

## GIORGIO DE CHIRICO BETWEEN ORTHODOXY AND INQUISITION

Paolo Picozza

On the occasion of a criminal trial held in Milan, particular importance (even in the media), has been given to an unexpected and insistent *return* to the subject of fake de Chiricos and the so-called “*oddities*” of the Maestro: accusations which were thought to have been long surpassed which, in a surreal game of inversion of meaning, as well as aim, propose a reversed *Inquisition* that intends to pursue *Orthodoxy*.<sup>1</sup>

To better understand this “*game*”, it is necessary to take a step backward. We see that *today* no one contests the Maestro’s declaration as false expressed in the second half of the 1940s concerning the fakes produced by Oscar Dominquez which were shown at the Gallerie Allard and at the Biennale of 1948.<sup>2</sup> And yet, *at the time*, a chorus was composed of well-known historians – first of whom, Roberto Longhi –, critics, dealers and even institutions, were as unanimous as they were deafening in placing de Chirico in the wrong. Even if it was by different paths, they arrived at an identical conclusion:

---

<sup>1</sup> The criminal lawsuit n. 5554/05 held before the Milan Tribunal deals with an art dealer who is accused of having placed a new and different signature of Giorgio de Chirico on a painting contested by Giorgio de Chirico which was declared fake with a sentence by the Rome Court of Appeal on February 10, 1955, with an order to cancel the painter’s signature by scraping (published in «*Metafisica*» n.1-2, 2002, pp. 348 ff.), confirmed by the Court of Cassation, as well as having put the painting up for sale on the market. In the course of the trial, the defence managed the admittance, as witnesses, of a few well-known historians and art critics, of various capacities, who spoke at length of so-called “*oddities*” of Giorgio de Chirico, taking up once more themes and theses which history has long since resolved. Consequently, even if it was not the Judge’s intention, the lawsuit became a kind of inquisition of Giorgio de Chirico, and the accusations aimed at the Maestro were extended to the Foundation as well. The Foundation, according to these witnesses, is guilty of defending the work of the *Pictor Optimus* in a non-critical and bureaucratic manner. After what was written in this Periodical (*Origin and Persistence of a Topos about de Chirico*, 2002, n. 1-2 pp. 334 ff.), it seemed that the question had been surpassed definitely, inasmuch as the complex problems which have derived from the declarations as fake (and also as authentic) placed by Giorgio de Chirico on the back of a number of photographs, often without having examined the original, are to be looked at case by case and subject to the examination of the original. On page 328, the following was expressed: “Scholars of Giorgio de Chirico will need to revise a whole part of their criticism with regards to a part of his works: a revision that will have to be carried out with total intellectual honesty free of market considerations and liberated from every, already mentioned, commonplace. Their studies will have to be exclusively based on an examination of the works with only secondary consideration given to their origins. It seems evident then, at least among more serious scholars that the common refrain that de Chirico got a kick out of declaring his own works from the metaphysical phase and from the Twenties and Thirties fakes – done apparently to spite his enemies – does not hold water (apart from the fact that de Chirico did not have a sufficient number of enemies for all the paintings he declared false); also because these rumours contradict the nature of de Chirico’s personality (if we rid ourselves of the clichés about the artist).” Evidently, we were mistaken, given the violence and the lack of style with which the question has been brought back into the spotlight, even by the media (see the article published on the front page of «*La Stampa*» on July 16, 2006 with the emblematic title: *De Chirico the Spiteful*, by M. G. Minetti.) Our evaluation was influenced by a worthy study by Paolo Baldacci, which for the most part finds consensus and which we recommend, entitled *Betraying the Muse, De Chirico and the Surrealists*, with Italian translation entitled *Le Muse Inquietanti. De Chirico tradito dai surrealisti*, published on the occasion of a de Chirico exhibition in New York (April 21 – May 28, 1994) with an excellent foreword by W. Schmied. This study was amply cited in our essay of 2002. The unexpected change of opinion by the author of this study forces us to take the argument up once more, even if briefly, in order to clarify once and for all the position of the Foundation on this newly proposed litigation which assails the Artist and the judgement of his work.

<sup>2</sup> In the section *Yesterday and Today* in this issue we have chosen to let the Maestro speak for himself and have published a few of his writings, both previously published and unpublished, which throw light on different aspects of the problem of the falsification of his work and on the hostile battle array of critics and historians, dealers and even institutions which, on various occasions, aligned themselves helpfully en bloc against the capricious painter that “*dared*” demand respect for his work and his Art. On this subject, along with the position taken at the 1948 Biennale against de Chirico (the award for Metaphysical Art was given to Morandi, who was a non-metaphysical painter) see *The Memoirs of Giorgio de Chirico* P. Owen, London 1971.

either it was Giorgio de Chirico who was cheating by negating the authenticity of his metaphysical paintings, in order to increase the value of his more recent work, or the more benevolent hypothesis, where he was no longer capable of recognising his work.<sup>3</sup> The “*Oddities of de Chirico*”: just like today. In the 1970s, in front of a striking increase of fake works, the responsibility always belonged to Giorgio de Chirico, who disowned his authentic works for obscure reasons. Wieland Schmied stated that in that period, the Maestro’s reputation had gone down to such a low level that “*if de Chirico had declared a painting false, it must really be authentic*”<sup>4</sup>.

A courageous and tenacious servant of the state, Marshal Antonio Vastano of the *Arma dei Carabinieri* (military police) and Artistic Patrimony Protection Group, in contrasting all “commonplaces”, “unquestionable truths” and “deeply-rooted centres of power”, has finally attained justice for the Maestro with the results obtained from a long investigation and respective lawsuit in which circa 300 fake works were seized and subsequently confiscated and a number of forgers and dealers were arrested and sentenced, some of whom de Chirico mentions in his *Report for the Head of Police*, published in this issue.<sup>5</sup> Despite this, the clichés regarding de Chirico have remained intact, to a point where an aphorism of Einstein is applicable: “it is easier to split an atom than remove a prejudice”.

Today, the theme of fake de Chiricos has unfortunately become once more an actuality, not only due to the fact that at the turn of the century a consistent number of completely unknown “recent fakes” from “early years” were fed onto the market, some of which were shown in prestigious national and international exhibitions, and published in the relative catalogues, but primarily because we are witnessing an umpteenth attempt to delegitimise the Maestro for purposes that are anything but scientific, which endeavours to recreate a climate of renewed distrust toward the artist, motivated by an intention of taking a “heavy burden” off de Chirico’s shoulders.

In this disquieting design, as it is clear that in addition to his word, de Chirico (who after having fought on many fronts throughout his long life, can no longer, *ad evidentiam*, defend himself on his own, if not with the extreme and authentic force of his work), it is also necessary to discredit the word of the Foundation that carries his name which is guilty of a new and strange offence, of “*Orthodoxy*”, that is, of carrying out a mere bureaucratic activity regarding Giorgio de Chirico’s body of work (guilty, in fact, of safeguarding the artist’s exclusive rights regarding his personality and work). By eliminating this last obstacle, it is evident that it would become very easy, for a few, to reaffirm their own truths, that is, their “own” *Orthodoxy* which they have put together over time.

Thus, the Foundation is called upon to take position and continue the *Pictor Optimus*’s strenuous battle, and leave for another time the discussion on the “new” question, certainly more stimulating from a scientific point of view, regarding whether the Maestro has or doesn’t have a monopoly on the discovery of Metaphysics and on the autonomous paternity of its ideation.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>3</sup> P. Baldacci, cit., 1994, p. 139.

<sup>4</sup> W. Schmied, foreword, in P. Baldacci, cit., 1994, p. II. According to this scholar Giorgio de Chirico “is the artist whose work has suffered more falsification than any other artist of his time, or maybe even in all of art history” In *L’Enigma de Chirico*, exhibition catalogue edited by P. Baldacci and G. Roos, Marsilio, Padova, 2007.

<sup>5</sup> See pp. 582 ff. of this Periodical.

<sup>6</sup> P. Baldacci in a series of texts, monographs and essays over time, including the text in the recent exhibition catalogue of the Exhibition on de Chirico

The problem of fakes, presented here again today, invests a consistent number of paintings, not only metaphysical, which were contested by the Maestro and which date back to the period between the two wars. In his *Report for the Head of Police*, the Artist emphasises that the falsification of his work “*dates back many years. It began in France between the years 1926 and 1930*”<sup>7</sup>; therefore, it does not date to the 1940s, as some maintain *today*. In fact, it is sustained that fakes of that period do not exist or, at most, can be counted on the fingers of one hand; even after it had been proven that fake de Chiricos made by various surrealist artists, in addition to the well-known Dominguez, (and there is reason to believe that this also concerns non-metaphysical paintings) were put on the market, and in addition to fake works, the so-called “amusements” originating with Paul Guillaume entered into circulation after his death. And yet more examples could be given, not only in France but also in other countries including Italy.<sup>8</sup>

According to some, what one would have is a period *happily* immune to fakes, in which the Maestro’s declarations as fake regarding paintings of this period would, not only be absolutely unbelievable, but often the result of bad faith or revenge. To Paraphrase de Chirico one could say: “*a lot of ‘orchestra leaders’ have changed, but the music is still the same in Rome and not only in Rome*”<sup>9</sup>. One can see that the argumentation used is the same as that of the 1940s and 1970s. But it is not so.

It was Paolo Baldacci himself, who in 1994 wrote: “*The Surrealists’s misappropriation of de Chirico is one of the most extraordinary stories in the history of modern art. On the occasion of this exhibition, documents and important testimony chart the course of the relationship between de Chirico and the Surrealists, from their initial friendship, to open warfare. It clarifies how, within the climate of disrepute created by Breton and his friends, fertile terrain was laid for the germination of the first forgeries. There [sic] were produced, and sold, expressly within Surrealist circles [sic]. Because of their provenance, de Chirico himself was sometimes subjected to legal rebuttal when he attempted to denounce Surrealist copies of his work.*”<sup>10</sup>

This thesis fully concurs with what Giorgio de Chirico wrote about the falsification of his work dating back many years. *It began in France between the years 1926 and 1930*. The period coincides exactly with the fight the Surrealists (who did not, in fact, despise his most recent work) engaged him in, and which culminated with Breton’s excommunication in 1928. Breton (himself or his

---

in Padova, is astonished that art historians have bowed down and accepted the legend of de Chirico as the sole creator of Metaphysical Art, even though Breton firmly and explicitly expressed the opposite idea. It was Savinio who invented Metaphysical Art and not De Chirico; everything was done together, to a point where even the de Chirico’s first paintings dated 1910, which Baldacci contests inasmuch as he holds that they were painted by de Chirico in the presence of Savinio in 1909. De Chirico then falsified his life story in order not to acknowledge his brother. Such hypothesis, which is founded more on un-due influence than documents, has already been contrasted by the world of art criticism. It will be necessary to take this problem into consideration in a thorough manner, in order both to acknowledge Savinio what is effectively his (and he surely doesn’t need any official defenders) as well what is Giorgio de Chirico’s. For critical considerations on this hypothesis read: *A Gambling with Intellectual Ownership* by Viola Mangusta (Jole de Sanna) published in «Metafisica», 1-2, pp. 311-316, and Riccardo Dottori’s essay *De Chirico, Savinio and the other Face of Modernity* *ibid.* p. 321-324., as well as the article by Maurizio Calvesi which is cited in footnote n. 17.

<sup>7</sup> In this periodical pp. 582 ff. This document, unknown until now, is of extraordinary importance due to Giorgio de Chirico’s declaration which refers to that particular period of time.

<sup>8</sup> P. Baldacci, *op. cit.*, 1994, where he refers to certain “amusements” of Paul Guillaume which were signed Giorgio de Chirico and put into commerce after the death of the art dealer (p. 89.) It also refers to a number of important Surrealist painters, for example Ernst (p. 89) and the circle of the Belgian Surrealists (p. 88, footnote n. 44) and in this regard, we do not feel that Magritte can be excluded. In addition, for P. Baldacci, it is right after March 1928 that “it is in this climate of contempt and undeserved appropriation of the artist’s work that the road was opened, first to copying, and then to forgery” (p. 89).

<sup>9</sup> G. de Chirico, *1918-1925 – Ricordi di Roma* (reprinted 1988, La Cometa, pp. 14-15).

<sup>10</sup> P. Baldacci, *op. cit.*, 1994, p. 214.

Surrealist friends) certainly did not wait until 1939 to take action. This date is supposed to act as a kind of filter in order to avoid taking earlier works declared fake by the Maestro into consideration. Fakes were produced in significant numbers (and not only by the hand of the Surrealists). As such, de Chirico treated the problem when he was able, and with greater vigour once he commenced the editing of the General Catalogue of his work with the examination of photographic reproductions which were sent to him.<sup>11</sup>

Unfortunately, after the Maestro's death, the works of that period declared false have gradually found themselves a placement which has been consolidated in time – and there are individuals who contributed to this – with repeated appearances expositions, publications etc. For one to question positions that have been thought to have been acquired once and for all, risks creating numerous problems. This occurs at times, but not only, when the Foundation is called upon to express judgement on such works. On these occasions the judgement given by the Maestro is always cited, even if not necessarily in a binding manner, in order for a work to be registered in the archive as requested.

In order to overcome such obstacles, it was necessary to find a radical solution able to delegitimise – *rectius* – and get rid of “*the words of Giorgio de Chirico*” once and for all. One begins therefore, with a presumptive premise, based on a contemptuous judgement (given in a different context but clearly indicative of a way of thinking which, if taken seriously, places a heavy mortgage each time one examines a painting contested by the Maestro): “*de Chirico was a Levantine: if he could cheat someone he would, without scruple, and this upset even Breton's exaggerated moralism [...]*”<sup>12</sup> in order to sustain that *today*, it is necessary to re-establish “*the objective truth concerning an important part of de Chirico's historical work, which the artist himself, [...] had wanted to irresponsibly negate*”<sup>13</sup>.

However, regarding this excessively exploited argument and the accusation that he reneged his metaphysical painting, one forgets that the Maestro himself responded without hesitation and he did so immediately and with firmness: “*All are full-out lies; I never reneged any manner of my painting*”, as we read in *Definition of a Fake Painting*.<sup>14</sup> There exists no period that Giorgio de Chirico reneged: he merely simply declared as fakes paintings that were not of his hand.

<sup>11</sup> The editing of the General Catalogue began at the end of the 1960s. The catalogue represents an essential tool for the study of Giorgio de Chirico's work, even if it often poses delicate problems regarding the choice of method with which it was compiled.

<sup>12</sup> P. Baldacci, *Savinio e il Surrealismo*, in *Alberto Savinio* edited by P. Vivarelli and P. Baldacci, Milan, 2002, p. 28. To get an idea of how authentic and coherent Breton's moralism was, as well as that of his surrealist friends, see what de Chirico wrote in this Periodical (pp. 590 ff.), and Jole de Sanna's article («*Metafisica*», n. 1-2, 2002, p. 62) and the text written by Baldacci cited in footnote n. 1, who, in addition wrote: “[...] we can accuse Breton of ideological forgery, sectarianism and distortion of de Chirico's work, and therefore of having carried out in Stalinist fashion the moral destruction of adversary; we can accuse him of creating the climate of disrepute in which the forgeries could be disseminated with disregard for the artist's reaction; but we still cannot accuse him of lack of respect for those old de Chirico works that he loved, Among the many declarations of authenticity and ownership drawn up by former Surrealists and their widows or lovers or companions, which included forgeries, there are none by Breton.” (p. 121) With this in mind it is difficult to speak of Breton's moralism. It is not possible that Breton be excused of having been disrespectful to de Chirico as a man, who he actually attacked physically on one occasion, just because he respected de Chirico's ancient work. Such “respect” did not stop him from inspiring, or at least tolerating everything the Surrealists did from 1926 on against de Chirico. In other words, the dirty work, including fake declarations of authenticity was left for others to accomplish.

<sup>13</sup> The phrases with quotation marks and in italics are taken from a letter (dated 2/5/2007) written by P. Baldacci, who gave testimony in the court case, deposited on 4/5/2007 in criminal lawsuit n. 5554/05. The phrase omitted in the square parentheses is: “as has been verified by the majority of scholars”.

<sup>14</sup> See in this Periodical on pp. 593 ff., as well as *The Memoirs of Giorgio de Chirico*, cit. It must be specified that the paintings contested by de Chirico are not limited to metaphysical paintings, and deal in fact with the period immediately after; which does not concord with the accusation of having repudiated his metaphysical painting.

Today, the hypothesised solution, in order to arrive “to the objective truth”, aims at removing a judicial sentence in favour of the Maestro regarding the abovementioned sentence delivered by the Rome Court of Appeal – “mother of all battles” – which “allows still today, in contempt of all evidence and scorn of the truth, the artist’s word to stand against documents, testimonies and the most blatant proof”<sup>15</sup>. And, in case that “a clear position is not taken in merit of this sentence and this painting, [...] we will know whether we can still hope to shed light on de Chirico by study or if we will have to bow down before the Holy Office guardian of Orthodoxy”<sup>16</sup> which possesses “revealed truths”.

This strange and rhetoric way of reasoning (exaggerated to say the least, concerning both the result it hopes to produce and that which it fears) seems deceitfully constructed in the aspiration of creating a fictitious and dogmatic counter position which can be reassumed as *De Chirico’s word can always be relied on* (it is apparently in this that the Foundation’s orthodoxy resides) to *De Chirico’s word can never be relied on* (on this occasion, Paolo Baldacci invests the role of grand Inquisitor: where the one undergoing the inquisition is always Giorgio de Chirico, and not only to with regard to his painting).<sup>17</sup>

This way of reasoning shows its cunning as well as its fragility, whereas its finality is not only declared but evident. In reality, it is a matter of *getting rid of, once and for all, de Chirico’s say in the matter*. The “irresponsible” Giorgio de Chirico would be, today, not only post-mortem, but finally expropriated, *with retroactive effect*, of his right to express his opinion concerning his own paintings.

It is impossible not to see a profound analogy, in another salient and successful expropriation, the one enacted by Breton and the Surrealists, in which de Chirico was the victim: “*The Surrealist’s misappropriation of de Chirico is one of the most extraordinary stories [of intellectual and artistic expropriation ever inflicted on a man] [...]*”<sup>18</sup>

Even then, a convention hostile to him was employed in order to expropriate the Artist’s creative strength while he was in the process of creating the base for a number of artistic events of the twentieth century such as Classicism, Surrealism, right up to Pop Art, and in the end, his Neo-Metaphysical period.

However, it is important to remember that what happened in the mid 1920s, was designed *even then*, not with the aim of following the “noble” ends professed by the Surrealists, but was actually, as de Chirico writes, aimed at boosting the flowering art market for metaphysical painting by saying that de Chirico’s geniality was exhausted and that the metaphysical works were something that went beyond what he had become and hence out-lived him.<sup>19</sup> This conformist censorship was established *then* and *today* it repeats identical leitmotifs perfect for every occasion.

<sup>15</sup> See footnote n. 13.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibidem*

<sup>17</sup> The negative judgment afforded to de Chirico, following along the line of Breton and Longhi, emerges clearly in the writings of the last few years by this author, as well as in his monograph on Metaphysics of 1997 and the essay cited in footnote 12 (pp. 19 ff.) and in a further study entitled *De Chirico e Savinio, la Parabola di una Fratellanza Intellettuale* in the same catalogue (pp. 55 and ff.), previously published in German with the title *Zu zweit hatten wir einen einzigen Gedanken*. Die concordia discors der Dioskuren, pp. 45 and ff. Exhibition catalogue “Die Andere Moderne De Chirico-Savinio”, Hotje Cantz Verlag (Dusseldorf, 15/9 – 10/12/2001), and in the recent exhibition catalogue of the show at Palazzo Zabarella in Padova. Professor Maurizio Calvesi wrote an article in 1999, *De Chirico dall’Arno alla Senna* (in *Ars*, aprile 1999, p. 46 ff.) in which he formulated a well-founded and convincing critique concerning Baldacci’s thesis regarding the time and place of the birth of Metaphysical Art: Florence and not Milan, whether the paternity of such is ascribable to de Chirico alone or also to his brother Savinio.

<sup>18</sup> Baldacci, op. cit., 1994, p. 11. (The text in square parentheses has been added by the editor of this Periodical. It provides content from the original Italian text which was omitted in the original English translation.)

<sup>19</sup> In this Periodical pp. 593 ff. See also P. Baldacci, 1994 cit., p. 229 “So they decided to excommunicate him by declaring war on him, a war that was especially a mercantile war [...]” See in this Periodical *Fake de Chiricos*, p. 590.

If the hoped-for result of permanently silencing the artist's word is achieved, other authoritative and self-referential "Words", based on three categories of elements, of various qualifications and evidently of a different weight such as: "documents", "testimonies" and "the most blatant proof" will have the merit of re-establishing "the objective truth".

These are three elements which are potentially dangerous, insomuch as they do not entail the support of a prior and thorough examination of *the original* of each work that has been contested, especially when these elements are used to demonstrate a pre-packaged "truth" whereas *de Chirico's word can never be relied on*. It is therefore necessary to at least ask oneself who it is who decides, and to what end, when the proof of falsity is blatant and when it is not, because if "falsity is founded in judgement [...] and can not be considered as a property inherent in the object" as Cesare Brandi wrote in his analysis on artwork, it is necessary that judgment be at least exempt of prejudice.<sup>20</sup>

It is evident that this foolishly ambitious and unhinging design has no place in the scientific world. Its radicalism prevents there from being any basis for confrontation.

The objective of the Giorgio and Isa de Chirico Foundation is much more straightforward. It consists in safeguarding the Maestro's artistic and intellectual personality in order to valorise and honour his work and memory as well as, together with other objectives, the individuation and recognition of his authentic works, so as to continue the fight against falsification of the Maestro's work, which is unfortunately still current. This is what the Foundation's *Orthodoxy* consists in, and it is proud of it.

The Foundation possesses a precious archive that gives testimony to the various periods of the Maestro's production and documents the uninterrupted production of fakes. The archive contains declarations of falsity handwritten by the Maestro.

For the Foundation, the Maestro's declarations benefit from a *presumption of truthfulness* that is in the Author's rights, whether they are affirmative or negative, and accepted until proof of the contrary. Hence, we are not dealing with "revealed truths", but truths originating from Giorgio de Chirico which are to be respected and accepted.

Works that were declared fake by the Maestro, especially those executed only by examining photographs on the back of which the judgement was written, or on photographs in catalogues, or regarding works upon which contradictory declarations were later given, even pertaining to works published in his General Catalogue<sup>21</sup>, are particularly problematic and should be taken into consideration with a sense of balance and prudence, keeping in mind, as I have expressed<sup>22</sup> that the Maestro has been mistaken on a number of occasions.<sup>23</sup>

<sup>20</sup> C. Brandi, *Teoria del Restauro*, Einaudi, Turin, 1997, p. 65. Documents, especially of sure and verifiable provenance, together with the examination of the painting, are without doubt useful in order to form judgement on difficult questions. Testimony and blatant proof, in my advice, leave a lot to be desired: first of all as they are unreliable, as any historian knows and secondly for their total subjectivity. De Chirico observed, "Unfortunately, those who have to do with art, be it ancient or modern, are more interested in the historical aspect, [...] than the painting" *Ricordi di Roma*, cit. p.50.

<sup>21</sup> This is the case of an *Italian Piazza*, dated 1914, published in the General Catalogue which the Maestro, once he had occasion to examine the original painting, declared false and acknowledged his error.

<sup>22</sup> See «*Metafisica*» n. 1-2, 2002, p. 337.

<sup>23</sup> The Artist himself told me of the danger inherent in calling judgement on the basis of photographic reproductions, to a point where the back of many of the photographs kept in the archive carry a written request to examine the original work and at times, even contradicting opinions are found. The Foundation is studying the option of publishing the photographs of all the works which were contested by the Maestro in a specific publication.

The Foundation has been, for some time, following an autonomous path (as is known to people in this field) concerning the works declared fake by the Maestro, which is that of examining the original work directly, hence case by case, by taking into consideration all aspects in depth and when possible using the technical and scientific instrumentation available today, as well as adequate documentation where it exists. It is by following this *modus operandi* that, on a few occasions the Foundation has expressed itself differently from the Maestro, and reassessed works of Giorgio de Chirico, which had been contested and thus registered them in the archive with other authentic works. As seen, this is anything but a bureaucratic activity.

The position of the Foundation is one of balance, which was also the position of Soby who said: *"We should pay attention to what de Chirico himself said. In cases where he declares a picture attributed to him to be false, he is generally right"*<sup>24</sup>.

From this, it follows that no generalization of a contrary kind is consented, or rather, the inversion of Giorgio de Chirico's declarations to mean something else: *"the word"* always remains with the Maestro and can only be deactivated with motivation by the Foundation, *case by case* and *only* upon the result of the examination of the original work and the outcome of careful investigation, which ascertains an eventual error of judgement which the Maestro may have incurred, keeping in mind the opinion given by the Foundation if it contrasts that of the Maestro.<sup>25</sup>

We are convinced that the orthodoxy and non-bureaucratic way of operating of the Foundation fully answers its statutory aims and is capable of satisfying the requirements of those who endeavour to look for the truth without preconceived ideas.

#### Note

The writings and essays published in this issue of the Periodical pertain to 2005-2006, with the exception of a few corrections and additions. The above editorial refers to acts and documents that are subsequent, regarding which it has become necessary for the Foundation to take a stand.

<sup>24</sup> W. Schmied, foreword, 1994, cit, p. II.

<sup>25</sup> No-one objects when historians, art historians, and art critics manifest dissenting ideas as they have always done and will always do, and freely so, and often without even mentioning the Maestro's opinion, even if only to contest it. It is a pity when such ideas are purposely meant, especially with unacceptable means, to be imposed on others. Calvesi, in the above mentioned article (footnote 17) observed in reference to works contested by de Chirico and other scholars, that: *"Baldacci silences the opinions of others which are different from his own, not only concerning the big problem of placement and interpretation, but also, and this is more worrying, regarding the authorship of the paintings; paintings that have been judged fake are considered as authentic without even mentioning the annoying objections. Up until now, in the scientific catalogue of an artist's work, the single files would always take into account every opinion that had been previously expressed; regarding the dating of the piece and attributions. It has never happened that eventual judgements of non authenticity could be overlooked. The catalogue edited by Baldacci marks a "step forward" to the simplification of studies. Baldacci is not only a scholar of twentieth century art, he is also an art dealer and his methods may please other art dealers, for the simplification they bring. Unfortunately, I like them less."* (p. 59)