

Press Release Facts and legal sterling, dated February 18, 2008

Following various media reports in which Cor van Loenen is accused of selling fake paintings to Johan Meijering here are some (legal) facts: The verdict in the case Meijering against Van Loenen of the Court in Assen on January 30, 2008, on 10 states come into disrepute Team Paintings:

"Now that the court does not hold true for the paintings false / not authentic, primary claims are not eligible for allocation."

[Click here to read the full verdict](#)

Conclusion: the court Van Loenen gives equal. Van Loenen has extensive studies into the issue, which he not only refuted the findings of the experts but also demonstrated the incompetence of the experts themselves.

Are independently certified appraisers, or Squad Experts name, unanimously first considered good conscious ten paintings and valued, to the best knowledge and belief, unaware that the works from the collection of Cor van Loenen came. Only later - after announcement of the name of the owner - they returned to their initial judgment. Apart from the fact that these remarkable turnaround unpacked at the expense of Van Loenen, the artist places generally questioning the skills and content of appraisers. In the case of the Working Team, the experts gave their testimony demonstrates a lack of factual support their assertion that this is fake paintings. They did not go beyond terminology as "the cloths do not plow Radiance" and "

"Freedom is the expressionists unsuitable for a common style." "Speaking of a style of De Ploeg is a negation of the other, just as valuable work does not fall within that style." (See: Adriaan Venema in his book De Ploeg, p. 159).

For the record, Mr. Meijering was fully aware of the history and controversial status of the fabrics knowingly as unadulterated Team Working with much profit by selling at a sale at the time of purchase and towels bought.

Team collection Meijering "Real or fake?"

Cor van Loenen found that the experts often have a stereotype knowledge (books and pictures knowledge) of the work of the team Painters. As a way of painting or subject matter or colors or brushwork and composition of soil from the more traditional recognizable work of an artist one is quickly inclined to cry, "False". And then when the origin is associated with the label of the name of Cor van Loenen called by the same art world than does the poison of too often unmotivated and unjustified ratings, sloppy prepared "statements" work.

Sworn art appraisers, certified art auction containers and other experts should be more of their great responsibility awareness. They would do well to be more careful to vent their opinion when they under oath and to the best knowledge and know are valued and have allocated large sums of money (for insurance). expected from an expert that they stay in their judgment and not rotate frequently. Original paintings, perhaps not immediately recognizable as the work of the master, be this way forever made "tainted". Experts contradict each other. Crows there is a "false" then be withdrawn valuations and turning the heads on the side of the largest Kraaier, thus creating the so-called domino effect. Where money, power and prestige go together because the devil is dancing.

The undersigned has shown in his extensive and detailed studies, the respective team Painters have experimented their lives with painting techniques, various brushes here have tried / used in the most different ways, in many different types of paint materials in innumerable different substrates. (" freedom makes expressionists unsuitable for a common style "- Speaking of the style of the team is a negation of the other, just as valuable work that is not covered by that style "- (see: Adriaan Venema in his book on the plow, p. 159).

The "experts" vent their incompetence to substantiate their opinion, without convincing arguments. In the opinion of the court in Assen - already - rendered an interlocutory judgment that Van Loenen the statements of the experts on the falsity of the paintings disputed motivated.

Van Loenen has extensive studies into the issue, which he findings of the "experts" have contradicted detailed; including responses from Johan van Hende; appraiser and auctioneer old Groningen and Han Steenbruggen, curator of the Groninger Museum. The latter blundered by eg setting a statement: "Jan Wiegers painted not on board - Altink not painted with a palette knife."

That Johan Meijering now feels cornered; including the judgment of the Court in Leeuwarden, in January 2007, his complaints, again not declared admissible, he is constantly trying surreptitiously to influence the publicity by making misrepresentations.

Johan Meijering

Johan Meijering was fully aware of the 1st Altink affair (early nineties). Although the paintings at the time were "contaminated" by negative publicity, Johan Meijering bought anyway. Two of these paintings - previously depicted in art catalogs of Sotheby's and Christie's, the art world these works IIP - along with eight other team Paintings, which came from the collection of Cor van Loenen, one ticket to sell, he the judge called himself!

The link was quickly made regarding Plow Arts in Groningen Art Circuit, Meijering / Van Loenen. For this, Cor van Loenen Johan Meijering so warned. The Forensic Laboratory in Rijswijk obtained on the basis of material evidence no investigation, or concluded that the paintings from the so-called., 1st Altink affair were "false". Furthermore, no indications are in the other Selection Working obtained that it is incorrect to be signed with J. Altink.

Auke van de Werff

The above two paintings were well appraised in 1993 by Auke van de Werff for respective amounts of f f 10,000.00 and 15,000.00.

It is incomprehensible that someone from the (former) caliber as Auke van de Werff issued a positive assessment so high values attributed to the paintings, and that to the best of knowledge and know (as stated under valuation), - that it is not preliminary valuation was - as he now wants to claim - as he now, in the press say they are convinced that it is 100% false to work and please note painted by Cor van Loenen. In addition, he has recently been tempted, at the request of Johan Meijering, to write a letter with Cor van Loenen and his wife extremely damaging innuendo, bad inaccuracies; In short: vile slander. About false voice! More hypocrisy than expertise. That Auke van de Werff himself, repeatedly, reduced to this kind of statement does not surprise me considering his reputation as an expert at stake. A cat in a corner makes crazy jumps.

Though my style of paintings in common in some ways with the work of several painters Team, which some in the art world would argue, it would not mean that the disputed paintings of my hand. (See: www.corvanloenen.com).

Some other examples of "expertise"

A Team Painting Altink was valued positive in 1999 by Johan van Hende on f 35000.00. And that "to the best knowledge and know" which indeed mentioned in the official valuation stands. When Johan van de Hende understood that this painting came from the collection of Cor van Loenen, suddenly appeared coloring and brushwork not be written by Altink. Rara how can! The painting now had a value of f 0.00. About false voice!

Then Mr. Frank Buunk art house Simonis & Buunk Ede.

These sworn connoisseur itself in numerous art magazines such as Team Kenner. He recently wrote a great article in the magazine Art & Antique News about the team in Groningen also herein again for Cor van Loenen damaging insinuations. He bought in autumn 1999 six Plow Works from the collection of Cor van Loenen. This after intensive study of its restoration workshop. Again by negative stories of others, Frank Buunk was put on the wrong track by

oJan Smit (Bailiff Ommen), known from the private sale of paintings. Jan Smit, who ever bought also Plow Works Cor van Loenen (and resold). This purchase was now reversed surreptitiously, ended with the intervention of a lawyer, and left Frank Buunk a significant amount on the purchase price of the Plow Works, fall. Unfortunately, Mr. Frank Buunk we initially as an honest and passionate art dealer had come to know, was the Van Loenens fallen by the wayside.

The fixed restorer, Johan Meijering his art collection, Mr. Lammert Muller rich art restorer Groningen and familiar with Plow Arts has several works, refurbished from the conscious collection (for commerce) with new framing; whereby the authenticity violated.

In the other seven paintings Johan Meijering himself nota bene provided positive assessments, as evidenced by the letters of Henk Buy with counsel Johan Meijering mr. RC Spronk. This letter is na Johan Meijering himself, through his attorney. JA Ball filed with the Court of Assen. With € 50,000.00 profit Johan Meijering has sold these works on Bouwonderneming Koop Holding Groningen, now more than five years ago.

Summarizing:

Are independently certified appraisers, or Squad Experts name, unanimously first considered good conscious ten paintings and valued, to the best knowledge and belief, unaware that the works from the collection of Cor van Loenen came. The "Hosanna" of the experts and was dumbfounded: "Crucify him." Incomprehensible Cor van Loenen, and all those who know better. All ten works were declared false. The experts are distinguished by simply crowing: "False" to carry on without any valid argument.

The independent expert

So once again, Mr C. Buijser of Vendu house in Utrecht. Mr. Buijser has appointed Justice as an independent expert. He builds nothing and brushwork to mention. In the manner of its value expresses its incompetence.

Moreover, Mr Buijser is unable to provide an objective, independent judgment. Mr. Buijser na has been sent the documents and paintings that were Justice, were supplied to him by Johan Meijering!

The outcome of its assessment was not surprising. It was predictable. Naturally chose the appraiser for the big art world, there are indeed his (financial) interests! (Conflict of interest). "Whose piper, with whose word we speak." This expert has not held in any way to the contract and the guidelines of the court. The statements by Van den Hende and Han Steenbruggen and studies of Cor van Loenen are not involved in the final decision, while this Mr Buijser asked. He is in his final report, particularly in the absence of reasons, no evidence can provide specialized knowledge regarding painting and certainly not any specific knowledge of "De Ploeg".

This expert has disqualified himself by failing to comply with the directives of the court, so can not send any probative value to the final report of the expert. Mr. Buijser was, as yet, the court ordered to complete this brief final report with supporting facts.

Where Buijser in his draft report as its final report claiming 1st to read the authenticity of the paintings on the brushwork is remarkable that it does not matter the brushwork in his 2nd final (13-9-2007)

It "may or may not work with palette knife" and

The "or not paint with long keys interspersed with short strokes." That is the brushwork.

Mr. Buijser therefore speaks against it!

Materials and technology weigh less severe than what Mr. Buijser now calls "the look". Again, earlier claimed Mr Buijser right to technology and material to read the authenticity of the work!

Mr. Buijser now makes vague properties as "appearance" and "vigor" prevail over much harsher and objective criteria such as technology and material!

After "appearance" and "vigor" they're very subjectivist qualities to measure the value of a work of art to make and so completely in contradiction with the experience and knowledge Buijser that would characterize the competence of appraisers. As Mr Buijser thinks he can claim his 2nd final report.

Subjective feelings as "appearance" and "power wire" and let instinct badly or not fit at all with experience, knowledge and expertise.

Van Loenen has shown that the relevant Team painters throughout their lives very different technologies and innumerable different materials are used in their work with their own documentation (eg based on literature and photography and imagery include the National Art Documentation Center in The Hague). They experimented to your heart's on the loose.

Cor van Loenen can support his response with evidence.

Cor van Loenen, Beilen, February 18, 2008.