

EXTRA!

Several articles have been written in the popular press in London, Toronto and New York about the apparent controversy surrounding the permanency of acrylic paint. Although the articles site information from one another, they tend to use inaccurate information and flawed logic... Modern paintings are falling apart... Acrylic is a modern paint... Therefore, Acrylic is falling apart, and so on. We feel it's important for you to know **all the facts** to the best of our knowledge.

For example; all the articles site problems with acrylic, then go on to mention the Rothko's that had to be removed from exhibition from Harvard because of their deteriorated state. These Rothko paintings were in fact oil paintings.

This is not to sound the alarm for oils, we already know how oils deteriorate. **The articles, in a profound way, confuse modern materials with modern experimental techniques.**

When I had a chance to speak to some of the conservators that had been quoted in the article, from the Modern in NY and the Tate in London. They mentioned that the authors of the article had a particular bias. **Any information they presented in favor of the acrylic tended to be ignored.** In fact, one conservator from the department of conservation at Buffalo State College, even

though interviewed for two hours by phone, was completely left out of one of the articles because he had nothing bad to say about the acrylic.

We will periodically provide more information for store personnel that details the work done examining the permanency of the acrylics. Armed with as much accurate information as possible is the only way we see to deal with these issues.

Included in this supplement to the Daily Hues are the articles that have appeared recently, as well as our responses to those articles. One response, to THE TORONTO STAR, was not published as it is quite long, yet we feel it is important for you to see the complete letter.

GOLDEN
ARTIST COLORS



- Mark Golden, President

The London Times

March 29th, 1992

by Caroline Lees and Richard Palmer

Cracking paint ruins modern masterpieces

Fortunes at risk in the art world

Paintings worth millions of pounds by the world's leading contemporary artists are disintegrating because of chemical changes in synthetic paints used in the 1960's.

Important works by artists such as David Hockney, Jackson Pollock and Mark Rothko are discolouring or cracking. Some paintings are beginning to flake and fall off the canvas.

The damage, which threatens to wipe thousands of pounds off the value of works on the £200m-a-year contemporary art market, has so far proved irreparable because the artists often used materials designed to last only a few years.

Restorers have been unable to find a way of conserving the synthetics - including acrylic, polymers and household paint - which have deteriorated rapidly, often because the artists failed to understand the implications of using modern chemical-based materials.

The Tate Gallery in London and the Museum of Modern Art in New York are so concerned about the problem that they have contacted all the living artists they display asking them to list the materials and methods used.

One of the Tate's most popular works, Mr. and Mrs. Clark and Percy, by David Hockney, is among those affected. It has discoloured and turned grey as the acrylic paint has absorbed dirt and dust from the atmosphere.

The acrylic emulsion used by Hockney when he painted the work in 1971 has yellowed and started to form drips down the picture. Hockney, who once admitted that he was not a natural painter - "This is my frustration as an artist. I don't really paint very well," he told The Sunday Times in 1988 - was said to be too busy to talk about the problem this weekend.

Other works at the Tate have been similarly affected. Industrial paint used by Jackson Pollock in his painting *Summertime* has cracked. A work by Ben Nicholson has been removed from the British Council's touring art collection because glue used by the artist in the carved white relief is coming unstuck.

In the United States a mural by Rothko was removed from display at Harvard University because the colours faded and it has become worthless, according to Jay Kruger head of conservation at the National Gallery in Washington.

Many other paintings in private collections have also been affected and hundreds more by artists such as Andy Warhol, Roy Lichtenstein, and Morris Louis, who all experimented with early acrylics, are thought to be susceptible. City analysts and art dealers say the rapid

deterioration threatens to undermine confidence in contemporary art works.

"If it gets around that they are not safe it will cause a short-term panic," said Guy Bell, an analyst with the stockbroking firm Beeson Gregory. "People will not be keen to buy paintings which are likely to fall apart."

Restorers at the Tate are so concerned that they are launching a £100,000, four-year study into modern painting techniques and their preservation.

Stephen Hackney, the conservator who will head the project, said the faults were only now starting to become apparent. "Some materials absorb dirt and most of the paintings do not have a protective varnish, which means traditional ways of keeping them in good condition cannot be used."

Acrylics and synthetic resins were presented as a panacea when they first came on the market in 1962, said Carol Stringari, the associate conservator at the Museum of Modern Art in New York. "But then the first time somebody tried to take a bit of dirt off an acrylic painting, they realised that it would not come off. We just do not know yet how to do it, we are waiting for technology to develop so that we can come up with a method to preserve them."

John Bull, one of the leading contemporary art restorers in the country, has found it almost impossible to get a good colour match with acrylic paintings, which generally contain large areas of even colour with slight brush marks. "With old masters you can do almost anything, but I have a studio full of abandoned acrylics that I can do nothing with," he said.

Not all works from this period were painted using acrylic materials, however, and not all paintings which did use synthetic paint have begun to deteriorate. John Hoyland, one of Britain's leading artists, has used acrylic paint for the past 30 years. He said the paints will last if they are properly applied and the base is prepared. "It should be common sense to use the best paint, canvas and to prepare your work properly," he said.

"Artists like Jackson Pollock and Lichtenstein used to splash anything on and they were very blasé.

"They used to say that by the time anything went wrong, somebody would have invented a way to save the painting."

The lack of technology to treat the pictures has opened up the possibility of collectors who are unable to save their paintings taking legal action against artists, according to Robin Fry, a lawyer at the London solicitors firm Stephens Innocent, which specializes in art.

Fry said artists should provide a guarantee. "A work of art is a commodity, like a washing machine," he said. "You expect it to be sound and be made of the best materials and if it goes wrong the manufacturer could be accused of negligence."

Some experts, however, have argued that deterioration is a natural process and part of the art.

The New York Observer

April 6th, 1992
The Transom by Clare McHugh

Perishable Paintings

Institutions that collect contemporary art are asking living artists to provide them with a list of materials and methods used in their paintings because many works from the last three decades are cracking, flaking and otherwise disintegrating as they hang on museum walls.

The Museum of Modern Art here in New York and the Tate Gallery in London are among the institutions that have requested such a list from all contemporary artists they display.

But knowing the ingredients of a painting is only a first step, since conservators still haven't learned how to restore modern works. Many synthetic paints that have been popular with artists since the 1960's were only designed to last a few years. Restorers, accustomed to working with oil paints, are unsure how to conserve these synthetics - including acrylics, polymers and household paints.

David Hockney, Jackson Pollock and Mark Rothko are among the artists whose work has been adversely affected by the passage of a relatively brief stretch of time. A mural by Rothko was recently removed from display at Harvard because the colors have faded so badly.

Carol Stringari, a conservator at MoMA, explained that there is a technology lag at work. "The first time somebody tried to take a bit of dirt off an acrylic painting, they realized that it would not come off. We just don't know yet how to do it," she said.

At the Tate, the conservation department is launching a \$200,000 four-year study of modern painting techniques and preservation.

The unanswered question is how much this will undermine the volatile contemporary art market. In an article in the Sunday Times of London, London art analyst Guy Bell said: "People will not be keen to buy paintings which are likely to fall apart." Many paintings in private collections have been similarly affected by chemical changes in the synthetic paints, and hundreds of other works by Andy Warhol, Roy Lichtenstein and Morris Lewis - who all used early acrylics - may be vulnerable.

The Toronto Star

May 24th, 1992
by Christopher Hume

"Cracked" painting row shakes art world

Life is short, they say, and art is long. But how long does it last?

For Toronto painter Alan Hooper the question is more than academic. Hooper is being sued because an acrylic painting he sold eight years ago is showing signs of age. The buyer says the originally white canvas has started to

crack and turn yellow.

Artists, dealers, curators and their professional organizations are nervously watching the case, which is unfolding as museums grow more concerned about the deterioration of acrylic in their collections.

If the court upholds Elizabeth Borek's complaint, the precedent could cause untold damage to the art market. It could make individual artists responsible for the longevity of their work and create standards that are impossible to live up to.

In 1984, Hooper was commissioned to produce a painting for Borek's Riverdale house. Her only instructions were that it measure 1.2 by 2.4 meters (4 by 8 feet), be highly textured and predominantly white.

"She came, liked it and paid for it," Hooper recalls. "Then in '87 she called me up because she thought the painting was yellowing and cracking. I didn't see her for the next few years and in '91 she sent a registered letter saying that if I didn't do something about it she'd take me to court."

At first Hooper didn't take the threat seriously. But after the pretrial earlier this year, he changed his mind.

"I came out of the discovery (for examination) thinking, boy, there's absolutely no realization out there that art is anything but a commodity.

"She wants \$3,000 (the cost of the painting) back and possibly interest on that amount."

Hooper and Borek, who would not comment on the matter, are now waiting for a court date.

"I don't think she (Borek) has a leg to stand on," says Toronto lawyer Aaron Milrad, who specializes in art law. "But I take it seriously because you might get some judge who doesn't understand. It would be a major inhibitor if we let this kind of thing happen.

"Just because it's a painting doesn't mean you have a warranty that runs through all eternity. We expect more from artists than we do from our best manufacturers. But it's art, not science. She bought a product, she had the use and enjoyment of that product.

"She certainly doesn't have any right to interest; what's she going to do, give back the enjoyment?

"It's buyer beware."

Olga Korper, well-known Toronto art dealer and former president of the Professional Art Dealers Association of Canada, is also skeptical about Borek's claims.

"I think the lady's getting bad advice from her lawyer even to consider a lawsuit," she says. "She won't be able to prove that the conditions (in her house) didn't alter the painting. The piece was sold to her in good faith and the artist used reasonable materials. It's a childish plot; very, very silly."

Garry Conway, executive director of Canadian Artists Representation Ontario, calls the case "extremely dangerous."

"The first point is that art by its nature is experimental," he says. "Artists have to be free to explore new materials and new media. There's no way of knowing

how long something will last. Everything has a life. Nothing can be guaranteed. Nobody in the commercial sector has this kind of responsibility; if they did, cars would last 50 years.

Acrylic paint, which first became available in the early 1950's, is relatively new as a fine-art medium. It simply hasn't been around long enough for many of the technical questions to have been answered. But the same can also be said of oil paint, which has been used for centuries.

"Any kind of paint or paint medium can yellow," explains Scott Williams, a conservation scientist with the Canadian Conservation Institute in Ottawa. "Yellowing is a natural phenomenon. We really don't know whether acrylic paints are degrading faster than oil paintings. Personally, I don't think they are. There's nothing inherently worse about acrylic than oil.

"It's unfair that this artist has to go through this. But it's also unfair the painting has yellowed. Still, I don't think it's a legitimate claim."

Nevertheless, museums around the world are growing more concerned about the future of the acrylic in their collections. Works by artists such as Jackson Pollock, David Hockney and Mark Rothko, painted in acrylic and sometimes even house paint, have deteriorated badly.

The Museum of Modern Art in New York and the Tate Gallery in London have both instituted programs to contact all living artists whose works they own to get data about their methods and materials. It's hardly surprising that when artworks worth millions of dollars start fading, cracking and falling apart collectors and curators get worried.

But, Hooper insists, "art isn't a product. I express myself in painting, that's what I get paid for. If they say you can't use a certain medium, they limit your artistic expression.

"The artists I've spoken to are outraged. Galleries are really worried. Some don't even want to hear about it."

If Borek wins her case, they won't have much choice. "It's an extremely complex issue," says Toronto art conservator Jayne Woods. "It's awfully hard to pinpoint causes unless careful analysis is done of the painting and its environment. Creativity is hard on longevity.

Note: This article caused us considerable concern as it included a photograph of Alan Hooper, with a jar of Golden Acrylics in front of him. THE ARTWORK BY ALAN HOOPER THAT THE ARTICLE REFERS TO WAS NOT PAINTED WITH GOLDEN ACRYLICS!

The Toronto Globe & Mail

September 1st, 1992

by Paul Recer, Associated Press, Washington

20th-century art fails test of time

Museum experts in the United States are struggling to find ways to prevent 20th-century artifacts from becoming the dust of history. Modern materials in paintings, sculpture and even space suits are flunking the test of

time, they say.

Mary T. Baker, a scientist at the Smithsonian Institution, says polymer-based plastics have become an important part of modern life and thousands of objects and works of art collected in U.S. museums are made of this material. And many are rapidly decomposing.

"We would like to think these polymer materials would last forever," Baker said recently, "Unfortunately we are finding that polymers degrade very quickly by museum standards. Museums tend to think in centuries."

Paintings made with acrylics and other modern tints can flake and crack within a short time, she said. Efforts to protect the works can speed up deterioration.

"Coatings can yellow or become brittle, obscuring the paintings they were meant to protect," said Baker. Adhesives can yellow or weaken, disfiguring or endangering the object they were used to repair."

Elyse Klein, a Smithsonian expert on art preservation, said some sculptors in the 1920's and 1930's worked in plastic materials that have rapidly crumbled away. She said a work sculpted in the 1930's in nitrocellulose seemed to be in good shape while it was stored in a glass case. But when the work was exposed to ordinary air, it quickly disintegrated.

"When we lifted off the top of the case, all of a sudden - 1,2,3 - the thing crumbled to dust," said Klein. "It happened that fast. It basically just powdered."

Klein said museum curators often don't know what materials are used in a work of art and without this knowledge, efforts at preservation can actually create more problems. Some now are turning to the FBI for chemical tests to identify all the compounds present in a painting.

Acrylic paints, introduced in 1953, now are used in about 75 per cent of artistic paintings. And yet, said Klein, there is still little known for sure about the best temperature and humidity for the storage of acrylic works, or how best to protect them. Methods used to preserve and restore paintings by the great masters can actually destroy acrylic paintings.

There is no coating known, for example, that can be removed from an acrylic painting without causing damage, she said.

Baker said artists often cause destruction of their works by manipulating acrylic paints in such a way that the chemistry is changed.

Science still doesn't know the best way to store and preserve many of the plastic objects now in the inventories of museums, said Baker. The result is the wholesale loss of a art and artifacts.

"We're seeing losses in things that are only 10 to 20 years old, especially if they were stored under poor conditions," she said. "Even a simple cleaning can start deterioration in some things"

Eric B. Lange of the Smithsonian Air and Space

Museum said a major effort is being made to find the best way to find the best way of preserving 88 spacesuits from the early days of the U.S. space program. The suits, some of which were designed to withstand the extreme temperatures and vacuum on the moon, are losing out to time, said Lang.

"Virtually all of the spacesuits in our study collection... already display some signs of deterioration as a result of their years on Earth," he said. Lange said the suits are now in a storage vault at 41°F, but researchers believe that this temperature causes crystals to form in a rubber layer of the suits. These crystals embrittle the rubber and can be removed only by heating the material to a high temperature. This would further damage the suits, he said.

Until a way is found to preserve the suits, the boots that put humankind's first footprints on the moon are slowly turning into dust, he said.

Response by Golden Artist Colors

In Response to The Toronto Star

by Mark Golden, President, Golden Artist Colors, Inc.
May 26, 1992

Attn: Jim Atkins, Feature Editor / The Toronto Star

This letter is in response to Christopher Hume's article "*Cracked' painting row shakes art world*", which was published in *The Star* on 24 May, 1992.

The article, which suggests that artist paint based on acrylic polymer is inherently unstable, draws, in part, from an earlier article published in *The London Times* of London in March 1992. Both articles raise complex questions about materials, application, conservation, and individual artist technique. Unfortunately, Hume's article and its predecessor take a sensationalist approach, forsaking accuracy in the balance.

Firstly, let me state my position: I am a manufacturer of acrylic artist paints. It is understandable if you reject my conjecture because of my unique position. Yet, a great deal is at stake for my company, professional artists and collectors of acrylic paintings if your readership takes your printed word and the assumptions within your article as the truth. Therefore I am compelled to relay this letter to your attention concerning several matters discussed in the Hume article.

Artists work in a wide variety of media and methods. Some artists are fastidious about their methods and materials, and incorporate this into their working techniques. Other artists, in obtaining their creative ends, do not care about the means in obtaining it. Both of these are valid approaches to creativity.

Although a fastidious approach would seem to hold out the prospect of greater longevity, even the most meticulous preparation and forthright intentions cannot

provide air tight guarantees. The recent restoration work on the Clyfford Stills paintings attest to this fact. The McKay Lodge Conservation Report indicates that despite Still's own care to incorporate what he believed were the most advanced levels of scientific and traditional methods of the time, a few of his works are deteriorating at an alarming rate.

When the materials themselves are considered, questions of application and material integrity become even more complex. Such matters involve not only the extensive body of objective test results, but the considerable subjective aura that surrounds a material, which has been stigmatized as "plastic paint": since its introduction in the 1940's.

A few facts are helpful.

First U.V. resistance. The first acrylics produced for artists by Bocour Artist Colors, Inc, in the late forties, remain the most Ultra Violet transparent artist media to date. This means that the acrylic polymer is much more resistant to the damaging effects of Ultra Violet radiation which effects other polymers used in paint including Polyurethane, Epoxy, Vinyl and of course Linseed Oil paints.

Secondly, flexibility. Acrylics, in general, are much more flexible than more traditional artist oil or tempera paints. This allows the painting, which is typically produced on a flexible support like canvas, to stretch and relax with the changes in tension brought on by changes in humidity and temperature in the environment.

Finally, ease of use. To enhance survival, oil paintings require painstaking detail for the proper preparation of the prime, ground, and the order that the colors are painted in -- fat over lean. Conversely, the acrylics have freed the artist from this tedious process. Perhaps it is this very liberation which has inspired some artists to go too far in "stretching the possibilities" of this very special painting medium.

Even if such "stretching" were the case with the work of Mr. Hooper, it is premature to ascribe any blame to the artist for a failure of application technique. At this point, it still remains to be seen whether the paints -- or the ground -- of the work in question have assumed their present condition through fault of manufacture or storage.

Acrylics, of course, are not without their limitations. There are three limitations which are particularly germane: two technical, the other emotional.

Acrylics, being a much more flexible material than oils are also a much softer medium. Being softer, it is possible for dust and pollution to imbed itself into the acrylic surface. Without a removable varnish, (and sometimes with), it is difficult for a conservator to remove that dirt without effecting and possibly damaging the painting. There are quite a few removable varnishes on the market for artists to use to reduce the effect of this problem.

The second technical problem deals with new issues uncovered by Dr. Marion Mecklenburg at the Smithsonian Conservation Analytical Laboratory. As the temperature

falls below 15°C, acrylic becomes increasingly more rigid. Therefore, when transporting acrylic paintings in colder seasons, care must be taken to protect the painting from severe shock, similar to the care required when moving the more brittle oil paintings.

The third problem is much more insidious and, I believe, much more difficult to confront. It arises from our feelings about synthetic materials, especially plastics. In the 50's and 60's plastics were a bad joke, their status associated with breakable children's toys. In the 70's and 80's, with increasing concern and awareness of our environment, plastics have turned an even more sinister corner. They are the materials that do not degrade in our environment. Save that thought for a moment... Isn't this just the sort of material we would want for a work expected to last indefinitely. If by the lack of foresight we have designed our plastic diapers to last indefinitely in our land-fills, can it not be expected, that if we plan, we can be at least as successful for our modern painting materials?

There is a final aspect to this discussion. Ordinarily, I would not introduce the subject, but in this instance it may shed some valuable light into an obscure area. Quite simply, some artists and critics who work in oils, or prefer a more traditional style of painting, view modern painting -- and by extension modern materials -- with prejudiced eyes. A clear example of this is in the Hume article. After describing the problems with acrylics, the article sites several instances of deteriorated works of artists, including the Rothko pieces donated to Harvard. In fact, although the work is very modern in its approach, Rothko used oil paints in this work.

Recently, conservators have come under increasing scrutiny in regard to repair and cleaning of artworks. I believe that it is no coincidence that scrutiny has intensified as market forces have caused the trading of art to resemble a feverish commodities exchange.

Art conservation has a long and rich history. Conservation, long held as one of the dark sciences, full of closely guarded formulas and techniques, has emerged into the light during this century. Yet, not without major consequences.

There now rages within art conservation several profound debates. One, that tries to distinguish two distinct camps. Those conservators bent on the science of conservation versus those in the field that lean towards the art of conservation, (preserving the artists intentions). A second debate swirls around the issue of an artwork as a mere "artifact" from a specific period. Here the conflict rests upon a view that any conservation intervention intended to restore aesthetic intent must yield to regard for its historical relevance. These issues of conservation are only raised because they present a profound implication for the lack of experimentation in the restoration of modern paintings. There is simply too much at stake, too many lawsuits.

As Carol Christensen, in her recent article for the *A/C*

(American Institute for Conservation) *News* describes wryly: "It appears that whether one restores an object, or objects to a restoration, one can now end up on the wrong side of expensive litigation."

Oils, tempera, natural fiber papers and fabrics have been with us for thousands of years. The techniques for their conservation have been developed, improved, refined and redefined as long as these works have carried any significant value. Yet, lately we find conservators in a quandary on how to restore modern materials. In fact the large majority of conservation professionals do not have experience working with modern art. They're quite comfortable inpainting an older oil painting that has cleaved and lost its colors down to the canvas, yet they remain quite cautious using these techniques on acrylics.

Caution, of course, should always prevail. Too many works have been lost because caution was not exercised in the restoration. However, we run a terrible risk of confusing a cautious, careful, or conscientious attitude with a timorous approach that raises unfounded concerns about the vulnerability of materials. Granted, the same techniques that have been used to restore other paints should not be used wholesale on the acrylics. We, conservators and manufacturers, must work to develop other techniques suited to the specific properties of the acrylic.

Museums are always concerned about the permanency of their collection. Yet, Jo Crook, from the Tate Gallery in London, remarked in a recent conversation, in contradiction to the Hume article, that the Museum is still purchasing acrylic paintings and there is no evidence of a common failure in the acrylic paintings as suggested by the article. They see the failure in their Hockney painting as simply an isolated instance of failure in one acrylic painting. In fact every conservator or materials scientist interviewed for the article stated the acrylic is quite stable.

Scott Williams, a conservator with the Canadian Conservation Institute in Ottawa when asked, felt that the acrylics were not inherently unstable. Carol Stringari, conservator from the Museum of Modern Art who described how difficult it was to clean dirt from the surface of the acrylic, has also acknowledged that during their recent review of acrylic paintings The Museum acquired over the last 40 years, "that the acrylics have held up quite well. In the cases where they didn't, for the most part it was because of poor environment or handling." In a recent seminar at the Smithsonian Institute in Washington D.C., materials scientist, David Erhardt suggested that if oil paints had just been introduced onto the market, that they would suffer the same debate as the acrylics do now as to their permanence, considering the yellowing, cracking and gain in transparency of the oils with age.

With so much at stake for painters, conservators, gallery owners, collectors, and manufacturers, it is imperative for all parties to question -- and test -- the integrity of materials under all kinds of conditions. However, it serves little purpose to treat this subject in such a way as to stir

fears and anxiety -- and in some instances, unfortunately, panic -- about materials when it is clear that the issue is not the materials but the technique.

Henry Levinson, material scientist, creator of Permanent Pigments and leading advocate for the improvement of artist materials, stated in his book *Modern Pigments*: "The psychology of the artist, particularly the less knowledgeable ones, is interesting. Until a few generations ago, the pigments of previous ages, good or bad, apparently held an aura of tradition. Basically this was probably caused by confusing ancient materials with the superb craftsmanship of the great masters."

Let us all hope that none of us falls prey to the same confusion.

I would also like to take this time to offer mine and my staff's assistance should you be planning on follow up articles or future articles dealing with the issues addressed in this letter. I would certainly appreciate a response on how your paper plans to answer these concerns.

We manufacture custom paints, as well as a standard line of products, for professional artists around the world. In addition, we produce materials for architects, museums and conservators. We welcome you and your staff to visit our facilities and to examine our work if you should so desire.

Very truly yours,
Mark Golden,
President, Golden Artist Colors, Inc.

Responses by Toronto Star

Reply to Golden's Letter to Editor

by Ellie Teshler, Sunday Editor
June, 1992
Attn: Mark Golden

Thank you for your interest in The Star's article of May 24, 1992.

I have spoken to the reporter Chris Hume and he strongly recommends that you also write to the woman who is suing the artist.

There is no plan at this moment to do an in-depth story on the viability of acrylic paint. Mr. Hume was reporting a news story, and the natural follow would be the results of the lawsuit.

As for the article itself, Mr. Hume notes that no side was taken and most people quoted were sympathetic to the artist.

I hope you can get further help by communicating directly with the woman involved in the lawsuit.

Sincerely,
Ellie Teshler, Sunday Editor
Toronto Star

Response by Golden Artist Colors

Reply to Toronto Star's Letter

by Mark Golden
July, 1992
Attn: Ellie Teshler, Sunday Editor

Thank you very much for your prompt reply to my letter addressing my concerns over the May 24th article by Chris Hume.

I agree with Mr. Hume that the article ended without siding for or against the artist. I very strongly disagree that it fairly reviewed the subject of acrylic paint failing. I know this, because of the number of phone calls and letters, my staff and I have had to answer since your article. As mentioned in my rather lengthy letter, information was stripped out of an earlier London Sunday Times article without researching its accuracy.

Additionally, although I am glad that Mr. Hooper is now currently using my product, and our jar is prominently displayed in your photo, there is nothing in the article to counter the idea that it is the Golden paint that has caused the failure in the painting.

We have been in contact with Mr. Hooper previous to your article. He was interested in searching out accurate information on the relative stability of acrylic paint.

I again thank you for your time, and remind you of the potency of your printed word. Like a speeding car down a wet road, it may not hit anyone, yet it sure can soak those just standing nearby.

Sincerely, Mark Golden

A20 Sunday, May 24, 1992 THE TORONTO STAR



CRACKED ART: Toronto painter Alan Hooper is being sued by a client because an acrylic painting he sold eight years ago has started to crack and turn yellow.