

Press Release on Altink / Van Loenen, dated July 28, 2012

The Leeuwarden Court considers that two of the suspect identified paintings by the Groningen Ploeg are false ¹. These works' Reitdiep "and" Pic de Luc. The Workshop for Research and Restoration of Paintings (ASSR) has done a study of the paint used. On that basis, the Court is convinced probability bordering on certainty, that these works can not be made by the deceased in 1971 Altink. The paintings are in fact pigments found which only came in 1978 in paint in tube form on the market.

however, more than before that time were the same pigments already present in powder form. Altink and other Team painters experimented a lot. It is not excluded - and even likely - that they used this pigment powder to make the paint itself. However, the Court finds this assumption speculative and this fact has therefore not taken into consideration.

ASSR has the painting "Pic de Luc (1954) found a yellow dye that first came in 1978 in tube form on the market. However, living in London Dr. Estaugh involved in this investigation, has determined that this dye since the late fifties was available in powder form. De Ploeg artists, including Jan Altink often made their own paint, also using this pigment. The presence of the yellow dye is therefore no need to explicitly not indicate a date or anti-forgery.

"Pic de Luc is dated 1954. The pigment was not until the late fifties powder on the market. So not But 1954 was when painters and it is not unusual for them to make changes in their work at a later date or until signs for sale. She never did not prove it.

The disputed paintings, including "Pic de Luc are also 13 years no longer in possession of Van Loenen. In that period can all be done with it (to tampering). For example, "Pic the Luc 'is provided with a layer of varnish on the base oil. This is not, as erroneously stated in the judgment of the Court is, happened at the initiative of Van Loenen, but at the initiative of Johan Meijering.

On the false identified as painting 'The Reitdiep' Phthalocyanine the dye is detected. According ASSR this substance does only rise after 1935. Another found this substance (CI Pigment Yellow 3) from the fifties available and has a popular increase after 1970. On this basis ASSR concludes that doubted this painting could not have originated around 1931 or 1951. This issue is not relevant, because the painting is undated.

ASSR finds it striking that the same above-mentioned dyes are found in the doubted painting by Johan Dijkstra. However, this is less noticeable when it is considered that both Team painters themselves composed the paint on the basis of what was already available pigment powder.

Finally ASSR brings this painting directly related to the painter technical method of Van Loenen. But between the two disputed paintings and one work of Van Loenen is also a significant difference. The primer coat "The Reitdiep" and "Pic the Luc" are based on a mixture of oil and beeswax, as a reference from Van Loenen painting not used. According to research by Han Steenbruggen, enjoying the fame as Team Kenner par excellence, this mix of oil and beeswax is typical painters Squad. This fact makes the untenable by ASSR presumed relationship. But in the final ASSR notably absent from this finding. Here there is the manipulation of results. In a truly acrobatic manner ASSR practicing here the art of "jumping to conclusions".

One at the University of Groningen graduate engineer in Technical Chemistry, at the request of Van Loenen, kept the results and interpretations of the investigation against the light contained in the final report of ASSR. He specifically looked at the theoretical basis of the conclusions stated in the report. According to this engineer is The Lion, owner of ASSR not be considered objective. "Evidence shows the contrary, he does not mention. The way his own measurements (which has further been none existent and therefore not verify) and the results of dr. Estaugh's study interprets his suggestive. The conclusions of The Lion are not supported by either theory or statistical information after pulling sources. "

The Court of Leeuwarden presented the findings of the engineer aside. He may be a chemical engineer, which however does not mean that he has experience in the field of paint research, says the Court. Spectroscopy is one of the basic subjects of chemistry education in Groningen, but according to the engineer's knowledge even irrelevant. With his experience in data analysis, among other things expressed in his current role as analyst, he has the ASSR report solely judged on scientific and theoretical merits. And falling negative.

Johan Meijering crowing loudly again around that Van Loenen is a forger. In the judgment of the Court of Leeuwarden is there to make an allusion to in any way, the Court suggests that the parties reach a settlement. Figments of Meijering so. As he imagines more like crazy. For example, Van Loenen would have concealed the problematic background to the sale of the disputed paintings. In reality Meijering certainly familiar with the history of these paintings.

For example, in the judgment of the Court of January 30, 2008 Assen include 'Meijering therefore knew of the doubts about the reputation of Van Loenen and paintings, but still wanted to buy at a bargain price. "

The monthly magazine for art in Groningen, 'Cultimo ", an article written by Jeroen Goulooze in summer 1999. It is Meijering, which a few months earlier had bought the now disputed paintings by Van Loenen quoted. He says, in part: 'Van Loenen was then accused he would have distorted the work. In the meantime, research has shown that this was not the case. " Further evidence so that Meijering fully with this sensitive issue was known.

In the recent contact with the Volkskrant Meijering has five disputed paintings. Initially, however, it had brought about ten paintings, which all the experts have to be 100 percent convinced that they were false. But at the seat of the Court in Leeuwarden went to only five paintings. Meijering conceals it. In the Court readmission paintings increase doubts about the correctness of the judgment of the experts. It has meant that the Court in its judgment has overridden the opinion of the experts.

An unsolved mystery is still that experts were so convinced of the falsity of these paintings before, to the best knowledge and belief, were valued as highly positive. The name (fame) Van Loenen to do with this?

Some salient details.

A recent survey exhibition at the Groninger Museum work Altink showed a black chalk drawing of this painting, called "Horses at boerenhek. From the collection of Van Loenen. Now also false?

The collection of Van Loenen also includes a work painted on panel flower still life by Jan Altink. At the rear is a reminder certificate, that this work in 1923 at the Stedelijk Museum has hung on the occasion of the jubilee of Queen Wilhelmina. The curator of the Stedelijk has confirmed (in a letter). Now also false?

Through two auction houses in Amsterdam Team scholar Frank Buunk bought two Plow Works. Both came from the collection of Van Loenen. It's just that he knows!

[1http://zoeken.rechtspraak.nl/ResultPage.aspx?quick_search=t&type=search&lijn=BX2307?](http://zoeken.rechtspraak.nl/ResultPage.aspx?quick_search=t&type=search&lijn=BX2307?)