

Riet de Leeuw

THE PRECARIOUS RECONSTRUCTION OF INSTALLATIONS *

It is some years ago now that in the Kunstmuseum in Bern, somewhere on its upper floor, I came unsuspectingly across the remains of *Honigpumpe am Arbeitsplatz* (Honey Pump in the Workplace) – the installation that Joseph Beuys made in 1977 for the Documenta in Kassel, Germany. It comprised an electric motor, a neatly rolled transparent hose, a chalk drawing on a piece of wood, pots, a brass rod, butter, felt – I can't remember all the details any more – all standing next to each other in a corner of the space. I recall the area being dimly lit and I no longer know what else was there. Probably I was so surprised to find the work there and so enormously attracted to these remains that I hardly had eyes for anything else. Standing quietly there in the corner, neatly arranged, the whole had something touching about it. At the same time the work gave the impression of things that had been used and then taken apart and put next to each other as a mechanic might do.

In the same way, at the Kröller-Müller Museum in Otterlo, Beuys 'discarded' an installation he made for the German pavilion at the Venice Biennale in 1976 – the *impressive Strassenbahnhaltestelle* or *Tram Stop* monument. At the core of the installation was a tall iron column terminating in a head with twisted features. Around the column were four barrels and a small distance away glistening tram rails cut across the floor with their bottoms turned upwards. A crank protruded from a hole in the floor. Rubbish and earth swept into small heaps bore silent testimony to the work involved to erect the monument. At Beuys's request the space, with its walls full of damp patches and peeling paint, was left just as he found it.

The installation was an enigmatic piece that evoked something mythical, something obscure. It refers to a memory of the artist's youth spent in Kleef. There on the way to school Beuys would pass a tram stop where a rusting relic still stood – a column made from seventeenth-century artillery which, by being topped off with a poised figure of Eros, had been transformed into a peace monument. Beuys did not understand the significance of the strange iron relic. He only noticed that it was in sharp contrast to the bare iron of the tram rails. The mystery probably attracted the child so that the name of the tram stop *Zum eisernen Mann* was automatically linked to the monument. At the Venice Biennale Beuys had an iron man – a head with twisted features – appearing out of the column. By doing so he was giving expression to how he perceived the monument from his youth.

Because of the meticulous arrangement of the elements – their positioning in relation to each other and to the surrounding space of the German pavilion in Venice – the monument became a special spot, a designated location. A place for remembering, but also a place for experiencing and re-experiencing. For in a process of transformations the monument was for a short time given a new appearance and the memory of its decline and dismantling could be experienced.

Given this background, it is evident why Beuys no longer wished to set up this monument in the museum that purchased it. That would have meant an impossible reconstruction of a completed phase of the process. In the Kröller-Müller Museum a new phase in the transformation process took place – the tram stop was taken apart, pulled down and discarded, as Beuys put it. The various elements were carefully sorted and placed on the floor: the long piece of rail freed from its original context, beside it the four barrels, tilted, then the column with the head, and then the crank and the cast iron bars all placed in a heap. Everything taken apart. Notwithstanding, the whole work appeared as if it were lying waiting for some future use. However, the once tense relationship between the elements created by their carefully considered positioning had disappeared.

What remains is a collection of separate components which look somewhat lost lying on a stone floor. They are often exhibited in the circular walkway next to the restaurant, and such an indeterminate setting heightens even more the sense that the work is displaced. You walk quickly past, also

because it is impossible to get involved with it. Instead of drawing everyone's attention, as the work did in Venice at the time, *Tram Stop* now looks like a motionless body on the earth.

A second version of *Tram Stop*, also from 1976 and shown for the first time at the Mönchengladbach Museum, appears to represent an earlier phase of the process. The installation is in a less discarded state, although the direct reference to 'death' is here more tangible. Beuys laid the 'body' across the barrels, the crank rests on the iron bars and is thereby linked. The iron man appears to be laid out. In this manner the memory of a once working construction is still prevalent.

The work *Honigpumpe am Arbeitsplatz* was made especially for the Documenta in Kassel. In the central area, the Fridericianum rotunda, a piece of hose extended upwards as far as the skylight. Honey was pumped through this and flowed into another hose running downwards. Nearby electric motors activated a brass cylinder that moved through butter, making it warm and partly fluid. Before the honey began each new cycle, it was led along the space of the 'Freie Internationale Universität für Kreativität und Interdisziplinäre Forschung' set up by Beuys. Here the Hundred Days Conference took place, an on-going discussion forum between hundreds of individuals.

The artist was not only present during the forum, he was often in the main area busily engaged in monitoring his work, making the occasional adjustments and checking things – as a visitor to Documenta I was able to witness this at first hand. Thus Beuys linked up two different systems to each other: the visual one with the honey pump and the exchange of ideas of the Free International University. Both sources of energy influenced each other. This manner of working clearly shows how installation and action interact with each other in the artist's body of work. The installation is close to the action and vice versa. The honey pump represents humankind and the social order, while the Hundred Days Conference represents the continuing exchange of ideas and convictions which tie in with the classic notion of political action.

In the totally different setting of the museum in Bern the remains had no relationship whatsoever to their environment and barely with each other. They were motionless, no longer in operation. Beuys decided that a reinstallation of the honey pump would not work without the debating individuals of the Free International University, and thus there was no point to it.

"Abstellen, einfach abstellen!" was the instruction Beuys gave for the placing of his work *Unschlitt/Tallow* in the Museum Abteiberg in Mönchengladbach in 1982. Six extremely heavy, giant segments of paraffin, which collectively formed the sculpture, were hauled into the museum with the greatest difficulty and put down. 'Put down' was the strategy Beuys used towards the museum as an institute. According to the dictionary 'abstellen' also means 'put away', 'turn off' (engine), 'bring to a stop' and 'switch off' (light). It describes the kind of putting away that does not imply 'storing for a long period of time' or 'file away in archives'. On the contrary, the word has something highly tentative about it, as if the work will be resumed after lunch. In 'einfach abstellen' lies an expectation, the promise of a future functionality.

Beuys was not only extremely aware that the smallest nuances in context have consequences for the experiencing and interpretation of a work, he also allowed these to determine the way a work would be presented. The experience of Beuys's installations within the walls of a museum is entirely different to that in the lively atmosphere of the Documenta or the faded glory of Venice. In fact they require a different approach altogether. In a museum it all comes to a halt.

This awareness of Beuys goes way beyond the usual exhibiting or installing of art works. It has nothing to do with eternal value or masterpieces that have to withstand the test of time. In a subtle way Beuys makes use of all the values associated with the museum, but at the same time he provokes these values and questions them.

We can learn much from the artist's awareness. Art is about cohesion, about differences and similarities, about transformations, about interpretations. Art work, space, viewer and context are not in themselves independent and static variables, but elements that influence each other. The art work changes along with the forces that are exerted upon it. That applies in a sense for all works of art, but artists of this century have increasingly made use of the device that lays bare these forces –

the installation. That is an art work, or rather a manner of working, in which thinking about the presentation is part of the art work itself.

And here the enormous paradox begins. For how does a curator or a conservator deal with such an in-built process? The preserving and exhibiting of such art works requires far more than simply storing in a depot, taking out and setting up. It demands of those involved with the installation a detailed awareness and knowledge concerning all aspects of the work in question – not only about the material and material condition, but also the possible interpretations which various arrangements of the work provide, how sensitive the work is to being exhibited, and how it triggers an experience in the viewer – sometimes an experience of his/her own perception.

If an art work only gains its form and meaning within the context of how it is presented, what should we then think about the reinstallation of Beuys's *Olivestone* from 1984? At the invitation of Rudi Fuchs, director of the Stedelijk Museum in Amsterdam, the artist made the work for a space in the Castello di Rivoli near Turin. In the so-called fresco hall, assigned to him for the opening exhibition, Beuys installed five 'stones' shining with moisture, while the hall itself was imbued with a pungent smell of olive oil. The 'stones' were in fact five large, eighteenth-century sandstone troughs originally used to decant olive oil. Inside each trough Beuys had placed a slightly smaller block hacked from the same kind of stone, leaving a small opening between the edge of the trough and the block of stone. Into this opening litres of oil were poured until the trough was brimming. Sandstone is porous and absorbent so the oil had to be replenished from time to time.

In Castello di Rivoli the troughs were arranged in the same way as the paraffin sculptures in Mönchengladbach – apparently artless, arbitrary, as if they could be deployed at any moment for their normal purposes. As if they had been standing on that spot glistening with oil for centuries, with traces of the substance on the ground. What originally belonged in the cellar was now placed above in the beautifully decorated hall. In so doing, the domain of the oil had shifted to the domain of art and (social and political) action. The tall frescoed hall of the Castello was dominated by the horizontal line of the troughs. The whole emanated an intense stillness and – because of the obvious weight of the stones – something inert as well, as if they were bound to the earth, entirely absorbed in themselves. The oil, 'stead-fast' in its fluid form, only served to confirm this sense of calm and heaviness.

In 1992, due to reasons of technical ownership, the installation was removed from the Castello. In that same year, it was reinstalled at the Kunsthaus Zürich by the well-known exhibition organiser, Harald Szeemann, who is attached to the museum. But can one just do that? This rearrangement reveals precisely which problems confront the curator in such cases, certainly if the artist is no longer living.

The Kunsthaus is an entirely different setting to a baroque Castello with an eighteenth-century frescoed hall. In the white, neutral space of the Swiss museum, in the seventies style, the stones are not so obviously 'present' as they were in Italy. The directional meaning of the work, from cellar to decorated upper chamber, is also lost. While the stones are placed in a way that is faithful to the original arrangement in the Castello, there they only took up half of the enormous space – a special, striking element of the installation – whereas in Zürich they fill the entire room. Here the visitor has to move between the stones and that is an entirely different experience. In the Castello the stones were far more at one with their site, as if they had been waiting there for centuries to be used. In Zürich they are so in evidence in a material sense that they define the entire space. And what about that untidy drop of oil on the floor of this spruce room? These rough troughs in a pristine white space create the impression that the work is now suddenly about 'sculpture'.

The one art work reacts more strongly to Beuys's installation than another. Precisely because contemporary art is now increasingly attuned to context, it has also in a sense become dependent on it. In his review of the *Iron Window* ('Het IJzeren Venster', 1985) exhibition at the Van Abbemuseum, Eindhoven, in which the then director Rudi Fuchs confronted three contemporary artists' works

with those of three classic modern artists, the art historian Carel Blotkamp maintained that works by Mondrian or Malevich possess so much individual power that they can hold their ground on any wall and in any combination, whether they hang alone or are jammed between those of other artists. On the other hand, the curator or exhibition organiser has to be extremely careful in presenting particular works by Kounellis or Beuys as they are highly sensitive to context.¹ Blotkamp made a good point. A poor presentation can destroy an art work, and for an installation this applies to an intense degree. But his value judgement that Mondrian and Malevich thus made better work is obviously nonsense. Artists such as Kounellis and Beuys chose consciously not to present their work as an autonomous whole but to incorporate the space, setting, time and social aspects. The unfinished – the process of construction, destruction and reconstruction – is part of their work. The transition between painting or sculpture and installation is in fact a gradual one. A fragile construction such as a relief by the Dutch artist Jan Schoonhoven appears impotent on a depot rack or wrapping table. It requires the neutral surroundings and the careful presentation of a museum or gallery in order to radiate.

Taking what we now regard as art works out of context is also nothing new. Altar pieces, ethnographic art, they were all wrenched from their original setting and given new places, where we have grown accustomed to seeing them over the years.

With artists from the sixties and seventies who often made fragile, process-type works from ephemeral materials, the reinstallation of such pieces was a recurrent problem with every new exhibition. Can temporary installations be reinstalled? Can site-specific works be executed again? And is reconstruction the only and appropriate option to present such a work, to evoke an image?

Harald Szeemann, who reinstalled *Olivestone* in the Kunsthaus Zürich, organised a retrospective of Beuys's work in the same venue in 1993, seven years after the artist's death. The work had to be presented at its best. In particular the image of Beuys as a sculptor was to be highlighted. Szeeman did not balk at the idea of presenting a few large complex works 'in the spirit of Beuys' and having two unfinished works completed.

"The visitors were served the image of a controlled, restrained oeuvre, an almost systematically organised and ordered body of completed works," wrote the art critic Camiel van Winkel.² This presentation did not do justice to Beuys's varied artistic practice, he claimed: "I'm convinced that with the material left behind, it would have been possible to make a much more unstable and therefore more open exhibition than the one Szeeman has made. (...) With much respect – too much respect – for the artistic aura of the often, in a material sense, worthless objects, the works, some in display cases, are isolated from each other. Nowhere, not even for a brief moment, is the completed-uncompleted made uncomplete again."

No matter how honourable Szeemann's intentions were, he showed little consideration for the intrusive interventions. With exhibitions such as this one, he sees his role as a mediator who ensures that a work, once away from the intimate world of the artist, is brought into the open in an appropriate manner and as such is also handed down to future generations. Thus, as far as he is concerned, the task of an exhibition organiser is an extension of the artist's thinking and way of doing.

Szeemann's interventions are based not on an analytical, but on an identifying interpretation of the work. He knew Joseph Beuys very well and collaborated with him on various exhibitions, he therefore places himself in the artist's shoes. It then becomes self-evident that certain installations can be shown again in another location separate from their original context. Thus, recreating the work becomes an obvious part of the process of presenting the work again. By the same token the decision can then be taken to omit the destructive aspects – the anti-sculpture which manifested itself in Beuys's *Aktionen*.

When Uwe Schneede reconstructed the Actions in documentary form,³ he pointed out how important this art form was to Beuys's work: "Beuys's Actions combine elements normally separated in the work: object and sculpture, space and time, drawing and language, body and music. The

unifying factor lies in his active handling of these elements. The Actions formed the true centre of Beuys's work."

Because Actions do not take on the shape of objects, Schneede adds, only after-images still exist. After-images on the basis of memories, witnesses, documents and pictures. It is then pointless to present remnants of Actions as autonomous sculptures, instead of parts of a continuing process.

In his review Camiel van Winkel states implicitly that showing 'original material' by Beuys can convey a false impression. It makes the works "dead objects in isolation". He concludes that the material form and the conservation of individual works, still mainly the starting point for reconstructions and reinstallations, should be subordinate to representing the artist's body of work as a whole.

The situation can therefore arise where it is decided not to reinstall certain works. Sometimes we must accept that the primary work no longer exists (see also Seminar 7 on installations). If that work was important to an artist's oeuvre it will have to be recalled in a different manner.

Recalling is all about remembering. With process-type, context-oriented art this is an extremely important activity. While the problem of the state of the material and how it should appear is central to reinstallation and reconstruction, the activity of remembering comes from the viewer. In certain cases a faithful impression of the work can be given on the basis of photographs, spoken or written statements and possibly film or video recordings. This allows scope for the viewer's imagination and can sometimes even convey a magic or intense experience better than an anaemic and contrived reinstallation.

When the Rotterdam Witte de With Center for Contemporary Art decided on a retrospective exhibition of the work of the American artist Paul Thek in 1995, they were confronted with an insurmountable problem (see Groenenboom's introduction to Seminar 7). Thek's installations were often temporary, consisting of extremely ephemeral materials such as scrapwood, newspapers, commonplace objects, textiles and sand. How could these be represented in the exhibition? The installations showed the results of a process of working that was temporarily brought to a standstill but after the exhibition continued as before. Moreover certain of the elements used in these installations were used again in new works. It was impossible to reconstruct these installations on the basis of documentation.

Ultimately two installations were presented in the exhibition, *Dwarf Parade Table* and *Fishman in Excelsis Table*, chiefly because the essential materials of these works for the most part still existed. But even reconstructing these installations was very precarious. Reconstructions, years later in a different setting, are unable to convey an image of powerful vitality, the instantaneous effect of the work. Showing installations as rigid, autonomous end results does not do justice to their status. They quickly become art objects, which in fact Thek campaigned against in his work.

Witte de With was all too aware of that. After thoroughly researching the meaning of the work and the artist's intentions, it was decided to present the installations in the form of documentation such as photographs, a video and statements. The catalogue was a vital medium for providing an insight into Thek's environments. The documentation emphasised the fact that these works were meant to be temporary, that they no longer exist, that they can no longer be reproduced – in short that they are recollections, and that this should not, or may not, be denied them.

It is precisely this photographic documentation, which has shown to be sensitive to this genre, that can make the intensity, the original energy of such works visible in a condensed form. This is apparent from the photographic material of Beuys's Actions. These Actions, as ultimate ephemera, as art forms carried out in time, can never again be experienced. Nevertheless we have preserved images of them. Sometimes very particular photographs recording a magic moment define our perception. Naturally the entirety of an Action is missing: the experiencing of the space, sound, the relatedness of the actions and especially the involvement of the public, since a photograph does not make someone a participant. Nevertheless, sometimes photographs convey an image in which

everything comes together. There are shots of Beuys's Actions, taken by photographers who later became famous such as Ute Klophaus and Caroline Tisdall, which have both an interpretative as well as a purely documentary function. As Uwe Schneede in his previously-mentioned publication states: "These photographs served in the first instance as an essential intermediary, but eventually, with their aesthetic duality, were joined so inseparably with the originals – no longer in existence – that they came to represent them."⁴

Certain photographs have clearly influenced our impressions of an Action. Widely known are those of Beuys gesturing with his raised arm, the cross and the bleeding nose; the gold-leaf-covered head of Beuys and the dead hare cradled in his arms; and the photograph with the coyote. About these Schneede says: "These instantaneous shots have, in one's memory, taken the place of the whole complex happening."⁵ Such penetrating photographs give the impression that the Actions were dramatic events. An impression that does not always tally with the experience of an event, but that is the dilemma of Actions photography. As Schneede points out, without these socially engaged photographs the Actions would no longer exist in our memory, but with these photographs we put the Actions behind us – so much so in fact that according to some, the pictures are of greater historical influence than the Actions themselves.

And yet, during the open-air Dutch exhibition 'Sonsbeek buiten de perken' (Sonsbeek beyond the Boundaries) in 1971, the American artist Robert Smithson, who died two years later, made his work *Broken Circle, Spiral Hill* in a sand quarry at Emmen, in the Dutch province of Drenthe. This comprised a circle-shaped peninsula and a dam as a positive form in the sand, with the water as the negative form, a 'Cyclop's eye' as Smithson called the megalithic stone – which already happened to be there in the middle of his Broken Circle – and a small sand hill covered with black earth from which a spiral gravel path ran upwards. These are all materials that gradually perish in the elements. Every time the work was in such bad condition that something had to be done, the question arose about how it should be preserved. Would it suffice to preserve the work through documentation like photographs, statements and drawings?

In American Land Art, for example in various large-scale projects by Smithson, photographic documentation played an important role. These projects were mainly made far away from the populated world and could only be experienced via photographs. Smithson's famous *Spiral Jetty* (1970), a gigantic spiral of bulldozed rock on the edge of the Great Salt Lake in the middle of the desert, is one example. The artist took breathtaking photographs and a now famous film of the creation process of this work. In it many of the artist's fascinations are drawn together: the Museum of Natural History with its skeletons of dinosaurs; grumbling excavators with shovels, who can barely keep their balance on the blocks of rock as they disgorge rocks and the sand; salt crystals clamped to the stones in the dead, pink-coloured brine, and the artist himself filmed from a helicopter, running along the spiral, against the clock, back in time, with Samuel Beckett's words "Going no-where, coming from nowhere" buzzing in the head. Smithson called this experience of emptiness the "aesthetics of disappointment".

After the work was made, the Great Salt Lake rose and gradually drowned *Spiral Jetty* in 1972. Thus, the documentation material became increasingly important, particularly when the primary work was no longer visible. For Smithson the photographs and film were pieces of evidence and initially these were sold via his gallery. However, when he realised that this material was regarded as the final art work, he put a stop to their purchase. The documentation then acquired an ambiguous status, halfway between the art work and the reference to it.

Smithson's *Broken Circle, Spiral Hill* is also in an isolated spot, in a sand quarry, but in densely populated Netherlands the work is much more a part of society. Although it was intended for the Sonsbeek exhibition, Emmen municipal council decided to take on the responsibility and to preserve the work permanently. Smithson thought it was splendid that the council was to take care of the work, since this was seamlessly in tune with his ideas about land reclamation: the reclamation of exhausted quarries and mines in terms of art. Art not as a safe, isolated luxury in a museum or gallery, but as a phenomenon concerned with actual ecological problems.

The council has been involved now for twenty-six years. Within a couple of years after the work's creation it already needed maintenance. A wooden anti-erosion barrier was placed around the peninsula and dam, while the small hill was planted with low-growing shrubbery. When *Broken Circle* was largely under water in the early 1980s and thus in an extremely deteriorating condition, major conservation work was carried out. Two years ago this was again necessary: this time the project in its entirety was clearly raised.

The constant care of this art work and the 'embedding' of it into an acceptable social context – protecting the work yet making it accessible to the public at the same time – forms a lively element of the work involved, which has consequences for how it now looks. It is different from the very first, known photographs, but that is unavoidable. An important consideration is that *Broken Circle*, *Spiral Hill* is almost the only site-specific Land Art project by the artist that can still be seen. Moreover, his work can withstand remaking as long as the specific environmental factors are taken carefully into account. In Emmen it means for the public an unforgettable experience in a deserted sand quarry where they are confronted with the pre-historic past – just as they are with the megalithic stones nearby. For Smithson it was the place of an entropic landscape where a distant past meets the present.

It is all too easy to reduce Smithson's body of work to a few large-scale Land Art projects, his so-called masterpieces. It is precisely those younger artists who also regard their work as a process, use ephemeral materials and are not afraid to reveal some kind of seeking, that feel an affinity with Smithson's work. All his sculptures defy the definition of 'autonomous object' or finished 'presence'. With the Site/Nonsite works the usual conventional concepts for defining sculpture become unstuck. The physical boundary of the object no longer exists. The work as a whole can only be experienced and understood through various forms of documentation and presentation. All these divergent elements contribute to the meaning of the work. The maps, various kinds of sketches, photographs of the site, physical material (stones and sand) collected on the spot and exhibited in plain containers – all these, including the original site (preferably wasteland) to which the material refers, are part of the installation. All the separate elements are necessary to the whole, but the whole remains fragmented in the form of pieces of 'mirror images' of the original site.

Exhibiting this kind of tense emptiness in a museum requires a thorough awareness of Smithson's body of work as a whole. Within this the works cannot be strung together like pearls to form the proverbial necklace. An article such as Smithson's 'Monuments of Passaic' in *Artforum* is just as important as the large Earthwork projects for an understanding of his work. In 1995, during the discussion forum 'Remaking Art?' at Witte de With, the exhibition-maker James Lingwood said that a firm framework, a kind of dialectic is needed for an exhibition of Smithson's works in order to bring the concept of them alive again. This is all the more necessary precisely because he so consciously used the 'mausoleum' nature of a museum.⁶

Beuys, Thek, Smithson are all artists of whom the scope of their work is only gradually dawning on us. They are not artists who can be properly judged by identifying them with their masterpieces. Their works are not to be seen purely as objects, precisely because they are so much linked to the personality of the artist. Also the artists' chosen, transitory nature of their creations should not be denied. The installations were made in the sixties and seventies as a conscious reaction to the object-oriented art world. They should not be treated as ready-made art works, lodged in museums and preserved.

When considering whether to show them again it is wrong to focus on the possibilities and impossibilities of preserving or reconstructing the materials. Rather the starting point should be the underlying concept, the meaning of the work, also within the context of the entire body of the artist's work. That does not mean that the original material is unimportant. On the contrary, without this material we would not be able to experience the power field of these works and our interpretation would no longer have an anchorage. But that is quite different to treating them as fetishes.

Certainly with these art works, vulnerable and sensitive in every respect, it is impossible to draw up a general theory about reinstallation. Every rigid approach, every purist viewpoint has to be avoided. Moreover the curator/exhibition organiser, the artist and the conservator have their own approach; these differences in perspective need to be made explicit to each other. In fact an awareness of the sliding scale between painting/sculpture, installation and performance is central to these works.

That is clearly evident here. The installation does not find itself 'somewhere in-between' for nothing. At a certain moment the work is brought to a halt and discarded, yet in that discarded work there was once so much energy invested that some of it remains radiating from the object – as a promise of future possibilities. Instead of forcedly reconstructing that energy, it is sometimes more useful to show the magic of the original movement via documented and fragmented recollections. The art, as a survival strategy, is to hold on to this energy.

1 Carel Blotkamp, 'Het IJzeren Venster', in: *Metropolis M* 7 (1986) 2, pp. 12-17.

2 Camiel van Winkel, 'Chaque homme est un artiste', in: *De Witte Raaf* no. 51, September 1995, p. 15.

3 Uwe M. Schneede, Joseph Beuys – Die Aktionen, Ostfildern-Ruit bei Stuttgart 1994, p. 8.

4 See note 3, p. 17.

5 Ibid.

6 'Remaking Art? – A discussion', in *Witte de With Cahier* 4, March 1996, p. 144.

Riet de Leeuw is art historian and policy adviser at the Cultural Heritage Directorate, Ministry of Education, Culture and Science

*The article has been published in: Hummelen, IJ., Sillé, D., *Modern Art: Who Cares?*, Amsterdam: Foundation for the Conservation of Modern Art/ Netherlands Institute for Cultural Heritage, 1999, p. 212-221.