporary consolidant for fragile objects before relocation and tips on the mass production of supports for housing various collection objects. In the middle of the session Tony Sigel's paper on a reconsideration of filling and inpainting techniques for ancient ceramics led to a panel discussion and questions from the attendees focused on inpainting issues in objects conservation.

The papers from the AIC poster session examine diverse topics from the paper by Bosworth, Johnson, and Hahne on researching and identifying organic pesticide residues at the National museum of the American Indian, to the paper by Griggs-Hakim on the repair of a bamboo basket using false wraps of Japanese tissue and wire. Leculier's paper examines cellophane in collections and the paper by Odegaard, Huber, Kaplan, Moreno, and Podsiki presents a treatment that used an S.S. White air abrasion unit to treat fire damaged baskets.

I would first like to thank those who participated as presenters at the OSG program and the many who graciously followed up with their written submissions to this volume. Special thanks are in order to Pat Griffin, the OSG chair in 2003, for her wisdom and support in the process of developing and carrying through the program and postprints. Tony Sigel did a wonderful job of organizing the afternoon tips session and the inpainting forum. Finally, this volume would not be possible without the dedication and experience of the OSG *Postprints* editor, Virginia Greene.

David Harvey, OSG Chair 2003-2004