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Preface

Imagine a medieval, carved wooden Madonna that has hung in the same church, in the same place for hundreds of years. Generation after generation has admired her beauty as she mysteriously gazes down upon the most important occasions in life, from christenings to funerals. Or imagine a painting in one of our major museums, a picture that has formed the attitudes of a whole nation, town or atmosphere of an era. All schoolchildren have passed some of these paintings, and they have helped to create our common identity.

If the medieval sculpture or painting is stolen or disappears, it can never be replaced, no matter what insurances we have. That is what separates cultural heritage theft from other theft, which may cause major damage but can usually be replaced.

We also have a lesser-known heritage under our feet, at the bottom of the sea. There are ancient monuments and shipwrecks waiting to be discovered and tell us about our history. But what happens if they are “discovered” by the wrong people? The knowledge that grave robbers and looters conceal from archaeologists leaves gaps in our historical puzzle.

We, and all others responsible for criminal policies and criminological research, have not taken crime in the cultural area seriously enough. One reason could be that we have not quite understood how much damage is caused, how generations are affected when medieval sculptures disappear from our churches and paintings are stolen from museums. We have now launched a new concept, cultural heritage crime, to explain the significance of crime that targets our cultural heritage.

The results are presented in this study, which is a Nordic collaboration between the Danish Commission on Export of Cultural Assets (Trine Østergaard, Camilla Mynster and Jakob Christian Bertram), the Norwegian Archive, Library and Museum Authority (Morten Skadsem), the Swedish National Heritage Board (Anna-Gretha Eriksson), the National Board of Antiquities/Finland (Leena Söyrinki-Harmo), the Swedish National Police (Jan-Åke Bylund), Swedish Customs (Karin Hansen and Sara Andersson), the Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention (Brå) and the European Police Office Europol (Dirk Deklerck, Serious Crime Department). The EU Commission’s AGIS Programme has financed the project.

Researchers Göran Hedlund, Sofia Elwér and Daniel Vesterhav from Brå, and doctoral candidate Anita Heber from the Department of Criminology at Stockholm University have written the report. The work has been led by Lars Korsell, Doctor of Laws, Brå.

The following people have contributed to the project by conducting interviews or assisting with other tasks: Kamilla Fleicher Michaelsen, Jan Liljewalch, Olle Niklasson, Elise Norrekjær, Sofie Fleischer Michaelsen, Sigfrid Arneberget Øien, Suvi Säätelä, Karolin Wallström and Johanna Sundholm.

A reference group has taken part in the project’s two seminars, which besides the project’s partners, has included Mats Attin from the Swedish
National Criminal Intelligence Service, Anton Biktimorov from the Estonian Crime Department of Põhja Prefecture, Lars Björk from the Swedish Royal Library, Anne Margit Borge from Norwegian Customs, Henning Hammel Bulow from Danish Customs, Kenneth Didriksen from the Norwegian Eco-Criminal Police, Jytte B. Ekdahl from the Danish Criminal Intelligence Service, Øyvind Endresen from Norwegian Customs, Trine Höjseth at the Norwegian Customs, Jarkko Keskinen from Finnish Customs, Karl Heinz Kind from Interpol and Tora Synnøve Myre from the Norwegian Archive, Library and Museum Authority.

The project’s Nordic partners, members of the reference group, and the interviewers Jan Liljewalch and Olle Niklasson have reviewed the report.

The report is intended for all players in the cultural heritage area, from the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Cultural Affairs, government departments and agencies for cultural issues to individual museums, libraries, Archives and other cultural heritage institutions. It is intended for government agencies that exercise control and supervisory functions in the culture sector, customs and the police. It is also intended for dealers who run antique shops, second-hand bookshops and auctions, and the general public.

The 16th century map on the report cover presents a rough picture of the Scandinavian geography. Future might pass the same judgement on this report, as the first rough work that outlines the extension and structure of Cultural Heritage Crime in the Nordic countries. With the same ambition as the mapdrawers we will continue to get a cleaver picture of the field as Brå aims to continue producing knowledge of Cultural Heritage Crime in the future.

Stockholm in January 2006

Jan Andersson,
Phd
Director-General
Summary

Cultural heritage crime

This report contains the first Nordic study of cultural heritage crime. It includes theft of cultural objects from preservers, such as museums and churches, and from dealers, such as antique shops and auction houses. Cultural heritage crime also includes the illegal movement/export of protected cultural objects that even though they are legally acquired, may not be taken out of the country without a permit. The illegal import of these objects from other countries also constitutes cultural heritage crime. The looting of ancient monuments and protected shipwrecks is also included.

The report is based on 2,111 questionnaire responses from preservers and dealers in Norway, Denmark, Sweden and Finland, and 150 interviews with players and experts in these countries. A study has also been made of Danish Internet trade in cultural objects.

As the studies cover such a broad cultural heritage area, the results cannot be summarised in a few simple words. Cultural heritage crime varies, depending on the types of objects, where the objects are kept and the countries where they are located. Let us take a walk through the fields of cultural heritage crime, from the actual theft of a cultural object until it arrives in the hands of a non-suspecting buyer. The results of the studies will be presented as we travel.

Our story begins with a theft, but first of all we need an offender. What types of offenders steal cultural objects and what are their motives?

Different thieves, one financial motive

Several different types of thieves steal cultural objects: thieves who spontaneously exploit an opportunity, addicts who steal whatever they can find, professional thieves who steal whatever they think might be valuable, thieves who work on commission and thieves with knowledge of cultural objects. In the questionnaire study, the victimized preservers and dealers say that the most common motive is financial gain. Of the dealers victimized during the last five years, 68 per cent say that financial motives underlie the thefts. The corresponding figure for preservers is 41 per cent. Of the victimized museums, 38 per cent say that visitors lie behind the disappearance. Even antique dealers say that visitors are responsible for most thefts (48 per cent of them have been victimized), but gangs of thieves are also considered a major problem (13 per cent).

An underestimated category of offenders is employees (insiders). They are close to the objects and can also influence inventories and other measures to avoid being discovered. To the same degree that employees are underestimated as offenders, neither is the eccentric collector who steals objects for his private and secret collections considered a real problem. Our data
suggests that these people constitute a marginal group of offenders because of their obsessive interest in specific books or coins.

**Worst affected are museums, libraries, antique dealers and second-hand bookshops**

The next step is to find a theft target. In the preservers group, Nordic museums and libraries are most liable to theft. Every year during the past three years, an average of ten per cent of the museums that took part in the questionnaire study and 12 per cent of libraries have lost cultural objects. But even churches, Archives and open air museums have been victimized. Amongst dealers, an average of 12 per cent of second-hand booksellers and an equally large percentage of antique dealers have experienced theft of cultural objects annually during the past three years. During this same period, five of the 28 interviewed auction houses have indicated this in the questionnaire.

**Not all crimes are spectacular**

Now the offender chooses an object. What types of objects are stolen from the targets? Mainly historical everyday objects, such as kitchen utensils and tools are stolen from museums and local history societies, where not all objects have a high financial value. These objects are not protected and it is easy for visitors to take them. Open air museums also lose many objects that are not terribly valuable, except for their cultural significance for the district. Churches and antique dealers say that candlesticks and silver are stolen most. Wooden carvings and other antiquities are also stolen from churches. For churches, missing cultural objects have a strong negative effect on the local community, regardless of their financial value, because the objects have been in the church for generations. Swedish churches in particular have experienced a series of thefts where many unique cultural objects have disappeared.

Libraries differ from these other theft targets because they lose predominantly rare and valuable books, maps and illustrations; objects that can be sold on the international market. It is also a specialised area where thieves act upon knowledge and commission-based choices.

Visitors usually steal from both preservers and dealers during the day. Burglary is the most common method for stealing from open air museums, however, because of the restricted opening hours. Around 90 per cent of victimized Swedish open air museums say that theft has taken place through burglary, and the corresponding figure for Finnish neighbours is 56 per cent.

**Security, registers and inventories**

In order to steal a cultural object, there must be an opportunity, and this is created by poor security. The preservers who were interviewed named staff
routines and security prioritisations as weak areas from a security perspective.

Factors that can determine whether thefts are discovered are registers and regular inventories. Of the Nordic museums in the questionnaire study, 63 per cent said that they have registers for all of their cultural objects. Of the Swedish churches, 90 per cent say they have complete registers, compared to 57 per cent in Finland, 46 per cent in Norway and seven of the nine churches that were studied in Denmark. In the dealers' group, 20 of the 28 auction houses and about one third of second-hand booksellers said that they have complete registers. Registers with descriptions and photos are also important for recovering stolen objects.

If the value of the stolen objects is not considered high enough, or the circumstances surrounding the disappearance are unclear, the theft is probably not reported to the police. Of the victimized museums, 75 per cent reported the incident, compared to 81 per cent of antique dealers and 32 per cent of second-hand booksellers.

On the market

To make a profit out of cultural heritage crime, the thief has to sell the stolen objects. As the legal cultural object market in the form of antique dealers, second-hand bookshops, galleries and auction houses predominantly handles second-hand objects, it is well suited to stolen goods.

Thieves have contact with fences who can dispose of stolen goods through their own legitimate businesses or transfer them to other dealers. Objects can thus travel far from the place they were stolen and even to other countries.

We suppose that the thief has sold the stolen objects to a fence who also runs a business, in this case a second-hand market. Neither the thief nor the dealer is capable of assessing the correct quality and value of the stolen cultural objects. The price is therefore low and favourable for a knowledgeable collector, who buys the object without suspecting that it has been stolen and considers it a find, as experts sometimes do in the sub-vegetation of the antique market. The collector resells the object on the same day to an antique dealer on the high street. This antique dealer cares about his reputation and is very careful about who he buys from. But the collector is a well-known and distinguished visitor, and the cultural object is soon sitting in the shop window with a much higher price tag than it had in the second-hand market. Because the object is offered in a conventional manner in a relevant and legitimate business, it has been transformed from black to white; it has been laundered.

Respectable dealers use different methods to avoid buying stolen goods. In the questionnaire study, 70 per cent of the antique dealers who purchased objects during the past 12 months say that they control objects. The most common form of control is to check the object's provenance (57 per cent). Seventeen per cent of antique dealers say that they have checked the object with the police in the stolen property register. Antique dealers also
check the seller, and 95 per cent of the dealers claim that they have demands on the seller. The most common demand is ID.

Even though unusual objects are stolen, it is not usually possible to identify them exactly. The market is huge and many objects are circulating. It is rare that objects are linked back to a particular theft or an original owner. After all, not many of these objects are unique paintings that are stolen from the country’s largest museums. In the study of Danish Internet trade, not one single stolen good that was reported to the police could be identified.

**Illegal movement/export**

The same day that a once-stolen cultural object appears in the window of an expensive antique shop, a foreign tourist walks past, sees the object and goes into the shop. Even though the antique dealer explains that the object is very old and valuable – a museum piece – the tourist resells the object to a business acquaintance later that day and there is never any discussion of an export permit. The object is then taken out of the country in violation of national laws.

This means that illegal movement/export is carried out in the dark, which makes it difficult to quantify. Of all the respondents in the main questionnaire study, only 62 (4 per cent) said that they knew of cases where cultural objects were taken out of the country illicitly. The interviews indicate that this is a larger problem, however, far greater than what is shown by the questionnaire. But the interviews have been difficult to evaluate because only experts can say whether objects are covered by legislation or not. As such, it is difficult to assess the scope of the problem. There is a risk that the problems associated with illegal movement/export are exaggerated. The market solves the law’s intentions in many cases, because the demand for some protected objects is greatest in their country of origin. There is an international market for some objects, however. Our assessment is that despite the difficulties of enforcing the law, illegal movement/export is a problem although the dimensions should not be overestimated.

One major and obvious problem that has appeared in the studies is that there is no consensus on protective legislation. That cultural objects from the 1900s are not protected by the legislation is criticised, and suggested solutions include government purchases or incentives as an alternative to prohibitions.

**Illegal import**

The studies have not attempted to plot illegal import, as this is an area that should be studied together with the countries of origin, and transit countries.

In the questionnaire study, only 38 respondents (3 per cent) say that they know about cases of illegal import. The interviews indicate that Nordic countries constitute a relatively small market for objects that are imported illicitly. The objects that are mentioned in the interviews come
from China. There are signs in the interview material that permit-issuing procedures in the countries of origin are corrupt.

From an international perspective, illegal import is a major problem because it seriously affects the gathering of archaeological knowledge. It should also be noted that the consequences of movement/export from Nordic countries do not compare with the looting of poor countries’ heritage through illegal excavations.

Thieves with metal detectors or diving suits

Cultural heritage crimes also include illegal excavations, the looting of ancient monuments and plundering of shipwrecks. These crimes are difficult to detect because nobody knows what has been taken.

Of the 145 people in the questionnaire study who claim that they work with excavations, only three answered that objects had disappeared from archaeological excavation sites. Illegal excavations can also take place on ancient monuments without scheduled excavations, which makes them difficult to detect. The interviews confirm that illegal excavations do take place. Some interviewees say however that this is a local rather than a general problem.

According to the study, the plundering of protected hundred-year-old shipwrecks and illicit removal of objects from newer ships is a far greater problem than archaeological excavations. Shipwrecks also fall victim to the kind of collector who takes objects as souvenirs. Information about shipwrecks is based completely on interviews, however, which makes it difficult to assess the exact scope of the problem.

What do we need to know more about?

Theft from libraries and Archives is very difficult to detect, which categorizes them as a special target. The number of unrecorded cases is probably extremely high. Further studies in this area would be interesting.

Church theft in Norway, Denmark and Finland requires more study in order to understand the scope and structure of the problem.

Illicit movement/export is an area that is difficult to assess. This is probably because the people who export the objects are usually their owners. Custom checks of goods that leave the country are also extremely limited. Compiling data in this area is thus problematic and should be investigated separately.

Illegal import is another area that requires further investigation.

Based on an analysis of the circumstances surrounding cultural heritage crime, risk assessment methods should be developed for each different type of institution and dealer affected by cultural heritage crime.

How can theft be reduced?

More effective security could prevent a large amount of theft. Scanty knowledge about the scope and structure of theft and the absence of continual
security planning, including risk assessments, means that security measures are often misdirected and ineffective. Basically, increased and more systemised knowledge of the scope and structure of cultural heritage crime is the best method of prevention.

Crime prevention authorities prioritise catching offenders rather than trying to recover stolen cultural objects. Object recovery should therefore become a more important part of crime prevention. This means that registers should be improved, contain photos, be easy to update, and user friendly.

How can illegal trade be reduced?

Increasing the risk of discovery requires much better control of trading practises. The increased presence of authorities leads to better contacts, which brings more suggestions and tips and, in turn, more intervention and a greater risk of discovery. Support for trade should be improved by making it easier to access registers of stolen objects and check objects. Information about provenance should be demanded, and establishment of an object’s provenance thirty years back in time should be rule of thumb.

Police should prioritise the handling of stolen objects because this is the lead where stealing becomes organized.

How can illicit movement/export and import be reduced?

As mentioned, legislation that safeguards against the movement/export of cultural objects has been questioned and should be reviewed. And even if this legislation is not reviewed, it should be validated, and culture institutions in particular should work harder to inform the public about the regulations that apply.

There is almost no control of objects that are taken out of the country. Control in this area should thus be strengthened, and contacts between customs and the culture sector should be improved to help with the assessment of objects that are discovered in customs checks.

How can cultural objects be recovered?

In contrast to other areas, museums and other crime targets want to recover the actual objects that were stolen. Inventories and accurate registers are needed to simplify this procedure. This presumes that police and customs also increase their interest in cultural objects.

How can the looting of ancient monuments and shipwrecks be reduced?

Ancient monuments and shipwrecks are difficult to guard. One control method sometimes applied is to let clubs adopt ancient monuments and shipwrecks so as to increase supervision.
Knowledge, prioritisation and control

Based on the results, assessments and proposals can be summarised by saying that knowledge of cultural heritage crimes is limited, which in turn leads to incorrect prioritisations by all parties, from the victimised crime targets through to crime prevention authorities. Prioritisations can be adjusted by raising knowledge of this crime. But knowledge and prioritisations will never replace action. Control is needed – of dealers, visitors, employees, import and export. Control must be based on knowledge and prioritisations. Knowledge, prioritisation and control are inseparable.

Summaries of each area are presented in Cultural heritage crime in the Nordic region – results of the study, on page 62 ff. There is also a summary of the results for the whole of the study on page 163 ff, at the end of the same section.
Introduction

Most people have heard about the stolen Munch paintings in Oslo, the dramatic coup against the National Museum of Fine Arts in Stockholm where Rembrandt’s self-portrait and two paintings of Renoir were stolen, and the systematic book thefts from the Royal Library in Copenhagen. These cases have received enormous media attention in both the Nordic region and the rest of the world, and the institutions concerned have been criticised for their poor security systems. Something unnoticed by the media, however, is that these spectacular art thefts are part of a larger threat scenario for cultural heritage that also includes less sensational crime. It includes the theft of cultural objects, illegal excavations, illicit removal of cultural objects and trade with stolen or illicitly removed cultural objects. Handling this type of crime requires stronger measures than just improving the security systems in the institutions that hold valuable cultural objects. In Crime against the Cultural Heritage – the Nordic Dimension, the goal has been to study these crimes from a holistic perspective as a means of analysing the structures and mechanisms that are unique to the field, and developing proposals for effective crime prevention measures. The international term that is used to describe this phenomenon is Art Crime, which is usually associated with spectacular thefts from internationally known museums. We thus launch the broader concept of Cultural Heritage Crime, which covers the whole threat scenario for cultural heritage.

An important part of this project has been to produce a theoretic model of the cultural heritage crime area, which is then used as a basis for analysing the quantitative and qualitative data from the study. The aim is that this model will function as a map of cultural heritage crime in future studies.

International trade in cultural objects, like all other international markets, has expanded over the last few decades due to globalisation (Brodie, Doole and Watson, 2000). This has also led to a larger market for the illegal trade of stolen or illicitly exported cultural objects. The scope of illegal trade in cultural objects is difficult to assess, however, because there are no reliable statistics in the area.

The Nordic region lies on the periphery of the international art and antique market and constitutes an unexplored field in relation to theft, illegal export and trade in cultural objects. Apart from the previously mentioned cases of theft that have appeared in the media, there is not much documentation in this area. There are no statistics on the scope and nature of this type of theft, which means that the crime prevention programmes developed by various cultural institutions are unbalanced, and the battle against cultural heritage crimes is like Don Quixote attacking windmills, a battle against false conceptions. The goals of the Theft of the World project have been to produce an overall analysis of the cultural heritage crimes area in four Nordic countries with quantitative facts on primarily theft, and qualitative analyses of markets and players. Only by knowing what crime in fact looks like is it possible to introduce effective preventive measures. The
The aim is then to continue analysing and developing specific crime prevention measures in a specialised project.

The Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention has implemented the Theft of the World project in collaboration with the National Heritage Board in Sweden, the National Cultural Heritage Agency in Denmark, the Norwegian Archive, Library and Museum Authority and the National Board of Antiquities in Finland. The Nordic police and customs services and the European Police Office, Europol have also contributed. The EU Commission’s AGIS programme and the Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention (Brå) have funded the project.

Purpose and questions

The purpose of the project is to increase knowledge of markets and players in the field of cultural heritage crime, and understand the scope of the problems. The project will propose new solutions for dealing with illegal trade, and focus on improving practises, training and cooperation between crime prevention and public authorities both within and between the four Nordic countries.

Due to lack of knowledge in the area, a number of questions have been formulated:

- What is the extent of problems with theft, illicit removal, illegal trade in art and antiquities and ancient monument crime in the four Nordic countries?
- How can the market and players involved in this illegal trade be described?
- To what extent is cultural heritage crime organized?
- What kind of legislation exists in relation to cultural objects, and how do the responsible authorities in each respective country apply this legislation?
- What crime prevention measures can be suggested, based on the project’s results?

Implementation

This study has been implemented by Brå’s Secretariat for Research into Economic and Organized Crime. A reference group was formed for the study with contact persons from cultural heritage authorities in Norway, Denmark, Finland and Sweden. Representatives from customs and police authorities in Nordic countries, and one representative from Europol were also involved in this network. Around 25 people were involved in the reference group.

The study has been implemented in three phases, which are presented in Figure 1. The first and second phases concluded with seminars where the reference group discussed the results and the work that took place in the

---

1 The names of all people in the reference group are listed in the preface.
project. Representatives from the Estonian police also took part in these meetings as observers.

Figure 1 Project timeline.

The first phase of the project comprised art crime literature, establishment of contacts in the cultural heritage area including visiting the Nordic culture institutions taking part in the project, construction, distribution and gathering of questionnaires plus interviews with the relevant players. This phase concluded with a seminar in Copenhagen on March 3–4 2005, where the preliminary results of the questionnaire study were presented and discussed.

The second phase was based on reflections that emerged from the seminar in Copenhagen. Several interviews were conducted and analysed, an Internet study was implemented in Denmark, the questionnaire results were analysed in depth and legislation was studied. The second phase concluded with a seminar in Oslo on June 2–3 2005, where the focus was crime prevention proposals for further action.

In the third and final phase, the material was further analysed based on reflections from the seminar in Oslo, the report was produced and strategies for disseminating results and continued research were developed. During the third phase on October 17, 2005, a progress report was also published on the theft of cultural objects from churches in Sweden as an extension of the overall project (Brå, 2005).

At the same time as Brottsplats Kyrkan (Crime Scene: The Church) (Brå, 2005) was published, this substudy was also presented for the Ministry of Education, Research and Culture, the Swedish National Council for Cultural Affairs and the Central Coordinating Committee for Sweden’s Ecclesiastical Heritage.

During the project, Brå has also taken part in the Swedish “export group”, comprising representatives from permit-issuing authorities, customs and police, who are tasked with controlling and monitoring the development of export issues in relation to cultural objects in Sweden.

A representative from Brå also took part in the Danish Customs training “Told-Kulturavv gentand” in Copenhagen, June 13–15, 2005.
Method

This study has different components: A questionnaire, an interview study carried out by six interviewers in the Nordic countries and a study of the Internet based antiquity trade in Denmark. We have also compared national legislation on the export of cultural objects, and how it is applied. The different components are presented below in more detail.

Nordic questionnaire

The aim of the questionnaire was to explore cultural heritage crime and the conditions surrounding art crime. The questions cover the depth and range of the research area and relate specifically to four aspects of theft and the illegal trade in cultural objects: theft, trade, security, and the illegal export and import of cultural objects. The purpose has been to give a general view of cultural heritage crime in Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden and because of its wide range the questionnaire study has not been able to present at detailed coverage and analysis of all included issues. The study does however present a first quantitative material of artcrime in the different fields. Many of the included fields could however also benefit from a in-depth investigation of specific circumstances.

The main purpose of the questionnaire is to study the extent of cultural heritage crime. All information on the theft of cultural objects in this investigation is unique material. The information includes the number of thefts during the period 2002–2005 and the circumstances, including when, from where and what cultural objects were stolen.

In the same way that the demand for a specific type of object creates an opportunity for an illegal market, the demand for cultural objects, i.e. trade with cultural objects, can be seen as the generator of cultural heritage theft for financial motives. The illegal market is closely linked to the legal market, and loopholes in the legal market are exploited to launder stolen objects. The section in the questionnaire on trade thus includes questions on general routines for trade with cultural objects, and on the existence of stolen objects on the market.

The preventive measures that the players themselves consider most important are different types of security measures. The third section of the questionnaire is devoted to the security situation in organisations that handle cultural objects. The questions focus on supervisory routines and the documentation of collections, including inventories and photo registers.

The fourth and final area covered by the questionnaire is illicit international trade in cultural objects that are protected by law because of their national culture heritage value. This section includes questions on the awareness of legislation, and routines for trade with foreign buyers.

DEFINITIONS

The questionnaire defines cultural objects as “objects of artistic, historic or archaeological value regardless of age. Examples of cultural objects are
paintings, books, furniture, archive objects, archaeological objects, textiles, coins, glass, silver, ceramics and objects from churches."

As this definition covers such a wide range of cultural objects, it is possible to identify the objects that lie in the risk zone for theft and illegal export. In the section on theft, the objects are also described according to age and type, which makes it possible to exclude the less interesting objects. This broad definition also enables a study of how legislation corresponds to practice in the export area. In the section on illegal export of cultural objects, the follow-up questions are different for each country because of differences in the national laws. The aim is to avoid a situation where respondents have to either already know or feel they have to find out about their own national legislation in order to answer the questions.

Illegal import is defined as cultural objects that are exported in violation of the law of their country of origin in accordance with the 1970 UNESCO Convention, which has been ratified by all countries in this study.

PLAYERS

This study covers the different types of players that handle cultural objects. The questionnaire was sent to 2,799 respondents in Sweden, Norway, Denmark and Finland. All project partners in the Nordic countries have taken part in the selection of players for the questionnaire study.

The number of approached respondents has been adjusted downwards from 3,187 to 2,799 due to a mistake in the distribution process in Norway, where the questionnaires were distributed to libraries and carriers who were not involved in the area, so the answers in these categories are independent cases rather than a representative selection. These two categories in Norway have also been removed from the numbers presented above in order to give a fairer presentation of the Norwegian distribution.

The number of distributed questionnaires is higher in Sweden than in the other countries. This is due to an in-depth study of churches in Sweden, where 886 churches received the questionnaire (see details below).

SELECTION OF RESPONDENTS

The selection of respondents differs between groups due to size and organisation. The overall goal has been to present a picture of cultural heritage crime in all victimized areas through sample studies. The cultural heritage authority of each country involved in the project has decided what and how many players to approach with the questionnaire in each field, with consideration for the structural differences of each cultural institution. The selection in each of the different groups is presented below. The respondents are divided into two groups: preservers and dealers.

---

2 This definition is based on Article 2 in the UNIDROIT Convention.
3 SOU 2005:3 page 104. In 2004 the Norwegian Parliament decided on a ratification of the Unesco Convention and the Norwegian cultural heritage legislation has been adjusted. The formal ratification has not yet been executed. This will probable happen during 2006.
In the selection of preservers of cultural objects, the focus lies on public players such as museums, libraries, archives, universities and churches. Private collectors are not included.

Dealers are involved in commercial areas such as trade or export. Both first and second hand dealers are part of this group, including runners, pawnshops, restorers and carriers.

RESPONSE RATE

Of 2,799 distributed questionnaires, 2,111 were answered which gave a response rate of 75 per cent (Table 1). As shown in the table below, Sweden, Norway and Finland have a similar response rate while Denmark is 10 per cent higher. This is probably due to the more selective distribution of questionnaires in Denmark. As the questionnaire covers such a broad spectrum of areas and not all areas apply for all types of respondents, this is a surprisingly high response rate. This probably indicates that these are important issues for the respondents.

Table 1: The number of selected respondents, responses and response rates for Sweden, Norway, Denmark and Finland.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Respondents (N)</th>
<th>Answers (n)</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>1447</td>
<td>1086</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2799</td>
<td>2111</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The response rate differs between the different groups. Museums and archives had the best response rate with 93% in both groups. Five hundred and eighty three of the 625 approached Nordic museums responded to the questionnaire, and 54 of 58 Archives responded. Categories with marginal handling of cultural objects like carriers, universities and pawnshops tend to have a lower response rate.

The interview study

While the questionnaire presents a broad description of the field, the interview study provides a complementary picture and an opportunity to penetrate some of the issues. The questionnaire provides a framework, while the interviews give a more detailed description that would otherwise be difficult.

---

4 For a more detailed description of the selection process, see Appendix 1.
5 For a more detailed description of the selection process, see Appendix 1.
6 Norwegian libraries are not included in this presentation. Due to a faulty selection process, the questionnaire was sent to 388 libraries in Norway, of which most are irrelevant for this investigation. The libraries where not reminded to answer the questionnaire. Eighty-two libraries responded (21%). Excluding the Norwegian libraries from this general description of response rate provides a more representative presentation of the material.
7 For a more detailed description of the response rate, see Appendix 1.
to achieve with just a questionnaire. As this study deals with both legal and illegal markets that sometimes merge, we have had to use different methods for gathering information.

The interviewed individuals are representatives from customs, police, cultural heritage authorities, Archives, libraries and museums as well as key persons from churches and permit-issuing authorities. Dealers in art, antiques and books plus representatives from auction houses are also interviewed. The interview material has been gathered from two offenders convicted of cultural heritage crimes, insurance companies, archaeologists, marine archaeologists and divers.

FORMAL INTERVIEWS

Different methods have been used to gather information via interviews. Formal interviews with prepared questions follow a structure based on the questionnaire, and are aimed at finding out how an institution works, identifying its routines, regulations, legislation and so forth, and at capturing impressions and opinions from the people working with these issues. The interviews have predominantly taken place in each person’s office or workplace.

INFORMAL INTERVIEWS

Special interviewers in each of the Nordic countries conducted the informal interviews. There were two interviewers each in Denmark, Finland and Sweden, and one in Norway. These interviews also varied, some were formalised after a number of questions or problem areas, others took the form of discussions and observations. The material was not recorded for reasons of confidentiality.

The total number of interviews was 150, distributed between 35% formal and 65% informal interviews.

The interviewers have different background, but a common interest in the culture sector, which has also influenced their working methods. One important and time-consuming part of the interview process has been finding suitable interviewees. We have tried to find people with insight and knowledge of illegal handling. Each of the interviewers was allowed to use his/her own methods, which has been practical but not always fast. Sometimes one interviewee has introduced the next (Trost, 2001). This has also become a pattern in the search for knowledge.

There are also risks attached to using interviews as source material. Zaitch (2002) is sceptical to the personal backgrounds of offenders because they tend to focus on exceptional elements rather than ordinary events. Active players are not interested in revealing everything. “Has been” tend to describe themselves in a positive light, in the manner they want to be remembered, preferably as central and influential figures. Researchers and journalists tend to accept their stories without checking the details. There are always tales and tall stories that circulate and are retold as if they are true. Some of these are also in our material. Another phenomenon is that some people say what they think the interviewer wants to hear.
In defence of the interviews as a source, however, Zaitch says that the sole use of official material is also problematic, because it only contains names and details surrounding the crime. This material gives no clear indication of the expectations of those involved, their background, their previous criminal experiences, etc. Zaitch claims that information is manipulated to fit the strategies of both crime prevention authorities and the defence.

Another phenomenon that is useful to consider is that interviewees do not only communicate their own opinions – true or false – their interpretation of reality is based on their role in an organisation, the market, etc. This means that their interpretations of other players are often biased and prejudiced. Art dealers can have a great deal to say about auction houses and vice versa. This does not necessarily indicate conspiracy, just a subjective view resulting from the situation of these individuals and their position in the industry (cp. Korsell, 2003).

The Internet Study

The third section of this study examines the role of the Internet, and the sale of cultural objects through online auctions. The main focus is on the Danish market, which serves as a description of the Nordic region.

The Internet’s art and antique market is enormous. Our aim is merely to describe how the market operates. The study describes the Danish market, and selected online auctions serve as case studies.

The main focus of the study is e-commerce and other services that are available online for trading in cultural objects.

The key areas are:

- **What players are involved in the online market?**
  - Who are the dealers and buyers, and what are their trading channels?
- **What is the size of the online market?**
  - What is the cash flow, and how many objects are for sale?
- **What objects are sold online?**
  - Are there cases of illegal trade and export?

The Internet study is recorded in the results section: *Cultural heritage crime in the Nordic region – results of the study*, in the Internet section, under Legal market.
Theories and research on cultural heritage crime

This section contains a review of existing research literature on art crime and other related areas. The literature is largely international, as Nordic research in the field is quite limited.

To provide some theoretic guidance to the empirical studies, an analysis model has been developed and used. The model is based on a literature study and can be described as a map of cultural heritage crime. The idea is that this map will describe the whole area that we call cultural heritage crime. The model is used in this section to structure the research literature. It is then used again when presenting the results, where the results are also related back to the theoretic review.

The model has not only functioned as a map as we delved into this complex area, it has also been used as an analysis tool, especially for the interviews, and to help structure the results of the studies. The overview that the model gives is also valuable if the ultimate aim is to discuss suitable crime prevention measures and where they should be applied.

The reference literature deals with theft, fencing and other market-oriented crimes in general, and with theft, illegal trade and the export of cultural objects in particular. The literature is largely international, but we believe that it is also relevant for Nordic circumstances. One difference, however, is that trade in cultural objects that have been looted (from illegal excavations, for example) is a major issue in the international literature, but less important in Nordic countries (cp. Brodie, Doole and Watson, 2000; Mackenzie, 2004).

The model was revised throughout the working process as the results of the studies became more varied, and different elements were added or removed. The final analysis model is described here.

One problem when developing the model, which has also underpinned this project, is the lack of scientific research on art crime or cultural heritage crime. The literature that is available is usually descriptive, and discussions based on empirical data are rare. In other words, there is a large knowledge gap to fill. Both the empirical studies and the model should make important contributions to the description of cultural heritage crime in general, and how the different types of crime are both separate and linked. Describing how the legal and illegal markets are linked and enable cultural heritage crime is particularly important.

The method of developing an analysis model that supports the development of crime prevention measures has previously been used by Brà in a study of narcotic crime’s organisational patterns, for example (Brà 2005:11, cp. also Brà 2005:18). There are major differences between literature on organized crime and art crime, however. There is an enormous amount of

---

8 Excluded are counterfeiting and vandalism, plus deliberate or threatened destruction of cultural objects due to conflicts, terrorism and war.
international scientific research in the organized crime area, but literature on crime prevention measures is limited. The reverse applies for literature on art crime. There is very little scientific research, but a great deal on legislation, locks and alarms, burglar proof installations and other crime prevention measures. This is unfortunate because first of all, research should be utilized to develop crime prevention measures and secondly, any such measures should be based on research in order to function effectively. Otherwise, there is a major risk that the various security arrangements that are introduced promise more than they can deliver.

**The model as a description of a cultural field**

In order to study cultural heritage crime, the whole context of standards and perceptions that are unique to this area must be studied. Bourdieu (2000) speaks of a cultural field. A simplified definition is that a field is a system of relations between positions. A social field can thus be defined as a system of relations between positions, which are taken by people and institutions who struggle for something in common. In other words, a social field is a unique and independent world with its own standards and regulations. A cultural field is then a specific social field that is tied to Bourdieu’s definition of culture, i.e. not in the anthropological sense but what we usually call “high culture” (Broady, 2000). Artists, gallery owners, cultural critics, art historians, archaeologists, art and antique dealers, thieves, looters and fences, etc populate our cultural field. There are institutions like museums, libraries, galleries, universities and academies, antiquarian authorities, cultural magazines and the culture sections of daily newspapers. In the cultural field of art and antique shops, there is a constant battle for interpretative preference and legitimacy. This is highlighted by art historian Elisabeth Rasch in her doctoral thesis where, in the spirit of Bourdieu, she studies the impact of art-dealers, collectors and critics on both the general public and the experts’ views on art, artistry and the market (Rasch, 2002).

**Analysis model**

This work is based on a market perspective of crime. The demand for cultural objects enables entrepreneurs to fulfil this need, also through criminal means. Cultural objects that reach the market come via theft, looting and illegal import. The entrepreneurs collaborate with thieves and other criminals while continuing to operate in the legal market. This is how legal and illegal markets meet.

---

Targets & Objects

**Preservers:**
- Art
- Museums
- Libraries
- Archives
- Churches
- Open air museums
- Universities
- Art dealers
- Auction houses
- Second-hand bookshops
- Antique dealers
- Pawnshops

**Dealers:**
- Carriers
- Archaeological objects
- Shipwrecks
- Historic everyday objects
- Ecclesiastical objects
- Furniture
- Documents
- Books
- Shipwreck parts

**Opportunity**

**Motives:**
- Financial motives
  - Sell
  - Collect (investment)
- Status-seeking motives
  - Souvenir hunting
  - Collections
  - Psychological (status, self-confidence, identity)
- Political motives
  - Blackmail

**Service functions**
- Storage
- Transport
- Technical equipment
- Craftsmen
- Valuation
- Register and archives

**Illicit removal:**
- Thefts
- Illegal excavations
- Shipwreck plundering
- Illegal export
- Illegal import

**PRODUCTION**

**Figure 2.** An analysis model of the cultural heritage crime area.
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This market perspective can also be seen in the model (Figure 2). The goods (cultural objects) must be produced before they reach the market. Accordingly, the model consists of a production section and a market section. In the production section, cultural objects are produced in the sense that they are made accessible – they have already been created; many of them are very old. They become accessible when they are illicitly removed from their rightful owner, for example. Illicit removal is a generic term for different crimes in the art crime area. It includes theft, receiving stolen goods, looting (illegal excavation, shipwrecks), import of illegal cultural objects and illegal movement/export of these objects. Illicit removal thus constitutes the production of goods for an illegal market, and then finally to the legal market.

After their illicit removal, most cultural objects end up on the market, or in the market section to refer back to the model. The market is dominated by the legal or “white” part of the market, constituted by auction houses, antique and art dealers and second-hand bookshops. Then we have an illegal or black market where thieves and fences deal in stolen goods. There is a grey zone between the legal and illegal markets. Here we see for example dealers with legitimate antique businesses who also include stolen cultural objects in their collections, making them both legitimate dealers and criminal fences (Steffensmeier, 1986).

The illicit removal of cultural objects is largely a financial market-oriented operation like any other handling of lawful products. It differs from a market that handles illegal products like narcotics. Cultural objects are intended for a normal market that demands these products, and they are acquired by legal markets such as auction houses and antique shops. This means that legal markets are central if cultural heritage crime is to function as a criminal activity on market terms.

Elia (1995) also makes this reflection, and points out that the illegal trade in cultural objects from foreign countries is often incorrectly compared with other illegal markets such as narcotics. The most important difference between these two illegal markets is that illegal cultural objects become legal before they reach the market. Cultural objects that are illicitly acquired in one country end up on the legal market in another country.

Cohen and Felson’s (1979) routine activity theory was used to construct the model’s production section. According to this theory, three factors must be satisfied in order for a crime to take place. These are:

- A likely offender
- A suitable target
- The absence of a capable guardian against crime

In the model, these three factors provide the prerequisites for illicit removal under the concepts motive (likely offender), object (suitable object), target (where the suitable objects are) and opportunity (the absence of a capable guardian). The absence of a guardian (opportunity) refers to cultural objects that are unprotected or not sufficiently protected, which offers the likely offender an opportunity to remove the object. There are different service functions that enable or facilitate the illicit removal. Stolen cultural
objects need to be renovated by craftsmen, stored and transported. Stealing the object usually requires burglary tools, illegal excavations require equipment like metal detectors, and shipwrecks require diving gear.

Following their illicit removal, most cultural objects end up on the market, with or without the help of service functions. Some objects are destroyed however because the burglar cannot dispose of them due to poor fence contacts and because he/she does not want to keep the goods (Wahlin, 1999; Polk, 1999). Other objects go straight into private collections or are kept for a long time to avoid being discovered. As mentioned, the market is divided into a white, legal section and a black, illegal section. These two markets are not completely separated from each other, however, as they overlap in a grey zone. In this grey zone, illegal products are sold in legal marketplaces like auctions, antique shops or on the Internet.

The legal market for cultural objects is also connected to other markets, legal and illegal. This can be seen for example when changes take place in other legal markets that release capital and increase the demand for cultural objects as investment objects or fashion and interior design trends, which creates a demand for certain objects from certain eras. Or buying and selling cultural objects launders cash from narcotics or other criminals markets.

Cultural objects end up with buyers or other acquirers via the market who may or may not be aware of an object’s illegal background. This does not only refer to individual buyers but also companies and public institutions. Museums also purchase stolen or looted objects (Conklin, 1994). The Getty Museum in the United States, the world’s richest museum, is currently embroiled in the “Gettygate” scandal (Hall, 2005). The scandal and the Etruscan vase in case are described in detail by the Swedish Archaeology Professor Eva Rystedt (Rystedt, 2005). Another eight American museums are accused of knowingly buying stolen cultural objects, including the Metropolitan Museum in New York and the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston (Hall, 2005). The emergence of new museums, the intense competition for popular art treasures and the number of antique cultural objects creates opportunities for cultural heritage crime that can reach the most established public institutions.

The following section describes the different parts of the model in more detail.
There are several different motives for removing cultural objects illicitly. We have divided them into *financial*, *status-seeking* and *political motives*.

**FINANCIAL MOTIVES**

Money is the overriding motivation behind criminal activity that supplies the market with products and services (Mack, 1975). The demand for cultural objects is greater than the supply, and prices on the international market have increased dramatically since the 1950s (Massy, 2000). This means that cultural objects have become more interesting for crime driven by financial motives. The financial motive also applies for a large per cent of cultural heritage crime. Theft and other types of cultural heritage crime are rational crime, where the purpose is predominantly financial (Steffensmeier, 1986). This objective is achieved when the cultural object is *sold* to a fence for example, or less frequently is kept as an *investment* by the offender him/herself, or even less frequently for *blackmail* purposes.

**Sell**

The most likely financial motive for most cultural heritage crime in the Nordic region, as in all other places, is to sell the cultural object, i.e. that a burglar sells to a fence or that the possessor of a cultural object sells the object abroad without an export permit. In most cases, thieves want to sell the object and make a profit (Wahlin, 1999). Their only interest in the object is to sell it for a good price. According to an overview of research on burglars, the offenders have different needs (Wahlin, 1999). Some are desperately in need of money, others have a more everyday need for money, and a third category commits the crime for a specific purpose, or to take advantage of a good opportunity.

A reasonable assumption is that the financial motivation for stealing cultural objects increases with time (Ministry of Education, Culture and Science in the Netherlands, et al, 2003). The demand for cultural objects increases, interest in art and interior design is great and an affluent Western middle class buys more and more objects. The high financial rewards stimu-
late crime. And the risk for being caught for illegal trade in cultural objects is slight.

Opportunities for financial gain exist at all levels in the structure that constitutes the illicit removal of cultural objects. It includes all players; from the local people in a poor country who dig up archaeological objects from their ancestors in order to improve the quality of their own lives, to the high end collector who invests in cultural objects. Then we have the collector’s successors and future acquirers who will contribute to an endless number of transactions on both legal and illegal markets.

For a fence with the right contacts, there are good opportunities for demanding a market price for some types of stolen cultural objects (Walsh, 1977). Many studies of the stolen goods market show that these goods are usually sold for a lower price than their market value (Wahlin, 1999; Sutton, 1998; Brå 2006). According to Sutton, however, s can sell some types of stolen goods for the same price as their market value, jewellery for example. A reasonable assumption would be that this also applies for some types of cultural objects. If thieves want to dispose of cultural objects at reasonable prices, they must have good contacts with buyers or fences who then have access to specialised buyers (Wahlin, 1999).

For local people in a poor country, the looting of archaeological cultural objects may provide a good source of income (O’Keefe, 1997; Mackenzie, 2002). Just like thieves, the local people at the front line of the production chain are paid badly for their work. A study of the selling chain for five cultural objects showed that in each of the studied cases no less than 98 per cent of the end price went to intermediaries. The person who “found” the object received a very small part of the final profit, and the ultimate buyer can hardly claim to have made a good deal (Brodie, Doole and Watson, 2000). When an object finally reaches the Western market, it continues to generate money each time it is sold. None of these profits go to the local people who found the object. At the same time, a piece of the local people’s cultural inheritance may be lost forever (Brodie, Doole and Watson, 2000).

**Blackmail**

Instead of the burglar selling to a fence who then disposes of the cultural object, it can be “sold back” to the original owner, or his/her insurance company (Conklin, 1994). Walsh (1977) notes that owning objects like snuffboxes of silver, pocket watches and jewellery was once unusual. Only the top social classes possessed these objects and it was more likely that fences of the time “found” property and returned it to the rightful owner for a “reward” rather than selling it to the small circle of people who would be interested in this kind of property. The story of professional thief Jonathan Wild in London reveals a highly organised gang engaged in stealing, finding and returning property (Klockars, 1974). The same economic framework may explain why the most valuable cultural objects that are stolen are probably sold back to their owners rather than ending up in a financially insecure second-hand market. The modern version of Jonathan Wild, in the guise of security companies and consultants, probably have
contact with owners and insurance companies, especially as the security market is experiencing such steady growth (Sheptycki, 2005).

Steffensmeier’s (1986) classic study, *The Fence: In the Shadow of Two Worlds*, follows an antique dealer and furniture restorer who begins his career as a burglar but later turns to dealing. Through contacts in the antique and stolen goods market, he moves *hot products* from one antique shop to another to avoid being caught.

*Collect (investment)*

An offender who steals a cultural object may keep it as an investment. The offender may be a collector who steals objects in order to build up his/her own collection. An employer may be the targeted source, in a museum, library or archive, for example. The object may be kept for a longer period, perhaps with the intention of selling it later. The motive could be that the object is too “hot” and has to be “cooled down”, or that the value of the object is expected to rise. This is the difference between cultural objects and ordinary stolen goods. Cultural objects maintain or even rise in value, while ordinary stolen goods lose their value if they are not sold immediately. This means that cultural objects can be hidden for a long time before reaching the market (Brodie, Doole and Watson, 2000). However, most thieves need fast money and the risk that stolen goods are traced is too high (Wahlin, 1999). Thieves usually dispose of stolen goods as soon as possible, while fences wait for better times.

*STATUS-SEEKING MOTIVES*

One motive for illicitly removing a cultural object could be to gain higher status by owning and showing it off (Massy, 2000). The manner of illicit removal can range from a tourist who buys a souvenir from an illegal excavation, to a recreational diver who takes bogwood and objects from old shipwrecks.

*Souvenir hunting*

One type of collector is someone who wants to acquire a cultural object as a souvenir. This type of souvenir hunting stimulates illegal excavations and other forms of illicit removal. The tourist can buy the cultural object with knowledge that it is illicitly removed, or not know about the handling or the country’s legislation. There are three factors that lead to the illicit removal of cultural objects through illegal excavations, etc. (Ministry of Education, Culture and Science in the Netherlands, et al, 2003):

- increased tourism
- unawareness of legislation on the protection of cultural objects
- enormous interest in non-Western cultures

*Collections*

Some people collect a varying array of objects, including cultural objects. The excitement of finding a missing item in their collection is like winning a trophy. Trophies are a kind of symbol. Social anthropologist Victor Turner
was a groundbreaking theorist in the role of symbols and their significance for society. He claims that symbols reflect culture and maintains that:

*The symbol is the smallest unit of ritual which still retains the specific properties of ritual behaviour; it is the ultimate unit of specific structure in a ritual context.*

(Turner in McGee & Warm 2000: 478)

When a collection object is found by excavating or by salvaging shipwrecks, a real trophy is won. It is not unusual that recreational divers emerge with objects from shipwrecks like trophies (Ekblom, 2000). In the same way that hunters save trophies from successful hunting expeditions, trophy hunting is a common motive for plundering shipwrecks. According to Ekblom (2000), a common motive for divers is that they want to take objects home and put them on their bookshelves. These objects strengthen their identity as skilled divers much the same as hunters with stuffed animals and antlers on their walls. Their identity is strengthened when they see their trophies. This type of collector is also described below under *Illicit removal* (plundering shipwrecks).

**Psychological**

Not only rational motives like economics drive people to commit the instrumental crimes that characterize cultural heritage crime. Suspense is a psychological reward that may appeal to a skilled burglar (Wahlin, 1999, who refers to other studies). A celebrated art raid can raise the status of an offender. It increases self-confidence and strengthens his/her reputation as a skilled professional. The cultural heritage crime area in particular, with its prestigious, rare and valuable objects, can fulfil an offender’s need for greater self-confidence, higher status and stronger identity. Perhaps it is relevant here to talk about legendary or aristocratic thieves. Few crimes gain so much attention as spectacular theft and robbery from famous museums with priceless treasures.

**POLITICAL MOTIVES**

“Political motives” refers to the illicit removal of cultural objects with the purpose of exerting political pressure, usually in the form of blackmail. Globalisation means that events taking place far away can often have a direct effect on local communities (Held and McGrew, 2000:2). As national borders fade, cultural objects may lose their significance for local and regional cultures. Scholte (2000) points out, however, that globalisation does not make us less territorial; it creates a need to become more territorial. Different areas can recede while others boom, which means that this development should in fact affect cultural identity and in turn cultural objects.

Modern wars are led by warlords and take the form of civil wars, compared to wars in the past that were fought by nations and national armies. Wars become profit-driven operations, and blackmail can be a source of income (Münkler, 2004; Lindholm Schulz, 2002). Payne (2000) refers to Bull who already in 1977 coined the concept the “New Middle
Ages”. Some important signs are the dissolution of countries due to separatist movements, and the emergence of new countries. Globalisation has encouraged regionalisation, such as developments in the former Czechoslovakia, Soviet Union and Yugoslavia. Another sign of the “New Middle Ages” is the resurgence of international violence, specifically terrorism, which challenges the states’ monopoly on violence. According to literature on modern war, blackmail with cultural objects or property could become an important target (cp. Lindholm Schulz, 2002). Armed conflicts also increase the risk for theft and the illegal export of cultural objects (Ministry of Education, Culture and Science in the Netherlands, et al, 2003; Bouwman, 1995).

Art and culture express a nation’s pride, myths and prestige (Massy, 2000). It is not a new phenomenon that hostilities are directed towards cultural buildings and objects (Guillotreau, 1999). An important feature of this regionalisation is cultural identity, and modern war can indeed focus on this identity making cultural buildings and objects targets for illicit removal, blackmail, terrorist attacks and similar. The motivation to illicitly remove cultural objects with cultural significance should therefore increase.

To summarise, modern political conflicts put cultural objects in the front line as a source of income, or a direct target.

OPPORTUNITY

Figure 4: A section of the analysis model. The complete model is shown on pages 24-25.

Both an opportunity and a motive are needed to commit a cultural heritage crime. A suitable object to steal and the right conditions for stealing it constitute an opportunity. Different areas of cultural heritage crime have different security levels. No country can offer optimum protection of archaeological sites, surveillance of borders or protection of art collections (O’Keefe, 1997; Brodie, Doole and Watson, 2000; Bator, 1983). On the other hand, security is better at museums and other institutions.

Poor security routines can create opportunities for acquiring cultural objects. Security routines in this context can range from legislative differences between countries to the security routines of a specific museum.

UNGUARDED CULTURAL OBJECTS

Unguarded cultural objects provide many opportunities for crime. They are usually found in places where it is possible to operate illegal excavations or plunder shipwrecks. It is not realistic to try and guard all vulnerable sites. This offence is similar to hunting wild animals illegally, which takes place in inaccessible areas without any form of surveillance (Brà, 2005).
The illegal export of cultural objects also provides many opportunities for crime. A crime is committed when an object in someone’s possession, generally unregistered, is taken out of the country illegally, possibly as part of an otherwise legitimate sale. Illegal export is similar to white-collar crime in that the offender can control the object without attracting suspicion (Korsell, 2003). The risk of discovery is remote. And the crime can easily be neutralised by claiming ownership (cp. Cressey, 1953; Coleman, 2001). It is also reasonable to assume that knowledge of the legislation in question is not terribly widespread. Illicit removal and export involves breaching administrative regulations, which is also a feature of white-collar crime. These crimes are much more difficult to validate than traditional crimes that have always existed and have easy to recognize victims (Korsell and Nilsson, 2003).

The low risk of discovery continues across the otherwise critical border crossing. Goods can move freely within the EU, and are not checked as they move between one EU country and another (Brå 2005:11). There are major variations between EU countries regarding the control of cultural objects (Ministry of Education, Culture and Science in the Netherlands, et al, 2003). Furthermore, customs officials and other control authorities must suspect criminal activity. In the cultural heritage area, great expertise is required to assess archaeological material, art, antiquities and other cultural objects. When the crime is then disguised amongst legitimate activities and normal routines, such as antiquities in a vanload of furniture, it is even more difficult to detect (cp. Korsell, 2003).

Customs officials are obviously more interested in what comes into the country than what goes out, but the control of imported cultural objects is also scanty because Customs prioritize narcotics (Brå 2005:11). The risk of discovery is slight even for illicitly removed cultural objects that are intended for other Nordic countries.

The Ministry of Education, Culture and Science in the Netherlands, et al. (2003) claims that the following factors obstruct the control and identification of cultural objects by customs officials:

- The provenance of a cultural object is often unclear
- Cultural objects are difficult to find in hand luggage and not detected by X-rays.
- Export. Details may be incorrectly recorded in the import declaration. For example, a wrong figure in the customs tariff or specifying a lower price than what was actually paid for the object.
- Receipts can be missing or show the wrong price.

Discovery of a theft is a basic prerequisite for reporting an illicit removal to the police, so that measures can be taken to stop the object from being sold and facilitate recovery of the object. Some cultural heritage crime requires...
special control functions in order to discover that it has taken place (Korsell, 2003). Many institutions store a large numbers of objects, which presents good opportunities for crime. One of most highlighted problems is the varying routines practised by museums and other institutions when registering and cataloguing cultural objects (Brå 2005b; Conklin, 1994). Museums, libraries, Archives and other institutions may not even know that an object is missing. Objects can also disappear temporarily and there are natural explanations for why they are not recovered in an inventory. It can take a long time before crime is suspected even though objects are identified as missing.

REGISTERING CULTURAL OBJECTS

An object must be registered and recognizable in order for different control functions to discover that it has been stolen or illicitly removed. Different registration routines are employed in different countries (Ministry of Education, Culture and Science in the Netherlands, et al, 2003). The information must also be communicated to all actors who exercise control, such as police, customs and market players such as antique dealers. Routines in many countries are scanty. There are no photos for example. In a study of Swedish churches, Brå maintains that routines for reporting theft to authorities are unsatisfactory. This in turn prevents authorities from conveying information to other sources (Brå, 2005b). The Swedish police have no website for stolen objects with photos, for example, and only some stolen objects are reported to Interpol. Poor registration routines obstruct the recovery process of cultural objects. A website for stolen cultural objects is currently under development in Sweden.

ILICIT REMOVAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illicit removal:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Thefts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Illegal excavations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Shipwreck plundering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Illegal movement/export</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Illegal import</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5: A section of the analysis model. The complete model is shown on pages 24-25.

There are different forms of illicit removal. A common form is theft. Employees inside the organisation, such as museum staff, can also commit these crimes.

There is also legislation that limits the right to export cultural objects and is linked to a permit-application procedure. There may also be regulations concerning the illegal import of objects. At the end of this section on *Theories and research on cultural heritage crime*, there is an account of Nordic legislation in the cultural heritage area.
Illegal excavations and plundering of shipwrecks constitute other forms of illicit removal, and national legislation usually has specific classifications for these crimes.

**Theft**

According to Kisluk (1999), there is no “typical” art thief, i.e. one who fits the romantic picture of a sophisticated gentleman thief recognized from films and fiction. In the real world, the offender is driven by the same motives as “common” thieves, specifically money. They only steal art instead of something else. But some thieves are more specialised than others (cp. Steffensmeier, 1986).

An American study divides burglars into six categories: the good burglar, the known burglar, the young burglar, the juvenile burglar, the booster and the junkie (Walsh, 1977). The good burglar, who only constitutes a small percentage of burglars, focuses on valuable objects that can be sold via their broad contact network to specialised fences (cp. King and Chambliss, 1984; Sutherland, 1937). This category of burglars can focus on cultural and other valuable objects like jewellery, and work on a commission basis. The known burglar is well established in criminal circles and constitutes a considerably larger percentage of all thieves. The known burglars do not necessarily have the same direct connections with fences and the legal market as the specialised burglar. The juvenile burglar, the booster and the junkie constitute together about half of all burglars, and steal to make fast money. This means that they usually steal anything that can be converted into cash, from 16th century furniture to computers (cp. Massy, 2000 who refers to Mocquot, 1974).

Polk (1999) points to some important differences between the “common” stolen goods market and art theft. A “common” thief sets out to steal something. But this still requires preparation and planning (Wahlin, 1999). An art thief needs other knowledge. This includes knowing what type of art is valuable, what objects can be sold, where cultural objects are kept and whether it is possible to steal the object (Steffensmeier, 1986). Another relevant difference, according to Polk (1999), is that the art thief has a much smaller market of fences who can dispose of the stolen objects than thieves who are focused on consumable goods. There are very few thieves who know about art and cultural objects, however, and they do not spend time improving their knowledge (Wahlin, 1999).

Media coverage of cultural heritage crime creates an image of a few, yet spectacular coups. A few rififi-type events in the Nordic region – in the National Gallery and Munch Museum in Oslo, the Moderna Museet and National Museum of Fine Arts in Stockholm, and the Royal Library in Copenhagen, received international attention. Kisluk (1999) claims however that these major art thefts that are reported in the media every now and then are merely a fraction of the total amount. Theft of lesser-known objects takes place all the time, even though they are not reported in the media (Kisluk, 1999). Thieves consider art, mats and antiquities as valuable objects, and some thieves prefer these costly objects if they have good contacts (Steffensmeier, 1986; Wahlin, 1999). There are also thieves who do not
steal these specific objects because disposing of them is too difficult. In general, cultural objects are considered interesting and they are stolen without creating headlines because not every object is particularly valuable.

A well-known expression in literature on white-collar crime is that it is better to own a bank than to rob one (Coleman, 2001). The background to this story was that a large number of bank employees ruined a number of North American banks through embezzlement, fraud and other crimes. They had used their positions inside the banks to ruin their employers.

An insider has far more opportunities for committing crime that someone outside of the organisation. And there are more opportunities in the culture sector because most institutions handle large amounts of cultural objects. We know that employees are responsible for theft in other sectors of society (Tucker, 1989). The above division of burglars into six categories from the good burglar down to the junkie is an example of external offenders who are more or less “professionally” active thieves. Steffensmeier (1986) claims that this categorization is too narrow because it does not include truck drivers, fences at wharves and other employees who supply the market with stolen goods. In other words, there are a large number of other people with legitimate employment who also supply fences and others with stolen goods. The insider problem of employees who steal and/or cheat their employers should not be underestimated (cp. Henry, 1978; Mars, 1994).

Museums and other institutions with cultural objects will probably never be free from internal theft, especially when inventories and cataloguing routines are so defective. This means that the risk for being discovered is also slight. A well-known example is the employee at the Royal Library in Copenhagen who regularly stole valuable books from his workplace (Korsgaard and Surrue, 2005).

ILLEGAL MOVEMENT/EXPORT

Many countries have regulations that prohibit the export of cultural objects. There is a section on Nordic legislation in this area at the end of the chapter on theories and research. We have not found any research literature that studies the scope of illegal movement/export of cultural objects. Some literature does treat the illegal export of objects that are looted in poor countries however.

ILLEGAL IMPORT

The import of cultural objects is regulated by the UNESCO Convention, which has been ratified by all Nordic countries. The Convention prohibits the import of cultural objects that are removed from their country of origin in violation of national law (see the section on legislation for more details). There is also very little research literature on the scope of this illegal removal.

ILLEGAL EXCAVATIONS

Problems with the illicit removal of objects from ancient monuments are largely explained by the difference between archaeologists’ and the market’s
view of archaeological objects. For archaeologists, the found objects have a context, i.e. the find circumstances, position and relation to other findings is as important as the object itself, which means that they study the area systematically. The market is interested in the object as merchandise that can be sold for a high price. The slow and systematic methods of the archaeologists mean that an archaeological excavation can take a long time. Raids can take place when archaeologists are not present. Looters can locate valuable objects by using metal detectors. Illegal excavations also take place around ancient monuments and cultural heritage sites where no scheduled excavations are ongoing. The common denominator for raids is that besides losing the actual objects, we also lose the historical knowledge that would be generated by the archaeologists’ scientific methods. We will never know what conditions surrounded the object in question in prehistoric society.

The difference between illegal excavations and other cultural heritage theft is that no one knows exactly what objects are in the ground before raiders take them. Which also means that no one can know for sure whether anything has disappeared (see e.g. Cranwell, 1999; Ruiz, 2001). Holes in the ground, or remains of archaeological material without financial value, are signs that raids have taken place but no one can ever know what has been taken. Archaeological sites are often remotely situated and easy to explore unnoticed. And it may take a long time before undesired visits are discovered. This also means that illegally excavated objects are almost impossible to trace back to their place of origin, which complicates control and evidence if and when an object appears on the market, because it is not registered under its correct provenance. Increased demand for archaeological objects means that even more types of objects are requested and sites are looted for their archaeological finds. In turn, the looting becomes more systemized and covers an even larger geographical area (Sidibé, 1995). Even though some illegal excavations do take place in Nordic countries, the problem is far more serious in other countries (Guillotreau, 1999). Adlercreutz (1994) claims that recent ravages with metal detectors on Gotland, Sweden, are examples of this type of activity in the Nordic region.

Sidibé (1995) describes how the looting of archaeological sites in poor countries has developed. Shallow excavations by people who live close to archaeological areas are followed by more organised and systemized excavations. Sidibé refers to Waals and Dembélé who describe in an article how looting in the Inner Delta of the Niger is organised. They make a distinction between two different types of organisations. The first category is independent pillagers. Independent pillagers are groups with designated leaders who are responsible for selling their finds to antique dealers in different markets. The other category is sponsored pillagers. Sponsored looting means that a dealer recruits groups to carry out commissioned excavations. The dealer provides equipment and food. All finds go to the dealer but the workers earn a certain percentage of the good’s value.
PLUNDERING SHIPWRECKS

According to Cederlund (2004), it is difficult to estimate the scope of shipwreck plundering. As mentioned previously, plundering usually takes place unnoticed. Ekblom (2000) refers to the Swedish Maritime Museum in Sweden, which categorizes three types of looters: collectors, treasure hunters and exploiters.

Collectors are recreational divers who look for objects to take home as souvenirs. Individual collectors do not cause much damage to ships but collectively cause a problem because they belong to the biggest category of plunderers.

Treasure hunters are divers who plunder shipwrecks in more organised forms. They are interested in large objects and specific smaller objects. Treasure hunters can work on commission or carry out other types of sponsored plundering. This category is smaller, but responsible for major damage to some shipwrecks.

Exploiters are companies who build bridges and dams. This category engages in vandalism rather than plundering. The wrecks are totally ruined by building and construction work, as are other ancient monuments.

SERVICE FUNCTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Technical equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Craftsmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Valuation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Register and archives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6: A section of the analysis model. The complete model is shown on pages 24-25.

Different types of service functions are usually required to implement illicit removal. These include transport for the object that will be illicitly removed, technical equipment for selling the stolen object via the Internet or skilled craftsmen and women who can disguise the identity of an object.

STORAGE

Thieves do not usually store stolen goods. To minimise risks, goods must be disposed of quickly, usually to fences (Wahlin, 1999). As described in our model, many thieves see themselves as craftsmen who carry out a trade in the production line, while other players then store and deal the stolen goods (Steffensmeier, 1986). Fences usually store stolen goods, and many fences run businesses to avoid arousing suspicion over their large storage space (Massy, 2000; Walsh, 1977). Running a business also makes it easier to deal in stolen goods without being discovered, because the business sells the same type of property legitimately. Sometimes fences have to keep the goods for a certain time and only sell parts of a stolen collection to mini-
mise the risk of discovery. While the stolen goods are in storage, the thief can borrow money from the fence in advance (Wahlin, 1999). Although thieves do sometimes hire premises for storing stolen goods (Wahlin, 1999).

**TRANSPORT**

An important feature in all forms of cultural heritage crime is transport. Thieves must be able to transport stolen goods and vehicles are often stolen for this purpose (Wahlin, 1999). This also reduces the risk that the offender’s own vehicle is linked to a burglary. A vehicle is a basic necessity for today’s property crime. Fences also need transport, and stolen antiquities are sometimes transported long distances and sold in antique shops in other parts of the country or abroad to minimise the risk of discovery (Steffensmeier, 1986; Walsh, 1977).

In Steffensmeier’s (1986) study of an antique dealer and fence, vans and lorries were used for burglaries. A van was driven into the garage of a private house when the owners were away and the house emptied of cultural objects that were then transported in the van to a hidden lorry, which was successively loaded with stolen objects from the van.

Carriers and transport companies also hold a central role in the illicit removal of cultural objects. It would be difficult to exercise both legal and illegal trade without specialized transport services for fragile and valuable cultural objects.

Packaging cultural objects is another important service. Objects can be bulky, heavy, fragile and valuable, which gives packaging an important role to play in both legal and illegal trade.

**TECHNICAL EQUIPMENT**

Technical equipment and tools are often important features in crime. Thieves use burglary tools and bags to remove stolen goods (Wahlin, 1999). Technical equipment for implementing illicit removal includes diving equipment. Metal detectors are used to plunder archaeological sites (Lundén, 2004).

Sheldon (1995) believes that people who use metal detectors to find cultural objects can be divided into two different groups. The first group is interested in cultural objects, and searching for them is a hobby. The other group takes part in organised looting. According to Sheldon, the latter group constitutes the greatest danger to cultural heritage. The first group is considered more accessible from a crime prevention perspective, because archaeologists can use education and persuasion to guide them towards more acceptable activities (Sheldon, 1995).

**CRAFTSMEN**

According to Elia (1995), restorers constitute the final stage in the laundering process for an illicitly removed object. Objects that are dirty, broken and corroded are cleaned, and any proof of their questionable origin is removed. Illicitly removed objects can thus be “laundered” twice, and their market value increases because a less scrupulous restorer has conserved, restored, cleaned and guaranteed their authenticity. This facilitates
and enables trade in looted and smuggled objects (Elia, 1995). The restorer plays a significant role, according to Elia (1995) for getting objects of doubtful origin onto the legal market. The restorer functions as a legitimate doorkeeper. Restorers have a different role in Nordic countries because they are linked to cultural institutions. Greater social control within the profession leaves less room for irregularities.

In addition to restorers, other craftsmen such as upholsterers, gilders, different types of smiths, cabinet-makers, watchmakers, etc can also carry out service assignments on illicitly removed objects. In Steffensmeier’s (1986) previously mentioned study, the fence was a skilled tradesman who had made valuable “business contacts” through renovation jobs.

EVALUATION

Valuers can also constitute an important service function by establishing the value of an illicitly removed object.

ARCHIVE AND REGISTER

Registers and databases of where archaeological or cultural objects are is usually publicly accessible in literature and/or websites. The registers provide a method for preserving institutions to communicate knowledge to the general public, but there is also a less desirable consequence. The registers can be used to identify suitable targets for theft. Examples of these registers in Sweden are Medieval Images, which is accessible via the Internet and lists the cultural heritage of the church with images and information about where objects are located, the Swedish Maritime Museum’s wreck register and Register of Ancient Monuments, which describes archaeological sites. Information about the type of object that has existed in a specific place can lead to illegal excavations in the hope of finding more of the same type of object (Lundén, 2004).

Fences and thieves use this information to locate suitable targets and objects. Thieves give each other tips at bars and restaurants (Steffensmeier, 1986). Another important source of information is the media, especially documentation about homes with valuable cultural objects. Barelleri (1985, cited by Massy, 2000) claims that glossy magazines like Country Life are akin to “The Burglar’s Bible”.
The diagram above shows a long list of targets for illicit removal and the objects that can be exported illegally. According to a Belgian study, the most common targets for Art Crime are private homes, churches, antique shops, galleries and castles (Massy, 2000). Some cultural objects are more attractive than others, especially everyday stolen objects where thieves know exactly what they want to take (Wahlin, 1999). According to Walsh (1980, and cited by Wahlin, 1999), some thieves know exactly what they want to steal when it comes to jewellery, silver and antiquities. The interviewed thieves rated jewellery, art, antiquities and collections as the most attractive objects. There are many different reasons for making these prioritisations, including how badly money is needed, the assumed risks, contact networks, storage capacity and knowledge (Wahlin, 1999). According to the Belgian study, common object categories for Art Crime are silver, collector's items, paintings, sculptures, religious objects, mats, furniture, clocks and watches and weapons (Massy, 2000).

Some thieves focus on cultural objects that are impossible or difficult to identify, china for example (Massy, 2000 who refers to Barelli, 1985). In a further development of the routine activity theory (Cohen and Felson, 1979) Felson (1998) uses the acronym VIVA to demonstrate how an offender chooses objects to steal. VIVA stands for:

- Value of target to likely offender
- Inertia of target to likely offender
- Visibility of target to likely offender
- Access to offender, with a chance to exit easily.
We will now describe these different categories from a cultural heritage crime perspective.

**VALUE OF TARGET TO LIKELY OFFENDER**

The offender’s subjective assessment includes
- the object’s actual value
- how easy it is to sell the object
- what the object can be sold for

From a cultural heritage crime perspective, the offender’s actions can be based on three grounds when stealing a specific cultural or art object. Firstly, the thief may have knowledge of culture or the object and can assess the value (Steffensmeier, 1986). This is probably rare amongst people who live a life of crime, who have an easy-come, easy-go lifestyle and their crimes are not planned especially carefully (Wahlin, 1999:156). Secondly, the offender may work on commission and have a list of objects to steal (Steffensmeier, 1986). This is probably fairly common in more advanced art coups (Massy, 2000). Thirdly, the offender may steal objects that look valuable, and from experience know that the object is in demand and can be sold for a good price.

**INERTIA OF CRIME TARGETS**

Some objects are not stolen even though they have a high value. This is because the offender has to consider the “inertia” of an object when deciding what to steal. An object might be too big or heavy to move, or attached to a wall. Thieves have to work quickly and do not usually want to transport large or heavy goods in their own vehicles (Wahlin, 1999).

**VISIBILITY OF CRIME TARGETS**

An object’s visibility plays a significant role when deciding what to steal. A painting hanging in a public place is more vulnerable than a painting in a private collection. Experienced thieves usually know where to look, and can even enjoy outwitting owners who try to hide their valuable possessions in unexpected places (Wahlin, 1999).

**ACCESS TO CRIME TARGETS**

The possibility of reaching the potential stolen goods without too much trouble and being able to exit quickly are significant factors when deciding what to steal. One good example of accessibility is open and unguarded premises with valuable cultural objects (Brå, 2005b).

Successful thieves rely on tips offs about where they can find interesting objects and when the owners are away. A fence who also runs a legitimate business obtains information from customers about where objects are and when they can be stolen because of holidays or travel (Steffensmeier, 1986). The fence can then tip off or direct thieves to the target.

These four categories are thus significant when an offender is deciding what type of art or cultural objects to steal.
Cultural heritage crime covers a wide range of specialisations. Different types of antiquities, for example. As mentioned previously, the supply of antiquities is limited. O’Keefe (1997) lists three principal sources for cultural objects. These are:
- existing collections
- monuments
- excavations or opportunist finds

The legal supply of some types of objects falls as more and more objects end up in permanent collections due to the growing number of museums, and therewith their collections. The consequences of increased demand for antiquities combined with a limited supply lead to greater pressure on cultural objects from illegal sources, such as illegal excavations or theft (O’Keefe, 1997).

There are no statistical details however on the development of cultural heritage crime. This also includes the scope and development of thefts from museums. Riksdagen’s auditors in Sweden claim the most recent analysis of criminal activities in the museums area was carried out in the 1980s (Riksdagen’s auditors, 2002). As we have already mentioned several times, several notable cases of theft have targeted museums in the Nordic region in the past few years (Swedish National Council for Cultural Affairs, 2001).

Illegal excavations are a source for finding archaeological objects for the market. Dobinson and Denison (1995) carried out a study in the UK where they tried to assess the scope of looting on archaeological sites. The study showed that at least 188 ancient monuments in the UK had been looted between 1988 and 1993, some of them several times. Two carefully monitored archaeological sites were raided at least 124 times during the study period.

It is important to make a distinction between objects that come from looting and illegal excavations, and other stolen objects. Valuable stolen objects are usually known and documented, which is not the case with objects from illegal excavations (Renfrew, 1995). From a historical perspective, looting and illegal excavations are serious because objects are separated from their context and can no longer contribute to the knowledge of human culture. There is also a risk that illicitly detected objects are destroyed or damaged because they are not preserved correctly. This risk is greatest when objects are taken from underwater sites (Prott, 1995).

**LEGAL MARKET FOR CULTURAL OBJECTS**

We will now leave the production section of the model and continue on to the market section. The illicit removal of cultural objects generally takes place because an object is in demand, and dealers and buyers meet each other in the marketplace. Both legal and illegal markets overlap to form a grey zone. We will look at the legal market and its players first to describe how trading practises take place.
In order sell a stolen work of art for a price that is close to its actual value, it must be sold on the legitimate second-hand market, at auctions for example, or through established art dealers (Polk, 1999). This means that trying to sell known stolen works of art will be difficult.

It is a common misunderstanding that cultural objects that are stolen every day are registered in Interpol’s databases or that they are easy to recognise. Not all cultural objects have a high value, but they are stolen from private homes and institutions because they are more valuable than other items (cp. Wahlin, 1999). Many of these cultural objects will probably find their way to legitimate buyers, and subsequent marketplaces are then antique and art dealers and auctions (Massy, 2000). We have surveyed these marketplaces and they are described under *Cultural heritage crime in the Nordic region – results of the study*.
As previously mentioned, the market for illegal cultural objects is very different to the narcotics market, where all trade is illegal from production to dealing, and in fact even consumption. But stolen cultural objects will only return a high market value when they reach the legal market (Polk, 1999). A distinguishing feature of the market for cultural objects is that legal and illegal markets overlap. There is a significant grey zone where cultural objects are “transformed” from illegal to legal by ending up in shop windows or auctioneers’ shelves as fully legitimate objects, amongst other legal objects. The object is still illegal, but it is impossible or difficult to separate it from all the legal objects when it is shown and offered in such a conventional manner.

One condition for identifying illegal objects, strangely enough, is that they reach the legal market (Cannon-Brokes, 1995). At the same time, it has become more difficult to monitor the market for cultural objects because it is so widespread and, thanks to the Internet, has millions of new customers (Ministry of Education, Culture and Science in the Netherlands, et al, 2003). Only experts can suspect misdemeanours or prove that an object is illegal. This is even more difficult with objects that come from illegal excavations or that are not unique. By selling illegal objects in cities distant...
from the initial theft, they become almost impossible to identify (Steffensmeier, 1986).

MARKETPLACES THAT "UNKNOWINGLY" MIX LEGAL AND ILLEGAL CULTURAL OBJECTS

Most marketplaces that buy and sell cultural objects unknowingly mix legal and illegal objects. The reason being that they deal in second-hand objects and not even the most stringent controls can stop illicitly obtained objects from ending up in legal trade. The dealers can be “unknowing” at different levels. Despite stringent controls, they can be tricked into buying stolen objects, or choose to be unknowing by not controlling cultural objects properly before buying them.

MARKETPLACE THAT KNOWINGLY MIXES LEGAL AND ILLEGAL OBJECTS

The fence is a “master of two worlds” (Massy, 2000:130). The fence is a central figure in the market-orientated crime that includes cultural heritage crime. This person is usually a vendor, either a dealer or someone who works with restoration, and has good contacts with the art and antiques market. The fence is an expert who knows how to assess objects that thieves or other fences offer. The objects that the fence buys can be stored with similar objects and thus escape attention. Through these activities, the fence also has contacts who can direct thieves to the right targets and objects, or to buyers. The fence is also financially stable enough to buy large parties of stolen goods and store them until the “dust has settled” (Massy, 2000:131).

“When you’re in the business, you know who’ll buy your stuff …”, Wahlin (1999:134) quotes a burglar referring to fences. The advantage for thieves is that fences buy their stolen objects without asking questions. Fences can also direct thieves towards objects worth stealing (Steffensmeier, 1986; Walsh, 1977; Klockars, 1974). The disadvantage with fences is that their prices are low. According to Massy (2000), fences pay about 10 per cent of the market value on average. Depending on the object, a fence might pay between 5 and 20 per cent (Massy, 2000). A strategy for thieves is thus to try different fences to see who offers the best price (Wahlin, 1999). A successful fence always gives thieves a reasonable price (Steffensmeier, 1986).

Fences cannot operate without a business because the storage space in private homes is too small and transporting goods in private vehicles is too obvious. If the fence runs a legitimate business, the opportunities for dealing in stolen objects increase immediately. In an American study, Walsh (1977) has identified three different types of legitimate business activities that also deal in stolen goods.

*Integrative front*

The focus on stolen goods is more or less the same as for legally obtained objects. About 50% of fences belong to this category. This combination reduces the risk of discovery.
**Functional-facilitating front**

Stolen goods are acquired but not distributed directly to consumers. The legitimate business is not constituted by the same type of products as the stolen goods. Typical retailers in this type of stolen goods market are restaurants and bars. Wholesalers might include building firms, auto parts companies, taxis and road carriers. Service companies might be petrol stations. The advantage here is that the fence has a much broader platform than those who integrate their activities with legitimate businesses.

**Dissonant front**

The stolen goods business is completely separated from the legitimate business. This concept usually takes the form of a successful company that builds a legitimate front for criminal activities. The advantage is that the stolen goods business can run invisibly. According to the study, the legitimate businesses that provide a front for the fence’s business include building firms, manufacturing companies, transport companies, wholesale companies and sales of medical equipment.

Steffensmeier (1986) describes more complex stolen goods networks where there are different intermediaries between the ultimate buyer and the fence, with other fences and vendors for example in the form of wholesalers or retailers.

The American study of fences showed that antique dealers, fine art valuers and auction companies dealt in stolen goods in the form of jewellery, pieces of furniture, paintings, cultural objects and antiquities (Walsh, 1977). The reason is that dealing in these types of stolen goods is easier through a legitimate business (Steffensmeier, 1986). It is also common that the focus on stolen goods is more or less the same as objects in the legal operation (Walsh, 1977). When fences who also ran legitimate businesses had contact with other fences, it was because these relations already existed in their ordinary business activities. Antique dealers, in particular, had contact with colleagues through regular commercial channels. These established commercial contacts then formed the basis for their criminal relationships. These connections meant that stolen goods could be moved long distances between different fences/antique dealers. Moving stolen goods long distances also reduced the risk of discovery (Walsh, 1977; Steffensmeier, 1986).

We have so far focused on the handling of stolen goods. Another area is the illicit removal of cultural objects that also end up on the market, including illegal excavations. Mackenzie (2002) makes an analytic distribution of the illegal market for cultural objects into three stages: access to cultural objects in their country of origin, demand for these objects from customers in market countries and the transport chain that links these two stages.

Sidibé describes how networks that deal in archaeological objects in Africa are constructed (1995). There are several different types of players operating and supplying the market with objects. As previously mentioned, there are local people, private looters, independent looters and sponsored looters. The finds are sold to antique dealers who constitute the intermedi-
ate level in the networks. According to Sidibé, these antique dealers do not usually have any link with the international market; they sell the objects in their own shops and to collectors in other towns. In a few cases, the dealers have connections with the international market and enough resources to establish contacts with other dealers in Europe and the United States. European and American markets constitute the next level of this illegal trade in cultural objects, in the form of galleries, collectors and even museums. And this is how illegal objects reach the legal market (Elia, 1995). There is very little knowledge of the connection between African antique dealers and the international market.

**LAUNDERING CULTURAL OBJECTS: ILLEGAL OBJECTS BECOME LEGAL**

The difference between trade in cultural objects and how cultural heritage institutions operate has already been discussed. Roughly, cultural objects for many dealers are first and foremost objects with a commercial value that serve a purpose for the buyer, an interior design detail perhaps. A cultural object is no different to any other consumable or capital goods where the origin is not important for most consumers. For cultural heritage institutions, the context of an object is its most important feature, and the object tells us about our history.

The commercial objectification may be a basic requirement for laundering illegal objects, i.e., transforming them from illegal to legal. This can take place by selling the cultural object through a “respectable” antique dealer or auction house (Brodie, 1999; Cannon-Brookes, 1995; Massy, 2000). The object is offered here and now, and its origin is rarely interesting provided that it does not have a provenance that will raise the value. This means that the object’s history and background begins all over again when it finds its way into legal trade, which enables the sale of objects with a tainted background.

Another condition that facilitates laundering is the discretion practised by art dealers, auction houses and museums (Elia, 1995; Lundén, 2004). Both dealers and buyers are usually discrete for legitimate reasons, in consideration for their customers’ financial situation, for example. Heirlooms may be leaving a respectable family, for private reasons. And it is not difficult to invent a provenance if anyone should ask. Because market players do not usually disclose all the details about transactions, in other words that provenance is not established, the origin of looted or stolen goods is easily concealed by creating a new origin, or claiming that the object comes from an established Swiss collection for example (Elia, 1995; Brodie, 1999). There are rarely registers or documents to authenticate an object.

For cultural objects that have been looted and removed from other countries, it is highly unlikely that authorities from that country will discover the object, identify it as looted and also have the financial resources to legally reclaim it (Brodie, 1999). Italy, however, has recently become embroiled in a battle against a series of illegitimate business deals where major American museums have purchased objects with a dubious background (Hall, 2005).
In other words, the problems are multifaceted. In many cases, it is impossible for a buyer to know whether an object without provenance comes from recent looting or whether it has been circulating on the market for a long time (Mackenzie, 2004). At the same time, a potential buyer cannot really trust the authenticity of an object’s provenance because it is so easy to create a false history (Mackenzie, 2004).

The export controls of countries can also be exploited to launder cultural objects. The purpose of export control is to stop cultural objects from leaving the country. If the possessor of an illegally excavated cultural object applies and is granted an export permit for the object, the object has then acquired legal status on the market. The export permit has given the object a false provenance (O’Keefe, 1997).

Criminal and underground economic activity is usually cash-based. Money is generated by theft and robbery. Buyers of narcotics and other criminal goods or services usually pay cash (Brå 2005:11). In businesses, black money is constituted by unrecorded cash payments. It is used to pay for black products or black labour (SOU 1997:111). But handling excessive amounts of cash makes banks and other businesses suspicious. There is also anti-money laundering legislation, which means that suspicious transactions or large amounts of cash should be reported to the authorities. Shadow or stolen money must therefore be laundered and redirected into the official economy.

One method is to invest in cultural objects (Massy, 2000). When these are sold, the purchase sum is recorded by putting the funds into a bank account, which places it in the official system. Works of art can also be “sold” for a receipt, which generates legitimate income that can be explained. It is difficult to establish the value of a painting for example and this can be exploited for laundering money (Graycar, 1999; James 2000; Cupboardstone, 1999).
MARKETPLACE FOR ILLEGAL OBJECTS ONLY

The description of fences has so far applied to vendors who also run legitimate businesses. Steffensmeier (1986) refers to Hall’s (1935) classic work, which distinguishes between three different categories of fences. The Lay Fence buys stolen goods for own consumption, the Occasional Fence buys stolen goods now and then for dealing, and the Professional Fence is a “dealer in stolen goods”. The Professional Fence runs a sustainable and complex business operation. For thieves, the Professional fence is a reliable market player who is always willing to make a deal. The Professional Fence is a “public dealer”, and known to both criminals and the police.

According to Steffensmeier (1986), the fence lies between the thief and the buyer. Stettensmeier does not define the buyer as the end consumer, but a legitimate business owner, a wholesaler for example, who will resell the stolen goods. These business buyers would never deal directly with thieves, only with fences. Steffensmeier claims that there is a category of skilled fences who buy from thieves and deliver to legitimate businesses, thus functioning as a filter between the legal and illegal markets.

Most of these professional fences also run a legitimate business, however. It is difficult to run a wide-scale illegitimate business operation with-
out being discovered, especially in Nordic countries with relatively small populations and a high degree of social control. For example, Johansen (1994, 1996 and 2004) has compared illegal distilling and liquor smuggling in the United States and Norway, and found that the industrialised forms that took place in the United States during the Prohibition would never have worked in Norway. Networks with less decentralised movements worked better there.

What is described are businesses that deal in objects that are illegal because they have been illicitly removed. And stolen goods are sometimes handled alongside of other criminal activities that deal with criminal goods or services (Walsh, 1977). For example, drug dealers exchange narcotics for stolen goods. According to Wahlin (1999), this exchange means that thieves do not need to steal so often.

Brodie, Doole and Watson, (2000) claim that there are signs that different groupings around the world involved in drug smuggling and money laundering also trade in illegal cultural objects. International literature points to connections between organized crime and illegal trade in cultural objects (Massy, 2000; Conklin, 1994; Guillotreau, 1999). The reason being that organised crime exploits any market where money can be made (Vander Beken, 2005).

MONEY AND CREDIT SYSTEMS

Fraud is a crime category with a significant amount of hidden crime (Dolmén, 2004). Only a fraction of these crimes are reported to the police. One form of fraud involves property insurance, which covers personal property. A common form of insurance fraud involves private cars that are supposedly stolen. This kind of fraud could also be applied to cultural objects, which are also susceptible to theft (compare the VIVA concept).

Illegal trade requires the same service functions as legal trade. This includes different types of craftsmen, valuers, carriers, etc. The difference is that the illegal market has to use people who will not ask questions or speak to authorities. Illegal trade may also need other illegal market players such as counterfeiters.

BUYERS AND OTHER OWNERS

After transactions on the market, the objects end up in the hands of buyers or other owners. The owner might keep the object or try and resell it. In some cases, the objects do not go via the market but directly from an illicit removal to an owner, for example from an illegal excavation into the hands of the person who took them.
The complexity of cultural heritage crime is that people want to acquire cultural objects, and a large percentage of this group is not interested in buying illegal objects. They obtain these goods via the legitimate channels offered by legal markets. In a well-known and legitimate environment, the objects are perceived as legal.

Buyers and other acquirers constitute the final stage in the cultural heritage crime model. The ultimate buyer might be a private person with an interest in antiquities and art, a private collector, company, museum, foundation or institution.

**Museums**

Museums are dependent upon the market to expand their collections (Brodie, Doole and Watson, 2000). As mentioned previously, museums compete with each other, and dealing with less serious businesses is always a temptation. As a result, several different ethical guidelines and codes have been developed. One of the best known in relation to illicit removal of cultural objects is the international museum organization ICOM’s Code of Ethics for Museums (ICOM, 2005).

These ethical guidelines have been criticised however. Brodie, Doole and Watson (2000) say that one problem with the ethical guidelines is that they are not sufficiently detailed when describing how museums should proceed when analysing the status of an object before it is acquired. Brodie, Doole and Watson (2000) quote Colin Renfrew who claims that museums often base their assessment of an object’s legal status on scanty information and only avoid objects where it can be proved that they have been looted. A number of museum scandals have emerged in recent years (Conklin, 1994). As mentioned previously, legal action against several of major American museums is currently ongoing (Hall, 2005).

**Collectors**

Mackenzie (2002) quotes Elia (1993) who claims that the real looters are the collectors because they create the demand for cultural objects, and thus make it possible for people to earn money by looting archaeological sites. According to Mackenzie (2002), many collectors feel that they carry out an important task by preserving cultural objects for future generations. The problem is that the objects have been removed from their cultural and archaeological context, and in some cases have completely lost their origin.
This problem links back to our earlier discussion on how the market values individual objects while science values the object’s context.

Collectors are traditionally categorised into *scholarly* collectors and *amateur* collectors (Cannon-Brokes, 1995). The *scholarly* collector is driven by an archaeological interest in the cultural object rather than its aesthetic value. He/she makes careful notes about the object including where it was found and its original context. The *amateur* collector is driven by the object’s aesthetic value rather than its history (Cannon-Brokes, 1995). There is also another category of collector who is driven by a speculative financial interest in the object (Brodie, Doole and Watson, 2000).

According to Brodie (1999), some collectors are unethical because they know that objects in their collections are stolen or looted, but remain silent. They justify their possession of objects from some types of excavations by stretching the concept of theft (Brodie, Doole and Watson, 2000).

The legal availability of objects for collectors depends on how the market is regulated, or on economic factors (O’Keefe, 1997). Some collectors claim that trade in cultural objects is good because it leads to a greater understanding of other cultures (Brodie, Doole and Watson, 2000). From a criminological perspective, this type of argument can be interpreted according to what Syke and Matza (referred to in Lilly, Cullen and Ball, 1995) call techniques of neutralization. This means that transgression of a norm or rule is justified by an argument that neutralises that specific rule or standard. By claiming that trade in cultural objects is positive, collectors justify their own behaviour. But this argument does not mention that trade in cultural objects that have been looted is one-sided, because the objects have been removed from their context. The objects are transferred from poor to rich countries (Brodie, Doole and Watson, 2000). According to Sidibé (1995), this relation is very obvious in the case of Mali. A large part of Mali’s heritage has been moved to Europe and the United States.

The discussion on what exactly is looting and illegal export of cultural objects is far from new. A classic discussion concerns the right of Western countries to move parts of antique temples and other objects to museums in European cities, a practise that has been ongoing for hundreds of years (Leyten 1995). One argument for this is that the objects would have been destroyed if they were not moved. A counter-argument would be that this theft was carried out in the name of colonialism.

“Interior designers”

The global antiquities market has not only increased due to the increased number of collectors, museums and other institutions. There is also a widespread interest in antiquities, design and art that is channelled through interior design. Although they are not collectors, there are large groups of people with money to spend who want to acquire cultural objects for their homes. This desire for cultural objects is strengthened by the fact that they rarely fall in value, which makes them a good investment. The interior design category appears at different social levels, and results in major price variations depending on the private economy of each different household.
Some illicitly removed cultural objects never reach the market. The person who steals an object or loots an ancient monument may be a collector. Theft and looting can also be commissioned so that objects are delivered straight to the client. This type of direct deal probably constitutes a minor percentage of cultural heritage crime though, as very few collectors would have strong enough motives for engaging in criminal activity or the contacts required to commission the job. Most collectors prefer to acquire objects through legitimate channels.

Cultural heritage legislation and its application

All Nordic countries\(^{10}\) have legislation to prevent certain cultural objects from being exported. Laws that limit the removal of cultural objects are based on the concept that these objects are culturally significant and that they will lose some of their ethnological, archaeological and historical value if they are removed from their country of origin. The purpose of these laws is to prevent the depletion of national cultural heritage and where possible keep an object in its original environment. A decision concerning objects that may not be taken out of the country (export status) is based on the object’s national cultural heritage value. Objects can be significant if they are unique, or represent ancient cultures. The decision can also be based on artistic, scientific and historical aspects.

The legislation concerning the definition of a cultural object is different in each country. In Sweden and Denmark, the objects are categorised according to age and/or financial value, but age only in Norway. Finland categorises according to age and/or cultural heritage value. In addition to national legislation, EU member states Denmark, Finland and Sweden also have joint legislation on the export of cultural objects (Council Regulation [EEC] No 3911/92 of 9 December 1992 on the export of cultural goods). These provisions define the object, age and value categories that apply in the regulations.

1970 UNESCO CONVENTION

In 1970, Unesco’s General Assembly adopted the Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property. The Convention considers cultural property as a basic element of civilisation and national culture (1970 Unesco Convention). It is the duty of each nation to protect its cultural property from theft, illegal excavation and illegal export. The Convention also emphasizes that museums, libraries and Archives should ensure that their collections are built up in accordance with universally recognized ethic principles. The Convention lists three main undertakings 1) registration and control, 2) prohibition on export and import and 3) steps for recovery. All Nordic countries have signed this UNESCO Convention. Finland was first to ratify

\(^{10}\) To make reading easier, Nordic countries is used to describe the countries in this study, specifically Denmark, Norway, Finland and Sweden.
the convention in 1999, followed by Denmark and Sweden in 2003, and Norway in 2005.\footnote{\textsuperscript{11}}

\textbf{1995 UNIDROIT CONVENTION}

The 1995 UNIDROIT Convention on Stolen or Illicitly Exported Cultural Objects complements the UNESCO Convention and contains a civil rights regulation aimed at facilitating the recovery of illicitly removed cultural objects (SOU, 2005:3). The Convention has been signed and ratified by Finland and Norway. Sweden and Denmark have not yet ratified the convention but both countries are currently working to make the ratification possible.

\textbf{DIRECTIVE ON RESTITUTION}

In Denmark, Finland and Sweden, there are also regulations concerning the restitution of cultural objects via Directive 93/7/EEC of the Council, of 15 March 1993, on the return of cultural objects unlawfully removed from the territory of a Member State. This directive aims to facilitate the restitution of cultural objects that have been unlawfully removed from the territory of a Member State. An annex to the directive lists the categories of property that are defined as cultural objects. In some cases, they are classified according to their historic and minimum financial value.

\textbf{NATIONAL LEGISLATION}

This section contains a brief description of national legislation concerning cultural objects in the four Nordic countries.

\textbf{DENMARK}

The Danish Ministry of Culture established the National Cultural Heritage Agency in 2002. The Agency is responsible for the national museums, gives advice on antiquities, preserves and restores buildings, and administers archaeological matters.

\textit{Danefae}

Unique to Denmark is Danefae (National Treasures, 2005), which mainly concerns coins found in the ground that no one has claimed. The first Danefae regulations date back to 1241, when a law was passed declaring, “all ownerless precious metals found on the ground should belong to the King”. In 1752, coins are referred to in a legal Act as Danefae. When this law was passed, it was also established that the finder is entitled to financial compensation. Today, the State – through the National Museum of Denmark – is responsible for the Danefae Provisions, which means in practise that all coins found in Danish soil must be submitted to the Royal Collection of Coins and Medals. An obligation to deliver all coins and

\footnote{\textsuperscript{11} See note 3 page 18.}
medals struck at the Royal Mint has applied since the 1700s, which means there is now a complete collection.

Marine archaeology\textsuperscript{12}

Ancient monuments in, on or under the seabed are protected by museum laws that are administrated by the National Cultural Heritage Agency. This protection applies regardless of whether the ancient monument is known – and registered – or not. This protection safeguards ancient monuments and shipwrecks that are more than 100 years old from human destruction. This refers primarily to theft and construction work on the bottom of the sea. The law protects all ships and boats that were wrecked more than one hundred years ago. This includes cargoes and ballast bunkers. All known ancient monuments and most shipwrecks are registered in the National Cultural Heritage Agency’s database, “The National Sites and Monuments Record” (Fund og Fortidsminder, 2005). Recreational divers, fishers, amateur archaeologists and any others who might discover objects from an ancient monument or protected shipwreck must report their finds to the National Cultural Heritage Agency, according to museum laws.

Removal and export legislation

Denmark was the last Nordic country to introduce legislation to stop cultural objects from being exported. The law was introduced in 1987. The background to this law was the sale of a series of paintings from the Danish manor house Gravø in an auction house in London in 1976 (http://www.kulturvaerdier.dk/dk/lovstof/forside.htm). One of the works was Reinhold Timm’s famous painting “Kong Christian IV:s hofmusikanter”. The Danish State collected SEK 5 million to buy back this painting, which was considered a significant piece of Danish cultural heritage. The money was insufficient, however, and the painting was sold to a collector in the Netherlands. To avoid similar losses in the future, a study was set up in 1982 to develop proposals for protecting the Danish cultural heritage, which resulted in the existing law.

The export of cultural objects is regulated in Denmark by Act no. 332, 4.6 on Protection of Cultural Assets in Denmark. Act no. 1104 of 22 December 1993 on Return of Cultural objects Unlawfully Removed from the Territory of an EU Member State also applies. This Act implements Council Directive 93/7/EOF of 15 March 1993 in Danish law.\textsuperscript{13}

The definitions of protected cultural objects are based on age and financial value. Objects covered by the protection are 1) cultural objects produced before 1660, 2) cultural objects valued at more than DKK 100,000 and 3) photography valued at more than DKK 30,000. Coins and medals are not covered by the legislation. The law applies for objects produced in Denmark or that have been in Denmark for at least 100 years.

\textsuperscript{12} This information has taken from the National Cultural Heritage Agency’s website http://www.kulturarv.dk/forvaltning.

\textsuperscript{13} These law texts can be found on the website of the Danish Commission on the Export of Cultural Assets: http://www.kulturvaerdier.dk.
The Commission on Export of Cultural Assets (Kulturærdiutvalget) is responsible for applications and consists of representatives from the National Museum of Denmark, the Danish National Gallery, the Royal Library, the State Archives and a member appointed by the Minister for Culture who are each responsible for permit applications in their own area of expertise. In addition, the Commission on Export of Cultural Assets collaborates with seven institutions that present the Commission with a summary of auction catalogues and acquisition cases. The seven collaborating institutions have been chosen because they span the areas of expertise in the Commission on Export of Cultural Assets.

Fines are imposed for violating the ban on export. A later amendment to the Act states that offenders may face up to 12 month’s imprisonment if the deed is carried out with intent, or to achieve financial gain.

FINLAND

The Finnish Antiquities Act of 1963 extends automatic protection to all permanent ancient monuments, and prohibits their excavation, covering or disturbance in any way without a permit from the National Board of Antiquities in accordance with the Antiquities Act. The law does not define the monuments or sites based on age, but uses terms such as ancient, in ancient times, from pre-Christian times, etc.

In Finland, ancient monuments in, on or under the seabed are protected in the same manner as ancient monuments on land. The protection of shipwrecks is based on age. A shipwreck or part of a shipwreck that has sunk one hundred years ago is defined as an immovable monument. The National Board of Antiquities must be informed immediately of shipwreck finds. If the owner has abandoned the shipwreck, it becomes the property of the State. The marine archaeological unit at the National Board of Antiquities is responsible for protecting ancient monuments in, on or under the seabed.

Removal and export legislation

Laws that regulate the export of cultural objects in Finland are the Act on Restrictions to the Export of Cultural objects 115/1999 and the Decree on Restrictions to the Export of Cultural objects 189/1999. The definition of cultural objects that are protected is based on the object’s age and/or cultural heritage value. The objects covered by the original legislation from 1978 are 1) more than 50-year old works of art and art industry and handcraft products, 2) other more than 50-year old objects of general cultural heritage value and 3) objects connected to national history and noted people, valuable manuscripts and scientifically significant collections regardless of age. The Act has now been amended to include archaeological objects that are found on land or in the water. The legislator has also raised the age limits from 50 years and upwards for many of the objects covered by point 3 above. The law applies to objects produced outside of Finland if they have been in Finland for at least 50 of the last 100 years.

14 For a more detailed description of protected objects, see the Act on Restrictions to Export of Cultural Objects 115/1999.
The National Board of Antiquities is a consultative and permit-issuing authority for the export of cultural objects. The National Gallery and the War Museum in Helsinki, Turku Provincial Museum, the Provincial Museum of Kymenlaakso, Satakunta museum, K.H. Renlunds museum, Jakobstads museum, Österbottens museum and the Provincial Museum of Torneålen assess national export permit applications in their own specific area of expertise.

The export of cultural objects without a permit is an offence liable to prosecution ranging from monetary fines for minor smuggling, to a maximum of two year’s imprisonment for smuggling.

Export to third countries is regulated by “Regulation (EEC) no 3911/92 of the Council, of 9 December 1992, on the export of cultural objects”. The definitions in the Council Regulation are slightly different to national provisions concerning for example value limits. The National Board of Antiquities and the National Art Museum issue EU permits in Finland.

NORWAY

The Norwegian ancient monument administration and legislation has a previous history where archaeologists have been responsible for protecting ancient monuments, and architects and art historians for preserving buildings, both with their own laws (Holme, 2005). These two traditions were combined in 1978 in a joint Ancient Monuments Act. The Norwegian county municipalities were given a leading regional role in 1990. Since 2004, responsibility has been distributed between a large number of actors in a complex administrative system.

ABM-utvikling – the Norwegian Archive, Library and Museum Authority – was created in 2003, through a merger of former administrative units in the ABM area. ABM-utvikling is a public institution tasked with promoting development and collaboration between archives, libraries and museums.

The Ancient Monuments Act covers churches in Norway.15 The Ancient Monuments Act also protects ancient monuments in, on or under the seabed e.g. shipwrecks. According to Section 14, any finds of boats, fittings, cargo and similar more than 100-years old belong to the State (Nævestad, 2005). The Directorate for Cultural Heritage is the exemption authority for handling shipwreck finds. There is no systematic registration of ancient monuments in, on or under the seabed in Norway. Existing registers do not show exact find areas, but illustrate areas with high activity by divers (Holme, 2005).16

Export legislation

There are several cultural institutions in Norway that permit export licences. The institutions are listed in figure 12.

---

15 All churches older than 1649 are automatically protected due to the legislation. Younger churches are protected when decisions on protection for that specific church has been taken.

16 The archaeological findings made underwater in Norway can to a high degree be credited to recreational divers who have reported them. The findings are registered in the maritime museums in Oslo, Stavanger and Bergen.
The Cultural Heritage Act (9 June 1978 No. 50) regulates the export of cultural objects in Norway. The definition of protected cultural objects is based on age. Cultural objects covered by the legislation are 1) automatically protected ancient monuments, 2) buildings of any kind, and others object of artistic, cultural or genealogical interest that are more than 100 years old, 3) Sami monuments of any age, 4) memoirs of prominent people regardless of age, 5) paintings, sculptures and other pictorial art, handicraft and prototypes for product design that are more than 50 years old, etc (for more details, see the legislation in the Cultural Heritage Act, 1978).

Violation of this Act may be punishable with monetary fines or imprisonment of up to 12 months. Serious crimes can lead to a maximum of two years imprisonment. Aiding and abetting is also a criminal offence and liable to prosecution.

SWEDEN

The Act Concerning Ancient Monuments and Finds (1988:950) is a combination of several laws in this area. It regulates all areas covered by this study i.e. immovable monuments including shipwrecks more than 100 years old, historic buildings, historic churches and safeguarding against the export of certain older cultural objects.

Removal and export legislation

Sweden was the first country in the Nordic region to introduce legislation that protected cultural objects from export. The background was a letter to the Head of the Ministry of Education and Ecclesiastical Affairs in 1927, where the curator of the Nordiska museet, Sigurd Erixon, registered a comprehensive and ongoing removal of old country style furniture and other cultural objects (Adlercreutz, 2001). This letter lead to the introduction of public notice (1927:129) concerning a prohibition on the export of certain categories of cultural objects produced before 1860, without the permission of the King (SOU 1995:128). This public notice was later replaced by Act (1985:1104) on protection against export of certain older cultural objects. At the same time, this permit-issuing function was transferred from the King to the National Heritage Board.

In Sweden, the Act Concerning Ancient Monuments and Finds (1988:950) and the Ordinance Concerning Ancient Monuments and Finds (1988:1188) safeguard against the export of cultural objects. The definition of protected objects is based on their age and/or value. The Act covers basically 1) archaeological objects from before 1650, 2) paintings and drawings that are more than 100 years old valued at more than SEK 20,000, 3) sculptures that are more than 50 years old and valued at more than SEK 50,000, 4) books and maps valued at more than SEK 10,000 and books printed before 1600 regardless of value, 5) Archives, etc that are more than 50 years old and valued at more than SEK 2,000, etc.17

17 For a full description of protected objects, see the Act Concerning Ancient Monuments and Finds (1988:950).
The National Heritage Board assesses all applications and distributes them according to the category of the object to one of the following permit-issuing authorities: Nordiska museet, the National Archives, the National Museum of Fine Arts with Prince Eugen’s Valdemarsudde, the Royal Library and the National Heritage Board.

Council Regulation (EEC) no 3911/92 of 9 December 1992 on the export of cultural goods contains provisions for export to countries outside the customs territory of the Community. The permit-issuing authorities and procedures are the same as for exporting cultural objects as set out in the Act Concerning Ancient Monuments and Finds, Chap 5.

To compensate for the absence of border controls now that Sweden has joined the EU, Council Directive 93/7/EEC of 15 March 1993 on the return of cultural objects unlawfully removed from the territory of a Member State was introduced after lengthy negotiations. This directive has been implemented in Sweden through the Act Concerning Ancient Monuments and Finds, Chap 6.

According to the Act on the Customs Administration’s Authority at Sweden’s Borders to Countries in the European Union (1996:701), Swedish Customs officials can exercise controls on the export of cultural objects. These controls must not take place randomly, however. There must be good reason to suspect that the person concerned has not applied for an export permit and the control must take place in immediate proximity to the border crossing.

Liability for illicit removal or attempts to illegally export cultural objects is regulated in the Act on Penalties for Smuggling (2000:1225). Attempts to smuggle are also punishable. Penalties may be monetary fines or a maximum of 2 years imprisonment, or up to six years for serious offences. If offenders are convicted, the smuggled goods are confiscated. Knowingly packaging, transporting, storing, hiding, working, acquiring or transferring objects are also criminal offences and liable to monetary fines or a maximum 2 years imprisonment. The crime classification is illicit dealing with smuggled goods.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Act on Protection of Cultural Assets in Denmark (Act no. 332 of June 4, 1986)</td>
<td>Age and/or financial value</td>
<td>Kulturværdiutvalget</td>
<td>If permit application is refused, the committee will offer to buy the object</td>
<td>Co-operation with 4 auction houses</td>
<td>Ratified 2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 12. Summary of national legislation on the removal and export of cultural objects.

\textsuperscript{18} See note 3 page 18.
Cultural heritage crime in the Nordic region – results of the study

This section presents the results of the studies in the analysis model described earlier. The model is used to systematically analyse all the treated areas. At the end of the results section, there are also summaries of the results categorised according to targets so that readers who are only interested in one area, museums for example, can quickly review the results of that specific area.

We have chosen to present the combined results in all countries wherever possible because we consider this to be a Nordic study. Any major differences between the countries are presented separately. If the selection for the questionnaire study differs between the countries, each country is also presented separately. The nationality of the interviewee is not given in the interviews because we see this material as Nordic, and also to protect the identity of the interviewees.

The model should not be seen as a flow diagram, or a production line that is read from left to right. Reality is usually more complex. In fact, it is usually impossible to follow an object as it travels “through the model”. We have studied verdicts and pre-trial investigation reports in an attempt to reconstruct in reverse how objects move through the model. Even this has proved difficult. We know how stolen goods change owner and place in some cases. The time it takes for objects to move from production to market is different. Sometimes objects move between different dealers several times before they reach a buyer.

The presentation of the results follows the analysis model’s disposition in a production and a market section.

The production section begins with a description of the targets, i.e. the institutions and marketplaces that are subject to illicit removal and the actual objects that are taken. Illicit removal is then explained, i.e. how the actual thefts, illegal excavations, wreck plundering or illegal import/exports can take form. Then we describe the opportunities for illicit removal that apply for the different objects. The section concludes with a description of motives for the illicit removal, and the service functions that are required to implement the removal.

The results in the market section begin with an account of the legal market, followed by a description of the grey zone, which is so important in cultural heritage crime. The presentation continues with the illegal market and finally buyers and other owners.
As mentioned previously in the theory section when discussing the routine activity theory (Cohen and Felson, 1979), there must be a motivated offender, a suitable target and poor security arrangements for a theft to take place. All of these elements are included in the analysis model and we begin with a presentation of object and targets based on the study results. The questions we will try to answer in this section are: What institutions and dealers are targeted for the illicit removal of art and cultural objects in the Nordic region and what types of objects disappear? What factors determine what is stolen and from where?

The motives for targeting a specific institution, government agency or dealer can vary. The same applies for the types of objects that are stolen. In the interview material, it has been possible to identify and categorise the different types of factors that determine which institutions, government agencies or dealers will be targeted for theft, and the types of objects that will be stolen. The categories overlap and several factors may apply simultaneously. The categories are:

- Commission-based choice
- Knowledge-based choice
- Market-based choice
- Risk-based choice
- Opportunity-based choice
- Generalist

---

19 Cohen and Felson (1979) calls this absence of a capable guardian.
We will now discuss each of these categories separately, based on the results of the interview study.

**Commission-based choice**

A commission-based choice means that the offender has been commissioned to carry out an illicit removal. The range of commissioned jobs can vary from a client who assigns someone to go around visiting libraries and stealing old maps, to an offender who has been instructed to steal specific objects from a specific place. In this category, the client has knowledge of the objects that will be stolen and the offender follows his/her instructions. The thief who carries out the crime is either the *good burglar* or *known burglar*, to refer back to the chapter on theories and research. The following example has been taken from an interview with a police officer and illustrates how commissioned jobs can take form.

An antique dealer from South America hired some fellow countrymen to steal cultural objects in a Nordic country. The antique dealer went around to churches, cemeteries, parks and other places and pointed out the sculptures and antiquities that he wanted. Some of these were objects made from cast iron. The objects were stolen by his countrymen and packed in a container that would be sent to South America.

Another good illustration of a commission-based choice is the following case rendered by some interviewed police officers.

A man hired some thieves to steal some specific objects for him from churches. He did his research carefully beforehand by reading books and scouting the sites. The offenders were given careful instructions on what to steal, both written and illustrated. The thieves invariably took the most valuable objects and left the rest, except on one occasion when they took an insignificant chandelier and left the more valuable chandelier behind. The verger of the church had rearranged the chandeliers just before the burglary, so the thieves took the wrong object. The actual offenders had no knowledge of the value of the goods. If the client had carried out the burglary himself, he would have known which chandelier to take. When the stolen goods were handed over to the client, he ordered the men to throw it in a lake.

**Knowledge-based choice**

A knowledge-based choice means that the offender has knowledge of cultural objects and steals specific objects that he/she knows are valuable. In contrast to commissioned jobs, the offender has knowledge of the cultural objects in these cases. Signs of knowledge-based choices in the interview material were cases where large quantities of objects had been stolen from major collections and only the most valuable objects were taken. One example was the case of a second-hand bookshop owner, when a burglary had taken place in the premises where he kept his books. A large number of books were stolen, valued at several million kronor. The interviewee said the thieves seemed to know exactly what they were looking for. The most valuable
book on one shelf was gone, and so forth. These thieves would be classified as good burglars according to the chapter on theories and research.

Market-based choice
A market-based choice means only stealing objects that are considered easy to sell. These are usually impersonal things that are difficult to trace and not subject to any kind of market control.

Risk-based choice
A risk-based choice means that the risk for being caught when choosing targets and objects is considered. This is reflected in seasonal crime. An interviewed police officer gives the following reasons for why there are so few art thefts through housebreaking in an exclusive suburb during a particular period.

It's not the season. The break-ins don't start until the summer when houses are empty. (Interviewee 74, police)

Another striking example of how risk can influence the choice of targets and objects is the following quotation from an interviewed police officer. He quotes a tipster who said the following when a series of organized church thefts had been solved.

Well, thanks to the police, the church season is now over. The new target is manor houses and country estates. (Interviewee 70, police)

All categories of thieves in the theory chapter make risk-based choices, but they take and assess risks differently because of drug addiction, for example.

Opportunity-based choice
An opportunity-based choice means that the theft is not planned, but takes place when an opportunity arises. The targets and objects are not chosen in advance, the theft is spontaneous. According to the chapter on theories and research, unskilled thieves are responsible for this type of theft. The following story from an interviewed museum employee provides an example.
Generalist

A generalist thief is an offender without a specific target or object. This kind of thief is not specifically focused on cultural objects, and will take anything that comes along. Anything that can be sold is of interest. The thief has scanty knowledge of both cultural objects and the market. Generalist thieves are usually the most unskilled thieves.

We will now take a closer look at the institutions and dealers that are targeted for the illicit removal of art and cultural objects in the Nordic region, and the types of objects that disappear.

PRESERVERS AS THEFT TARGETS

This section looks at preservers as targets for illicit removal.

NORDIC MUSEUMS AS THEFT TARGETS

Museums are regularly targeted for theft. Media covers the most spectacular events, while others pass by unnoticed. Sometimes it takes a long time to discover these thefts. Every year during the past three years, 10 per cent of museums have lost objects according to the results of the questionnaire study. On average, objects has disappeared on 58 occasions per year from the 578 Nordic museums that have responded to the study. Table 2 shows that Sweden has the greatest proportion of museums that have lost cultural objects during the past three years, 19–20 per cent per year, while the other countries report a lower proportion of thefts, between 5-13 per cent.

The interviewed representatives from the Swedish museum sector claim that the lower theft level in the other countries depends on 1) better organized museum training, particularly in Denmark and Norway, 2) a stronger security culture and 3) that museums have better economy in the other Nordic countries. According to the interviewees, security guards were the first to go from Swedish museums when the economy deteriorated.

A man came into a museum and wanted to see an exhibition. The staff noticed that the man acted suspiciously. When he left the museum, a silver goblet was missing. Sometime later that day, the man came back and wanted to see the exhibition again. He was allowed to walk around and when he was finished, the staff told him that the Head of the Museum wanted to see him. The man rushed out, followed by the Head of the Museum who chased him around the block. Soon afterwards, the police arrested him and the museum got the goblet back again. There didn’t seem to be any motive behind the theft. The man was not wealthy, and just passing through the town. The staff at the museum believes it was just a whim that he came to the museum. He may have thought he could steal something from the museum and sell it to an antique shop to make some money.
Another reason why Sweden has so many museums that report losses may be due to the selection process where the Swedish selection focused on museums that were considered to have interesting objects\(^2\).

The museums with reported losts of cultural items report a median of 1-2 objects on each occasion. The average number of lost objects per occasion is 3-4 objects, however, which means that a few cases must have lost a large number of objects on the same occasion.

According to the questionnaire responses, historic everyday objects constitute the largest category of stolen goods from museums during the past five-year period. This type of object has been reported stolen from 79 museums. These objects include tools, kitchen utensils, fabrics, china and toys. They may also include skirting board, fittings and bits of furniture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examples of objects stolen from museums:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tools from 19(^{\text{th}}) century printing shops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paperweight from 18(^{\text{th}}) century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toothpick labels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasses from 1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objects from WWII</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Figure 14, the historic everyday objects category is more than twice the size of any other category. These objects are usually small, not highly valued and left unguarded in museums. It is thus objects that are linked to the different categories of theft mentioned earlier that are subject to opportunity and risk-based choices, and theft by generalists.

\(^2\) For a more detailed description of the selection of museums, see Appendix 1.
An adjacent category of cultural objects is silver or precious metal objects that are reported stolen from 15 museums, primarily jewellery and pocket watches. Silver objects are usually more valuable than historic everyday objects but not valuable enough to warrant high security protection. When it comes to stolen art, thirty museums report losses during the past five years. The paintings are mainly from the early 1900s, and usually oil paintings on canvas. One interviewed prisoner, convicted of offences related to cultural heritage crime, explained why art from the 1900s is usually stolen.

Old and valuable art is impossible to sell. The stolen goods just lie around somewhere. It is easier to sell art from the 1900s. Really old objects are difficult to sell. They are too valuable. People react when they see really old things. New things blend into the environment. There's a different kind of demand for new things. (Interviewee 44, prisoner convicted of offences related to cultural heritage crime)

The interviewed prisoner has defined a market-based choice.

Danish museums differ from museums in other countries because only two of them reported stolen art in the questionnaire study, while 12 of the Swedish museums, 9 Norwegian and 7 Finnish museums reported art theft. The difference between stolen art and stolen historic everyday objects is that art is usually more valuable, but more difficult to remove from a museum without being noticed.

The third most common category of stolen cultural objects is antique weapons, which was reported by 25 museums. Most antique weapons are stolen from Swedish and Finnish museums. These choices may possibly be market-based because antique weapons are a collector’s item and usually quite valuable. Seventeen museums say that they have lost archaeological
objects. These included historic everyday objects such as axes, knives, coins and keys. Even furniture has been reported stolen from 17 museums during the past five years. The most common types of furniture are mirrors, cupboards and chairs from the period 1600 – 1900. The theft of sculptures from museums is most common in Sweden, where 11 museums reported disappearances, but this was not so common in other countries where it was only reported by a total of 7 museums. These cases usually included modern sculptures, although older wooden carvings were stolen on a few exceptional occasions.

Two thirds of the museums say that objects that had disappeared during the past five years had several features in common. As seen in Table 3, collector’s items are the most common feature when museums describe the stolen objects (42 per cent). The features easy to steal and easy to sell are used in 31 respectively 27 per cent of museum descriptions. High financial value and high cultural heritage value are used in 18 respectively 20 per cent of cases. There are no major differences between the countries.

[Table 3: Features in common for cultural objects lost from museums (n=152).]

NORDIC LIBRARIES AS THEFT TARGETS

Libraries differ from other preservers of cultural objects because their primary function is to lend books to the general public, and most of these books are new. Some libraries also have valuable older books on their shelves, but presenting these cultural heritage books for the general public is a minor part of the library’s activities. The definition of cultural objects in the questionnaire did not include any age or financial limit for books. Some libraries have therefore included new books in their response to the questionnaire. Newer books have thus been removed from the questionnaire responses and the results that are presented relate to older books with financial or cultural value.

Every year during the past three years, 12 per cent of libraries have lost cultural objects according to the questionnaire study. This means 10 – 16 libraries per year out of 120 libraries. The libraries that reported losing cultural objects usually report several cases. The relatively high level of dis-
appearances can partly be explained by the fact that it is unknown whether these books have been stolen or just misplaced.

The lost cultural objects are usually books from 1500s – 1800s.\textsuperscript{21} Seventeen of 24 libraries (79 per cent) that have lost cultural objects over the last five years say that the missing objects had some features in common. Most of these libraries, 12 in total, describe the objects as easy to steal. Seven libraries describe the objects as easy to sell and five as collector’s item. Four libraries mention unique features such as high financial value and cultural heritage value.

There are two well-known cases of internal theft from libraries in the Nordic region: from the Royal Library in Copenhagen, and the Royal Library in Stockholm. Both cases were discovered recently even though the crimes had been going on for a long time. In a report to the Ministry of Culture (2005) concerning the thefts from the Royal Library in Copenhagen, a theft profile based on the books that were stolen from the library was presented. Most of the books were printed before 1800. Most of them were exclusive European classics from 1500 – 1600, usually first editions or works with extensive illustrations. The languages in the stolen books were major European languages: Latin, French, Italian, Spanish, English and German. In addition, some other modern books on topics that the offender was particularly interested in were stolen. Although this theft profile is only based on the thefts of one offender, it is fairly useful for risk analysis purposes because it gives a selection of books that are sought-after on the international market. If we assume, in accordance with the chapter on theories and research, that financial gain is the most common motive for stealing old books, the international market is the principal arena for disposing of the books. National treasures written in Swedish, Danish, Norwegian or Finnish have a very limited market outside of their own countries and it is also difficult to sell the books inside the country because knowledge of them would reveal their origin. A very small circle handles second-hand books and everyone in that circle knows where the collections are kept. National books may be sought-after by thieves with a collection motive, however.

The interview study presents a similar picture to the Danish theft profile concerning the type of books that are stolen. The difference between the interviews and the questionnaire results and theft profile is that even valuable maps seem to be an attractive theft target. Based on the interview material, it seems that some thieves specialize in valuable maps, as illustrated by the following example.

Two men from a European country embarked on a thieving spree throughout Europe and visited a number of different libraries. They mainly stole valuable maps. Around 30 – 40 maps were stolen from one Nordic library. The men were soon caught. It was suspected that a fence commissioned them to steal maps, but it was never proved.

\textsuperscript{21} A few libraries have also reported disappearances of art, sculptures and furniture.
Whole books are not always targeted when stealing maps; the maps can be cut out of the books in the library, which makes the theft difficult to discover. Maps and illustrations are highly valued on the international market and the risk of discovery is lower when individual pages are traded rather than whole books with illustrations.

NORDIC ARCHIVES AS THEFT TARGETS

There are 54 Archives in the material, and four of them reported losing cultural objects during the past five years (7 per cent). Three of these cases were in Finland and one in Sweden. In Sweden, unspecified archive material, etc from 1600s–1900s were stolen, and a letter, wall chart and register were stolen in Finland. Twenty-four of the Archives said that they had lost documents in the past. The most common type of stolen archives, etc, are letters, envelopes and stamps, which 13 Archives had reported. Other types of documents are unspecified archives, etc from 1600 – 1900, which were reported by seven Archives, and maps and wall charts, which were reported by four Archives.

Although only a few cases of theft have been reported, it would seem that theft from Archives is more frequent than what is shown by the questionnaire results. Documents are not registered individually in Archives; they are registered in folders with related documents. This means that a document can be removed from a folder and not noticed in an inventory. For this reason, theft from Archives is difficult to detect and may explain why so few thefts are reported. The number of cases that are not discovered until a document appears on the market should also confirm this.

NORDIC CHURCHES AS THEFT TARGETS

Church thefts in Sweden have received a great deal of media attention during recent years. Due to collaboration with Diocesan Curators in Sweden, it has been possible to expand the study to include all churches in the Church of Sweden (Brå, 2005b). In other Nordic countries, a selection of churches has been used in the questionnaire study. As a result, the Swedish material is presented separately.

According to the questionnaire study, about five per cent of the Swedish churches have lost cultural objects every year during the past three years. This means an average of 41 thefts per year from 652 responding churches. The proportion of thefts is lower in other Nordic countries.

Between one and two per cent of the Norwegian churches have lost cultural objects every year during the past three years. This corresponds to five churches during the entire three-year period for 88 responding churches. On average, ten objects are stolen on each occasion, which distinguishes the Norwegian churches from churches in the other countries, where the mean value is two stolen goods on each occasion.

\[22 \text{ For a more detailed description of the selection, see under Method.}\]

\[23 \text{ For the sake of readability, a church’s economic entity is referred to as “the church” even though it may consist of several buildings.}\]
Every year during the past three years, three per cent of the Finnish churches reported losses of cultural objects, which corresponds to theft from 4 of 52 responding churches during the entire three-year period.

One of nine Danish churches reported losing cultural objects during the past three years.

The largest category of objects reported stolen from Swedish churches is candlesticks and church plate (reported by 66 churches). Effects like chandeliers are reported stolen from 33 churches. The third largest category of missing objects is sculptures, which was reported by 29 churches during the past five years. In Norway, Denmark and Finland, it is not relevant to present categories of stolen objects as the number of thefts is so low. The objects stolen from churches in the different countries are listed below.

### Examples of cultural objects stolen from Swedish churches:
- Bridal crowns
- Organ pipes
- Karl XII’s bible
- Model of ship for votive offering
- Nativity figures
- Candlesticks
- Antique church keys
- Hourglasses
- Crucifix
- Christening-bowls
- Chandeliers
- Dove from pulpit

### Cultural objects stolen from Norwegian churches:
- Candlesticks
- Organ pipes
- Grave sculptures
- Textiles
- Collection boxes

### Cultural objects stolen from Finnish churches:
- Candlesticks
- Altar crucifix
- Jesus sculpture
- Christening-bowls

### Cultural objects stolen from Danish churches:
- Antique furniture

From a market perspective, there are a number of differences between these different object categories that affect their vulnerability to theft. The largest category of stolen goods, candlesticks and church plate, is valuable for several reasons. Firstly, it has cultural heritage value that includes its history and artistic design. Secondly, the silver has both a silver-weight-value, and a layperson’s value based on what appears to be valuable to the average person on the street. Church plate and candlesticks can thus be targeted for both knowledge-based and market-based choices depending on the type of value that is most attractive, and there are markets for objects with both of these values. The specialised antiquities market that handles objects with high artistic and cultural heritage value, or the everyday second-hand market where material and marketability steer. As described in the section on theories and research (Walsh, 1977), this depends on the category of thief that steals the object: an addict looking for fast money who carries out a market-based theft, or a well planned commissioned theft.
An interviewed prisoner convicted of offences related to cultural heritage crime, claims there is no major market for antique ecclesiastical objects, and confirms the picture that there are different motivations for church theft. From his descriptions, it could be interpreted that ecclesiastical objects are just like any other objects for generalists and market-motivated thieves. An antique ecclesiastical candlestick is no different to any other candlestick. Thieves can either use them as candlesticks or give them away. For generalists, there is no difference between a car stereo and a chandelier. Another interviewee who works at an auction house presented a similar picture of church theft and claims that, in spite of everything, we should be grateful for thieves’ ignorance because according to him, they almost always take the “wrong things”. On the other hand, the interviewed prisoner claimed that commissioned work was fairly common. The objects are then sold in countries like Germany and the Netherlands.

Sculptures in churches are usually unique, old objects with a strong link to the region, which makes them more difficult to sell on the second-hand market without established contacts with specialists. The objects lack direct value like silver and are not prone to the same market-based theft, which may explain why fewer objects in this category are stolen. The theft of these objects is usually carefully planned. The theft of sculptures is extra deplorable because their cultural heritage value is irreplaceable. Chandeliers, like sculptures, are usually unique but they can be taken apart and put together again to disguise their identity. This means that stolen chandeliers are easier to sell without being discovered.

In the questionnaire, 39 per cent of the Swedish churches victimized by theft describe the missing objects as easy to steal. That the missing objects hold cultural heritage value is also a common description. Easy to sell, high financial value and collector’s item (20 per cent, 19 per cent, 10 per cent) are less common descriptions from churches. One possible reason for this is that the churches are not affiliated with antique markets and are probably oblivious to the demand for these objects and their prices.

**OPEN AIR MUSEUMS AS THEFT TARGETS**

There are open air museums in Sweden and Finland. They grew out of a non-profit local history movement with nationalistic overtones in the late 1800s aimed at saving what was left of a disappearing agricultural society (Arcadius, 1997). The efforts of local history societies have resulted in open air museums with collections of objects from pre-industrial society. The objects owned by these associations provide valuable documentation of local cultural heritage developments. Sometimes these objects are also financially valuable which makes them susceptible to theft. According to ICOM’s definition of museums (ICOM, 2005), a local history museum is not technically a museum because it usually lacks specially trained staff. Open air museums in Sweden and Finland are included in the questionnaire study but because the selection is so different in the two countries, the
results from each country are presented separately\textsuperscript{24}. There is no equivalent to open air museums in Denmark and Norway.\textsuperscript{25}

\textit{Swedish open air museums as theft targets}

The selection of open air museums in Sweden is limited to those that have reported thefts to their insurance companies between 2000 and 2004. This selection procedure was chosen, because it would present a picture of the circumstances surrounding the crime and its nature, despite the relatively small number of observations. Fifty-eight per cent, or 30 of the 50 reported thefts involve cultural objects. Compared to the total number of insured local history societies, 1,266 in total, this is not a high figure. There is a risk, however, that the theft of cultural objects has not been reported to insurance companies, which is also true in other areas such as antique shops and museums where less valuable objects are involved. During the past three years, 38 open air museums reported 46 incidents of stolen cultural objects. Normally, several cultural objects are stolen on each occasion, an average of 14 objects on each occasion. One possible reason for the high number of stolen goods on each occasion is the selection of associations that reported the thefts to their insurance companies. One category of objects that appears frequently in the questionnaire study (reported lost by 19 associations) is furniture, especially wall cupboards. Other frequently occurring object categories are silver and precious metals (reported lost by ten associations), candlesticks and coins (reported lost by eight associations) and archaeological objects (reported lost by seven associations). The most frequently occurring object category, as for museums, is historic everyday objects such as tools and household utensils (reported lost by 22 associations).

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|}
\hline
Examples of objects stolen from open air museums: & \\
Copper coins from 17\textsuperscript{th} century & Sacrificial axes \\
Silver pipe stand & Flint daggers \\
Bronze axes & Stone axes \\
Bronze knives & Pocket watches \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

About 80 per cent of the Swedish open air museums that have lost cultural objects during the past five years say that the stolen objects have some features in common. Half of the victimized open air museums give high \textit{cultural heritage value} and \textit{collector's items} as features in common, while only 24 per cent say that the objects have high \textit{financial value}. Thirty-eight per cent claim that the stolen objects are \textit{easy to steal} and 48 per cent that they are \textit{easy to sell}. These results match the descriptions given in the interviews with chairpersons from different local history societies. In some interviews, interviewees say that objects that are easy to sell are targeted, but in many cases the theft has been commissioned or is a knowledge-based

\textsuperscript{24} For more details on the selection process, see under \textit{Method}.

\textsuperscript{25} In Norway there are museums similar to these category but they have other trustees. This specific Swedish and Finnish form is called hembygdsförening and does not exist outside Scandinavia.
choice. Signs that suggest commissioned jobs, according to the interviewees, are that only ancient objects are stolen even though open air museums have other valuable objects. One interviewee describes a burglary, for example, where ancient objects from the Stone and Bronze Age were stolen. The local history museum also had a valuable collection of marine objects that the thieves left untouched. Another interviewee says that his local history museum also lost prehistoric objects in a theft. The theft occurred at the same time as similar thefts from other open air museums in the area. The thieves took the same type of objects from all places. The interviewee says, “We don’t have any whole daggers or prehistoric objects anymore”.

Interviewees have had difficulties estimating the value of the stolen objects. One interviewee says that during the last ten years, his local history association has lost objects amounting to about SEK 300,000. Additional costs for vandalism are about SEK 100,000. Open air museums are quite clear, however, that the greatest damage is not the financial loss, but that the objects were so unique for the district. One interviewee expresses this by explaining that “the objects themselves are probably not worth very much, but they are irreplaceable for our district. We can never replace them.” Another interviewee was devastated, “They’ve taken a piece of our soul.”

**Finnish open air museums as theft targets**

During the past three years, seven of 46 open air museums reported 12 thefts. The average number of stolen goods on each occasion is two objects, which is considerably less than for Swedish open air museums. As for Swedish open air museums, the largest category of stolen goods is everyday objects and household utensils, which seven of the respondents have reported. Three open air museums have reported stolen weapons and two say stolen furniture in the Finnish material. The stolen objects are mainly described as collector’s items and easy to sell. None of the associations have reported high financial value as a common feature for the stolen objects.

**UNIVERSITIES AS THEFT TARGETS**

A small selection of Nordic universities with collections has taken part in the questionnaire study. Of the eight universities that answered the questionnaire, none of them reported losing cultural objects during the past five years.

**DEALERS AS THEFT TARGETS**

Not only preservers handle cultural objects. These objects are also found in private homes, and there is a large market for antiquities of various quality and value. Dealers of cultural objects, such as auction houses, antique shops, second-hand bookshops and pawnshops can also be victimized by theft.

**NORDIC AUCTION HOUSES AS THEFT TARGETS**

Every year during the past three years, an average of 5 of 28 auction houses have reported losing cultural objects. The auction houses that reported thefts in the questionnaire claim three thefts per year on average. The
number of reported thefts is thus considerably higher than the number of victimized auction houses. The objects reported stolen from auction houses in the questionnaire study are graphic pictorial art, sculptures in bronze and china, silver goblets, candlesticks and jewellery. The majority of the stolen objects are from the 1900s.

One interviewee told how not only whole objects are stolen from auction houses. Parts of objects are also stolen from exhibitions, including original fittings or keyhole plates on bureaus or cupboards. These objects are easy to steal and have a high market value. The result is that furniture loses some of its cultural and financial value.

One auction house says that objects disappeared in burglaries, five auction houses reported other types of theft, and two auction houses say that the circumstances surrounding the thefts are unclear. Objects have been reported missing from the showroom of eight auction houses and from the store-room of one auction house. The most common circumstances were daytime, weekdays and unattended times.

NORDIC ANTIQUE DEALERS AS THEFT TARGETS

Every year during the past three years, an average 12 per cent of antique dealers (25 of 207) have reported losing cultural objects. Just like the auction houses, the antique dealers who reported thefts in the questionnaire reported three theft incidents per year. The number of thefts is thus considerably higher than the number of victimized antique dealers as shown in Table 4. During the past three years, the victimized antique dealers were robbed on three separate incidents per year, on average. On each occasion, an average of three objects was stolen.

Table 4: Averages for victimization, theft incidents and number of lost objects from nordic antique dealers during the past three years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Victimized by theft per year</th>
<th>Theft incidents per year</th>
<th>Lost objects per year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 antique dealers</td>
<td>65 incidents</td>
<td>200 objects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 per cent of all responding antique dealers</td>
<td>3 incidents per victimized antique dealer and year</td>
<td>3 objects per theft incident</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The questionnaire material indicates that antique dealers are a relatively vulnerable group in terms of theft targets. One reason could be that thieves assume that objects in an antique shop are both valuable and easy to sell – why else would they be there?

Amongst the cases of theft reported in the questionnaire, the most frequently occurring object categories are silver and other objects made from precious metal such as silver cutlery and candlesticks, which was reported by 22 antique dealers during the past five years. Seventeen dealers report glass and ceramics, while 11 dealers report art (predominantly 1900s).
Examples of objects stolen from antique dealers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Silver smelling salts box, 1700s</th>
<th>Glass objects by a noted glassmaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gustavian mirror</td>
<td>Rococo mirrors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver cutlery</td>
<td>Russian soldier’s sword from the late 1800s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candlestick from 1900s</td>
<td>Large china vase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seventy-seven per cent of the victimized antique dealers claim that the stolen objects have some features in common. The most common descriptions of the objects are easy to sell (48 per cent) and collector’s items (40 per cent). The description high financial value is also frequent. The interviews indicate, however, that smaller objects are usually stolen, where each individual object is not highly valued. Individually valuable objects are sometimes stolen but antique dealers do not usually display these objects in their shops. These are usually sold via contacts, and kept out the back or in the office rather than in the shop.

**ART DEALERS AS THEFT TARGETS**

In the questionnaire study, art dealers were categorized together with antique dealers, who were presented in the section above. Art galleries were not included in the selection and as a result, it is not possible to present any quantitative data on thefts from art galleries. Interviews have taken place with gallery owners, however, and these show that different types of objects are stolen depending on whether the crime takes the form of burglary or theft during opening hours. Smaller works of art are usually stolen during opening hours, for example small paintings. It is obviously easier to take a small object without being discovered. Large paintings are usually stolen in burglaries. The interviewees’ case descriptions convey a picture of both commissioned jobs and market-based theft. In some burglaries, only the paintings in the window were stolen, while specific paintings inside the gallery were taken in other burglaries.

**SECOND-HAND BOOKSHOPS AS THEFT TARGETS**

Thefts are relatively common in second-hand bookshops. Every year during the past three years, an average of 12 per cent (18 of 83) of Nordic second-hand booksellers have reported thefts. As shown in Table 5, a small percentage of second-hand booksellers, as with antique dealers, are particularly victimized by theft. Those who reported losing cultural objects during the past three years in the questionnaire have been victimized by theft on an average of four different incidents in one year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Victimized by theft per year</th>
<th>Theft incidents per year</th>
<th>Lost objects per year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 second-hand bookshops</td>
<td>64 incidents</td>
<td>264 objects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 per cent of all responding antique dealers</td>
<td>4 incidents per affected second-hand bookshop and year</td>
<td>4 objects per theft incident</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Averages for victimization, theft incidents and number of lost objects from second-hand bookshops during the past three years.
Fourteen second-hand bookshops have reported stolen literature from the 1900s. Five second-hand bookshops have reported stolen literature from the 1600s, 1700s and 1800s. The stolen objects are usually only specified as “old books”. Four second-hand bookshops also have mentioned drawings and illustrations.

Thirty-two second-hand booksellers (87 per cent) victimized by theft during the past five years claim that the stolen objects have some features in common. Twenty-five second-hand bookshops describe the objects as collector’s items (68 per cent), 21 as easy to sell (57 per cent), 17 as easy to steal (46 per cent), 10 say that the objects have a high financial value (27 per cent) and only three second-hand bookshops say that the stolen objects have a high cultural heritage value (8 per cent).

Concerning theft from second-hand bookshops, the interview study indicates that either extremely valuable objects or objects of no value are stolen, i.e. there is no middle bracket. According to the interviewed second-hand bookshop owners, books of little value, incunabulum, illustrated works, maps and similar documents were usually stolen. In other words, when books and other objects are stolen, the theft is not always a knowledge-based choice. When books of little value are stolen, the interviewees usually attribute this to opportunity-based and generalist thefts, for example theft carried out by drug addicts.

CRAFTSMEN AS TARGETS FOR THEFT

According to the questionnaire material, craftsmen are not particularly vulnerable to theft. Of 104 craftsmen, only three had reported thefts during the past five years. Craftsmen are probably an unknown category for many potential thieves, and opportunities for crime are few and far between because cultural objects are rarely exposed.

PAWNSHOPS AS THEFT TARGETS

Of the pawnshops that responded to the questionnaire, 25 are Swedish and 5 are Finnish. There are no pawnshops in Norway and Denmark. Pawnshops do not seem to handle cultural objects to any great extent. None of the pawnshops reported thefts of cultural objects.

ANTIQUE FAIRS AS THEFT TARGETS

Antique fairs are not included as a single group in the questionnaire study although antique dealers working at antique fairs are. In the interview study, two interviews have been conducted with people who arrange antique fairs. Both of these interviewees say that theft is uncommon at antique fairs but that it does occur. The types of objects stolen are usually jewellery, clocks, watches, cutlery and curios. This includes valuable objects.

OTHER TARGETS FOR ILLICIT REMOVAL

There are also other targets for illicit removal, such as individuals, archaeological sites and shipwrecks. These are described as follows.
INDIVIDUALS AS THEFT TARGETS

The study does not focus on crime that targets private collections. The interviews have, however, generated data on individuals as theft targets. According to the interview material, burglary in flats and residential houses varies from *generalist theft*, where art and cultural objects are only some of the bounty, to pure *commissioned theft* where a specific object is stolen and other, sometimes more valuable objects are left behind. Some interviewees, both police and people in the business, say there are individual thieves who know art and target private homes, which is described in more detail under *Theories and research on cultural heritage crime*.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES AS TARGETS FOR ILLICIT REMOVAL

Objects that are found near or at ancient monuments, or within ancient monument areas cannot be removed without a permit. This applies in all Nordic countries.

The questionnaire study provides very little information about illegal excavations. Of the 145 respondents who claim they work with excavations, only three reported thefts from archaeological sites during the past five years: two from Sweden and one from Finland. The description of the lost objects is unspecific because the respondents do not know exactly what was stolen. Some interviewees claim that illegal excavations might be a major local problem, but not a general problem.

SHIPWRECKS AS TARGETS FOR ILLICIT REMOVAL

As described in the theory chapter, legislation in the Nordic countries that protects ancient monuments in, on or under the seabed, including shipwrecks, is relatively consistent. Provisions in the ancient monument legislation of each respective country protect ships that sank more than one hundred years ago. Unfortunately, many shipwrecks are plundered before they reach the hundred-year limit.

The interest for skin diving into wrecks has increased dramatically during recent years. Technological advances now make it possible to dive deeper than ever imagined a few years ago. New navigation systems like GPS have revolutionized maritime navigation, and made shipwrecks easier to locate.

Concerning the illicit removal of objects from shipwrecks, the pictures presented by the interviews of how a shipwreck is plundered vary. They range from opportunity-based theft where a diver finds an object on an arranged diving holiday, to organised plundering of shipwrecks where divers identify a shipwreck through their own research and actively searching. The types of objects that are removed vary from drinking-vessels, ship’s bells, coins, binnacles, steering wheels, engine-room telegraphs, lights, cannons or materials like bogwood.

CARRIERS

None of the carriers who answered the questionnaire study say that they had been victimized by cultural heritage theft.
Illicit removal

Illicit removal:
- Thefts
- Illegal excavations
- Shipwreck plundering
- Illegal removal/export
- Illegal import

Figure 15: A section of the analysis model. The complete model is shown on pages 24-25.

Following the review of objects and theft targets, we will now look at the circumstances surrounding the thefts. The questions we will try to answer are, for example, what time of day a theft has taken place, how the theft was carried out and who the respondents think the offender might be. Theft by both outsiders and insiders, i.e. employees, is studied. Concerning insider theft, this is probably underestimated in our study. The section on *Theories and research on cultural heritage crime* describes how insider theft occurs in many situations. Unfortunately, the scope is difficult to estimate. This section will also study the circumstances surrounding illegal removal, export and import.

**THEFT OF CULTURAL OBJECTS**

When the different respondents have answered the questionnaire on stolen objects, only cultural objects are reported, not technical equipment for example. As mentioned previously, cultural objects refers to objects of artistic, historical or archaeological significance regardless of age. Examples of cultural objects are art, books, archival documents, archaeological finds, fabrics, coins, glass, silver, ceramics and ecclesiastical objects.

**THEFT FROM MUSEUMS**

In the questionnaire study, 31 per cent of the 164 museums that lost objects during the past five years say that the objects disappeared in burglaries. Sixty-six per cent of the victimized museums said that objects disappeared through unspecified theft and two per cent said that the objects had been stolen in robberies. Fifteen per cent of the victimized museums said that they did not know how the objects had disappeared. The conditions are similar in all of the studied countries except for a certain variation in relation to burglary. Norwegian museums reported the highest proportion of burglaries of museums in all the other countries (35 per cent), while Finnish museums (25 per cent) reported the lowest proportion.

The results of the questionnaire study do not show any major differences between the circumstances surrounding the loss of an object depending on the type of object concerned. One reason for this could be that respondents who reported losing several types of objects have not presented the specific circumstances surrounding each object because this was too time-consum-
ing. If there were major differences, this would have been noticed in the material because some museums only reported losing one type of object.

According to the questionnaire results, (Table 6), the typical circumstances surrounding the disappearance of objects from museums are that thefts take place during the day, slightly more than half of the victimized museums reported disappearances during staffed hours, and more than half on weekdays. Worth noting is that the circumstances surrounding disappearances are given as unknown by between 21 and 39 per cent of the victimized museums. A reasonable assumption based on the questionnaire results is that most objects disappear during the day because in cases where the circumstances are unknown, the disappearance probably took place during the day because burglaries are the most common form of theft at nighttime, and this would have been noticed.

According to the questionnaire results, most objects disappear from the museums’ exhibitions. Of museums that reported losing objects during the past five years, 86 per cent say that the objects were stolen from an exhibition. Fifteen per cent of museums say that objects were stolen from their storage area and 13 per cent say that the objects were stolen from other places such as depositions (5 per cent) or outside (4 per cent).

One interviewed prisoner, sentenced for offences related to cultural heritage crime, says that the reason why objects are stolen from exhibitions during the day is that security is so insufficient. The interviewee says, “With such low security, crime is inevitable”.  

The museums themselves believe that visitors and burglars are responsible for the thefts. Thirty-eight per cent of the museums victimized by theft during the past five years say that visitors are the offenders, and 33 per cent say burglars, but an equally large number of museums (37 per cent) say that they do not know who is responsible for the thefts.

---

26 Security will be discussed under Security.
Insider thefts at museums

Nine per cent of the victimized museums (15 museums) say they believe that an employee was responsible for some of the thefts. In the interview material, there are two cases of insider theft at museums. The first is a museum employee who stole valuable jewellery; the other is a coin collector who was employed by a museum. This person systematically exchanged coins from his own collection with the museum when the museum’s coins were in better condition than his own.

THEFT FROM LIBRARIES

According to the questionnaire study, 20 of the 24 libraries affected by disappearances during the past five years say that most of the older library books that disappear are taken from shelves. Eight libraries also say that material has disappeared from their storerooms. When the circumstances surrounding disappearances are known, they have taken place almost exclusively on weekdays, during the day and when the library is staffed (Table 7), although many libraries say the circumstances are unknown. Library employees usually discover disappearances when stocktaking their collections.
Most libraries (71 per cent) say that visitors are responsible for the reported thefts. Twenty-nine per cent of the libraries say that they do not know who the offender is.

The questionnaire results are confirmed by the interview study, where the interviewees give a similar description of the library thefts, i.e. that visitors are usually responsible for the thefts. The interviewees’ case descriptions seem to indicate that the thefts are based on opportunity, knowledge and commission-based choices. Opportunity-based theft may be carried out by book lovers who cannot keep their fingers in check, as illustrated by the following example.

A librarian discovered that a rare book was missing from the library. He immediately suspected a well-known visitor to the library who often sat and skimmed through books. Next time the person came in to the library, the librarian confronted him. The person admitted his guilt and returned the book. But he never came back to the library.

In the case of old books, the interviews reveal a category of collectors who are obsessed with their collections and will go to any length to find a particular book.

Thiefts that were knowledge or commission-based have been different. These thefts were not usually carried out by a regular, well-known visitor but by people who suddenly appear in the library. In some cases, they had scouted the library beforehand and in a few cases even become acquainted with library staff so as not to create too much attention.

**Insider theft at libraries**

Thirteen per cent of the victimized libraries (3 of 24 libraries victimized by theft during the past five years) say that an employee is responsible for some of the thefts. The description of libraries under **Object and targets** includes two noted cases of theft carried out by library staff in the Nordic.

THEFT FROM ARCHIVES

There are 54 Archives in the material, and four of them have reported losing cultural objects during the past five years (7 per cent). When the circumstances are known for the reported cases, the objects have been stolen from the reading room during the day. In two cases, a dealer later sold the stolen objects at an auction.

Insider theft from Archives

One of the Archives in the questionnaire study says they believe an employee carried out the theft.

THEFT FROM CHURCHES

According to the questionnaire study, church theft takes place equally as often during the day as at night. Of the 127 Swedish churches victimized by theft during the past five years, 43 per cent reported thefts at night time, 49 per cent reported thefts during the day and 22 per cent reported the time of thefts as unknown (Table 7). In Norway, two thefts occurred at night and two during the day. In Finland, three thefts occurred during the day and two at night. In Denmark, three thefts were reported at night (all from the same church). One interviewee who has researched cultural heritage crime claims that the thieves who burglarize Danish churches are not the same type of thieves who steal art from private homes. Church theft is too time-consuming because disposing of objects in Denmark is difficult. The interviewee claims that church thefts in Denmark are commissioned by clients in Eastern Europe who are interested in ecclesiastic objects.

In Sweden, according to the questionnaire study, most church theft takes place on weekdays, and only 14 per cent of the victimized churches reported thefts on weekends (Table 8). One possible reason for this is that churches are usually open on weekends and empty on weekdays. Nineteen per cent of the Swedish churches say that objects had disappeared during staffed hours and 69 per cent reported disappearances when churches were unattended. In the other countries, the number of observed victimized churches was too low to warrant a presentation of the relationship between these circumstances.
Table 8: Circumstances surrounding the disappearance of cultural objects from Swedish churches (n=127).

It is not easy to draw conclusions about offenders from the questionnaire material from the churches in Denmark, Finland and Norway because there are too few observations of church thefts. In Swedish churches, however, about half of the victimized churches do not know who is responsible for the theft, 38 per cent assume that thieves are the offenders and 17 per cent say visitors. According to one interviewee who works in a church, some of the burglaries have been well planned, and thieves have used equipment to remove the iron bands on some objects.

Inside theft from churches
The data gathered from the questionnaire study and the interviews suggests that insider church theft is rare. Only one victimized church says in the questionnaire study that a theft has been carried out by an employee. There is only one case description in the interview material that indicates an attempt at insider theft in a church.

The church plate had disappeared from a church. After a long time, it was discovered that the silver was in the wrong place. One hypothesis is that an insider placed the silver in a “waiting position” to see what would happen.

THEFT FROM OPEN AIR MUSEUMS
The most common circumstances surrounding theft from Finnish and Swedish open air museums are burglaries at night when the museums are unattended. Ninety per cent of thefts from Swedish and 56 per cent of thefts from Finnish open air museums take the form of burglaries, in contrast with other larger museums where most thefts take place during the day (presented under Theft from museums). This can be explained by the fact that open air museums are not open for as long as other museums. Many are only open and attended during the period March to October.
The high level of burglary also reflects the open air museums’ own view of who is responsible for the theft, as 61 per cent of the victimized museums say that burglars are the offenders. Twenty-nine per cent of the victimized museums do not know who is responsible for the disappearances and 16 per cent say visitors. In the interview study, several of the interviewed chairpersons in local history societies say that they suspect organized gangs. The burglaries are described in many cases as “professional”.

As in the results of the questionnaire study, the interviews suggest that the burglaries take place at night. The thieves break into open air museums through windows without alarms or windows that are difficult to lock, sometimes with ladders. In one case, the thieves sawed a hole through the wall to break into the local history museum. In another described case, the interviewee suspects that the thieves had gone around to different open air museums during the day. The interviewee had noticed a couple acting suspiciously. Even the actual break-in procedure indicates that the offenders had been there during the day, because an emergency exit had been left open.

Insider theft from open air museums

There is no data in the questionnaire study or the interviews to suggest that insider theft occurs in open air museums.

THEFT FROM AUCTION HOUSES

The small number of observations in the questionnaire study makes it difficult to draw conclusions about the most common circumstances surrounding theft from auction houses. Of the 7 auction houses victimized by theft during the past five years, six say that the thefts took place during the day, five say that the thefts took place on a weekday and six say that the thefts took place during staffed hours.

The victimized auction houses point firstly to visitors as the offenders (given by 5 auction houses) and secondly to burglars (given by 3 auction houses). The case descriptions of theft from auction houses that are presented in the interviews concern visitors at exhibitions who put objects in their pockets for example and then leave the auction house.

Insider theft from auction houses

None of the 28 auction houses in the questionnaire study say they have experienced insider theft during the past three years. There are descriptions of insider theft in auction houses in the interview material, however. One example is an employee at an auction house who systematically stole submitted goods over a period of years. The objects were then sold to art and antique dealers, or pawnshops.

THEFT FROM ANTIQUE DEALERS

Antique dealers are often the victims of burglary theft. Forty-two per cent of the 52 antique dealers who reported theft during the past five years say that objects disappeared in burglaries. Unspecified theft is however the most common circumstance, and reported by 67 per cent of the victimized antiq-
ue dealers. Robbery is very rare and only reported by one of the victimized antique dealers.

According to the questionnaire study, objects disappear from the shop or the exhibition. Seventy-one per cent of antique dealers report thefts during the day, 71 per cent on weekdays and 63 per cent during staffed hours (Table 9). In contrast to museums, there are very few cases where antique dealers claim that the circumstances surrounding disappearances are unknown, which can be explained by the fact that antique dealers handle fewer objects on smaller premises.
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Table 9: Circumstances surrounding the disappearance of cultural objects from antique dealers (n=52).

The antique dealers victimized by theft during the past five years say in the questionnaire that predominantly visitors (48 per cent of antique dealers) or burglars (33 per cent) are responsible for the thefts. In strong contrast with other categories, 13 per cent of the victimized antique dealers say that an organized gang is responsible for the thefts. Concerning thefts carried out by organized gangs, most interviewed antique dealers present a concordant description of the procedure. The following description is an account of how objects are stolen from antique dealers.

A group of well-dressed and polite foreigners came into the shop. They were courteous, and introduced themselves as antiquity buyers. One of them kept the antique dealer busy by asking questions, while the others looked around the shop. The man speaking to the antique dealer was particularly interested in an antique that stood in a far corner of the shop. They talked about the object for a while and then the group left the shop. The antique dealer soon discovered that objects were missing. The theft had taken place very quickly and was over in just a few minutes.

This type of theft from “well-dressed gangs” was the most common description, but one antique dealer in the interview material also described how groups of addicts sometimes came into the shop to sell or steal objects.
Insider theft from antique dealers
Two of the victimized antique dealers in the questionnaire study say they are victims of insider theft.

Theft from second-hand bookshops
Books that disappear from second-hand bookshops are more often stolen from the shop than from the storeroom. This was reported by 30 of the 34 second-hand bookshop owners who were victimized by theft during the past five years. Seven of the victimized second-hand booksellers reported burglary theft, and the rest unspecified theft. Most cases take place during the day when the shop is staffed.

Visitors constitute the largest category of alleged thieves, 28 of the 34 second-hand booksellers victimized by theft during the past five years say that visitors are the offenders, and 6 second-hand bookshops say burglars. As mentioned earlier under Second-hand bookshops as theft targets, either very valuable books and documents, or books that are not valuable, are stolen. Based on the results in the interview study, it seems that visitors steal the less valuable books, while burglars steal the more valuable books and documents. The theft of valuable books, in other words, seems better planned. Visitor thefts are mostly described as petty theft and pilfering. One interviewee tells the story of two people who come back several times. One stood outside and told the other person what books to take from the window display. The value of the stolen goods was between SEK 1,000 – 2,000 on each occasion. The interviewee believes that the thieves stole from the shop window because the price of these books was clearly marked and no other knowledge was required to see what was most valuable.

The case descriptions of the burglaries indicate that several people are involved because usually several books are stolen, and one person would not be able to carry them.

Insider theft from second-hand bookshops
Two of the victimized second-hand booksellers in the questionnaire study say they have experienced insider theft.

Illegal excavations and shipwreck plundering
The circumstances surrounding illegal excavations and shipwreck plundering are more difficult to identify than theft from collections because it is usually difficult to know what is stolen. Even if an object is found that has probably been illegally excavated or removed from a protected shipwreck, this would be difficult to prove.

Illegal excavations
Neither the questionnaire results nor the interview material give a clear picture of the circumstances surrounding illegal excavations. Some interviewees say that they have seen signs of illegal excavations, but it is impossible to know whether objects have been taken or not. The tracks of excavators indicate that metal detectors may have been used.
Another factor that complicates knowledge of the circumstances surrounding illegal excavations is that archaeological sites are often remotely situated and easy to explore unnoticed. Sometimes it takes a long time to discover undesirable visits, because scheduled excavations are not always ongoing.

In the interview material, however, there are indications that archaeological objects are found at illegal excavations. The following case from an interviewed archaeologist is a good example.

An archaeologist was working at an excavation in the country that had received coverage in the local paper. One day a man appeared and showed him a photo. It showed burial finds: weapons, bronze jewelry, fibulas, etc. There were about ten objects in the photo. The man asked the archaeologist what they were, how much they were worth and whether they were unique. The archaeologist asked the man where the finding-place was, but the man refused to say. And he would not give the archaeologist the photo.

SHIPWRECK PLUNDERING

Shipwreck plundering is usually discovered when a diver who is familiar with a shipwreck discovers that objects or parts of the wreck are missing. There are not usually any other signs. When objects are encountered in trade or private ownership, it is difficult to prove where they come from or who took them. The interview material reveals different types of offenders, for example divers who bring up objects as souvenirs. These are sometimes used as interior fittings in recreation rooms or gardens, for example. Sometimes the objects can be sold. Another type of offender takes metals like copper and sells them to scrap merchants. Interviews with marine archaeologists and divers present a picture of a few divers who systematically plunder shipwrecks and sell the objects. Examples given are shipwrecks from the 1700s that have been plundered, of both objects and material, bogwood for example, sold to buyers and businesses in the Nordic region or other countries. There is no evidence that divers can make a living from plundering, and the interviewees described it as a profitable hobby for a few interested people.

While working on this project, we heard several reports that organised gangs plunder shipwrecks in the Nordic region. There is no evidence in our interview data to suggest that this is a frequent occurrence, however. The only sign that this may be taking place is a brochure offering cannonballs, clocks and watches, vessels, bottles, compasses, cannons and various other objects. On the other hand, there are stories of divers operating with cranes and pipe tongs in the south Baltic Sea.

ILLEGAL MOVEMENT/EXPORT

As described in the theory chapter, all Nordic countries have legislation that restricts the removal and export of cultural objects and protects their national cultural heritage.

According to the questionnaire study, only 62 of the 1,470 (4 per cent) respondents who answered the question say that they know of cases where
cultural objects have been exported illegally. Thirty-six of these respondents are from Sweden, 12 from Norway, 10 from Finland and 4 from Denmark. Most are museums (24), antique dealers (15) and restorers (19). Forty-four of the 62 respondents say that permits are never applied for, and 25 respondent say that permits had been refused for the objects in the cases that they know about.

Two factors can explain the small number of reported cases in the questionnaire study. Firstly, the people who export objects illegally do not want to reveal this in a questionnaire. Secondly, it is difficult for outsiders to have all the knowledge required to recognize an illegally exported object i.e. objects that are prohibited, or objects that are transported without valid permits.

Table 10 shows the number of reported cases of illegally removed or exported objects, based on the category of the object. The most frequent object category is furniture, which was reported by 20 respondents who were predominantly antique dealers and auction houses. Nine respondents report known cases of illegally removed or exported books, and 7 respondents mention art, mainly restorers.

There is also information in the interview material about the illegal removal of cultural objects. There are only a few case descriptions, however where it is known that illegal removal has taken place and how it has taken place. On the other hand, there seems to be general agreement within the industry that illegal removal does take place and on the countries that receive the illegally exported objects. These views are usually based on discussions between colleagues. How well these views match reality is open to discussion, but it would be reasonable to assume that anyone working in the antique and art industry would a reasonably accurate picture of the illegal export situation.

The following map (Figure 16) shows the countries that are alleged, in the interview material, to receive the cultural objects that are illegally exported from Nordic countries.
Figure 16: Map of countries that receive illegally exported objects, as confirmed by the study.

Based on the interview material, the problem of illegally exported cultural objects seems to be greater in Sweden, Denmark and Norway than in Finland. A Finnish antique dealer who buys a lot of objects internationally says that in all of her travels to France and Italy, she has never seen a Finnish object. She explains that there is no demand for Finnish antiquities in other countries.

The only sign of illegal removal from Finland in the interview material is stories of Russian art and antiquities that are bought and returned to Russia. Some of these objects have been in Finland for so long that they are protected by Finnish export legislation. The demand for Russian cultural objects has increased dramatically during recent years.

A recurrent theme in several interviews is that Denmark functions as a transit country for Swedish and Norwegian antique furniture. One procedure seems to be to export antique furniture from Sweden or Norway, and sell it in Danish auction houses.

*It’s interesting to see a bureau that was sold at a Swedish auction house with an export prohibition that suddenly appears at a Danish auction not long after.*
(Interviewee 55, antique dealer)

Figure 17 illustrates the different forms of illegal removal and export. *Refused export permit* and *export permit* constitute opposite poles on the vertical line and exclude each other. *Conscious illegal export* and *Unconscious illegal export* are opposite poles on the horizontal line but do not exclude each other, because there is a sliding scale between both conditions. In practice, it may be difficult to determine the type of illegal export at hand. It is also difficult to determine the type of illegal export that constitutes the greatest threat; widespread unconscious illegal export has the same consequences as comprehensive conscious illegal export.
Figure 17: Different types of illegal movement/export.

**UNCONSCIOUS ILLEGAL EXPORT**

Several interviewees claim that illegal export is not usually an organized process but an act based on ignorance and thoughtlessness. Unconsciousness can range from pure ignorance to simply not wanting to know the implications of the law. One example in the interviews is an antique dealer who sells cultural objects via online auctions. Although antique dealers are registered vendors, this dealer is only vaguely aware of the details in the export legislation and has never applied for a permit. He also says that even in cases where a permit is required, no buyer has ever asked whether an export permit is necessary. Unconscious illegal export can also take place above the horizontal line in the model i.e. the unconscious illegal removal of objects that are prohibited to export.

**CONSCIOUS ILLEGAL EXPORT**

Conscious illegal removal can apply to objects that are prohibited to export and objects for which exporters have never applied for a permit. A general view in several interviews is that the market determines whether cultural objects are illegally removed or not. If it is possible to earn more by selling an object abroad, the risk for illegal removal immediately increases. One of the interviewees explains:

*The going rate for Gustavian chairs in Sweden is good, so that’s not a problem. On the other hand, a lot of fantastic Empire style furniture leaves the country, plus a whole lot of Rococo.* (Interviewee 46, antique dealer)

Several interviewed antique dealers say that they collaborate with other antique dealers, and channel objects towards favourable sales outlets. This does not necessarily mean illegal removal but these channels can also be exploited to sell illegal objects. Another example that presents a graphic picture of how market forces impact illegal removal is the following quotation from an interviewee who pointed to a grandfather clock in the shop as he spoke.
Some of the interviewed antique dealers say that they usually inform buyers when permits are required, and even offer to apply for permits for their customers. Foreign dealers sometimes use fronts, however. This means that there is one dealer in the country doing the business while another foreign dealer stays in the background. According to one interviewed antique dealer, these “fronts” do not work full-time; they are just colleagues who are doing a friend a favour.

A Norwegian antique dealer claims that one sign of smuggling is the occasional appearance of Norwegian objects at auction houses in Sweden, Denmark or the UK. The interviewee says they are somewhat of a mystery. Another interviewed antique dealer says that it is easy to export objects without a permit. One method described is to arrange a move and export the objects as removal goods.

One interviewed antique dealer gives a description that matches earlier stories about how the market governs illegal export. The antique dealer says that the market is poor for some objects in their country of origin but much better in other countries. This motivates some disreputable dealers to export objects illegally. How the objects are moved can vary, however. Some dealers transport objects over the border in private vehicles, while others ship them in containers to the United States, for example. The interviewee says that some dealers in different countries maintain constant contact. One dealer in Norway for example imports everything that is cheap in Denmark or Sweden but expensive in Norway, while other countries work in the reverse. According to the interviewee, this type of trade has also started with Eastern European countries.

Another interviewed antique dealer claims that established dealers are not responsible for most of this illegal removal; it is wholesalers who have storage space but no shop front. According to the interviewee, they operate like stock sellers who live by exporting furniture.

Another reason why cultural objects are exported without applying for a permit that was revealed in the interviews is that export regulations are considered too complex, and that permit-issuing procedures take too long. This means that applications are not lodged because of the time factor. The person might have to move the goods immediately, or exhibit a cultural object at a trade fair in another country fairly soon.

According to the interview material, some owners export objects even though their application for an export permit has been refused. The interviews also show that some buyers export objects even when they have been informed that an export permit is required. Some dealers and auction houses mark objects that require an export permit. Nonetheless, according to several interviews, these objects leave the country anyway after they are bought. The following case description is based on an event related by an interviewed carrier.
This interviewee’s description reveals a common misconception in Sweden. Nordiska museet does not mark objects that require export permits, but marks objects that cannot be exported with a preliminary export prohibition, which means that applications for an export permit will be refused. Quite simply, it is prohibited to export these objects.

**ILLEGAL REMOVAL OF STOLEN OBJECTS**

A common view held by the interviewees is that many of the stolen objects that fall within the framework for removal and export protection leave the country where they were stolen in violation of the legislation on removing cultural objects. These stolen objects can be illegally exported without applying for a permit, in spite of an export prohibition, just like any other object, knowingly or unknowingly. There are concrete examples in the interview material where stolen, protected objects are exported illegally. Even here, the market is considered to control where the objects end up. If the market is too small in the country of origin, the object is sold in another country. A Norwegian antique dealer says the Norwegian market is too small for shipwrecks finds and ancient monuments. Stolen unique objects must be sold in other countries to avoid being traced. Many of the stolen ecclesiastical antiquities and relics from open air museums are assumed to travel to Germany and the Netherlands.

**ILLEGAL IMPORT**

The illegal import of cultural objects was not covered by Nordic legislation until 1999 when Finland became the first Nordic country to ratify the UNESCO Convention. Sweden and Denmark followed Finland’s footsteps in 2003, and Norway during 2004. Now all Nordic countries have legislation that prohibits the import of cultural objects that have been illegally removed from another country.

The illegal import of cultural objects is a difficult area to control for Swedish Customs because the regulations are based on each individual country’s national legislation for export. This means that a customs official in an inspection must be familiar with the export legislation in the object’s country of origin.

In the questionnaire material, 38 of 1,469 respondents (3 per cent) say they know of cases where cultural objects over 100 years old have been exported from their country of origin in violation of national laws. This is
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27 Read more about the UNESCO Convention under *Theories and research on cultural heritage crime.*
reported by 14 antique dealers, 12 museums, 5 restorers, and 4 second-hand bookshops, predominantly from Norway and Sweden (14 respondents each). Finland (7 respondents) and Denmark (5 respondents) had fewer reported cases. It is worth noting that no auction houses say they know of cases of illegal import.

The most frequently reported object categories were ancient finds and furniture, given by 10 respondents each, and art, given by 10 respondents, 9 of whom said sacred art. Three respondents said they were familiar with cases of illegally exported books.

Most objects have their origin in Europe, but Asia, Africa, North America and Australia are also mentioned.

Sweden is named as the country of origin by 11 respondents of whom 8 were Norwegian respondents, and Denmark is stated as the country of origin by 10 respondents, of whom 9 were Norwegian respondents. This suggests that Norway may receive objects from both Sweden and Denmark.

One country named in the interviews concerning illegal import is Russia. Some of the interviewed antique dealers say that mainly icons are smuggled in from Russia. The market for these is small in the Nordic region, however.

In the interview material, several interviewed antique dealers say that the Nordic market is also relatively small for trade with objects from Africa, Asia or South America. One interviewee who works at an auction house also says that the scope of what is claimed to be illegal excavations is not great. At the same time, he is not terribly interested in knowing how the Asian objects sold at his auction house have arrived in Sweden.

We don’t dig too deep. That’s not part of our job. (Interviewee 52, works at auction house)

One antique dealer who buys and sells Asian objects claims that there are no major problems with the illegal import of Asian cultural objects.

China exercises strict control over trade with archaeological objects. When we talk about illegalities, we mean buying objects from illegal excavations and there is no reason why Swedish dealers should be handling this type of goods. There are enough attractive objects on the legal Chinese market. (Interviewee 37, antique dealer)

The antique dealer says that archaeological objects are traded with Chinese museums, which Swedish archaeologists oppose, but the interviewee has no apprehensions because as a dealer, he enters the chain a long time after their archaeological value is outplayed.

According to another interviewed antique dealer, Asian objects with export permits may also be suspect. This antique dealer had recently imported a cultural object from Asia although it should not really have been removed from that country. Sellers in the Asian country had arranged a permit for the object. The antique dealer said, “Don’t ask me how, cause I’d rather not know.” When asked whether authorities in the Asian country
were corrupt, he nodded. The antique dealer explained that if you wanted to trace the object, you would only run into problems.

One interpretation, based on the interview material, is that dealers are very careful about not being directly involved in illegal import. On the other hand, they show very little interest in how an object arrived on the market. It seems more important for dealers that they do not run the risk of being caught and convicted for breaking the law, than to take an ethical stand on the origin of an object. Many dealers seem to think that when an object arrives on the market, the damage has already been done.

**Opportunity**

The illicit removal of a cultural object requires an opportunity. The opportunity is often provided by inadequate security. The concept of security here refers to crime prevention measures, such as locks, alarms, surveillance and locked display cases as well as measures aimed at simplifying the recovery of objects that have been stolen; that is, registration of objects in print and photo, inventories of objects and routines when thefts are discovered.

The presentation of security is divided according to the different theft targets, as the prerequisites for security measures vary between the different categories. The comprehensive categories *Preservers* and *Dealers* are used in the same manner. Other areas as well as *Awareness, knowledge and strategies for preventing illegal export* will also be presented. The security level results are very general due to the scope of the study; however, the results do provide an overview of some of the most central security aspects in each area.

This presentation includes respondents victimized by theft and disappearances, as well as those who have not been victimized, unless otherwise indicated.

**Preservers**

To a certain extent, responsibility for the preservation of our cultural heritage has been formalised and distributed to institutions such as museums, libraries and archives. Thefts from these institutions can, thus, be considered thieving from society; theft that influences our understanding of identity and historical context. A further implication is that there is no specific victim of cultural heritage crime as no one individual is personally victimized. On the other hand, we are all affected, as are future generations. This is the dilemma of the cultural heritage crime area, as crimes against individual victims tend to be prioritised by the judicial system. Preservers consist of museums, libraries, Archives, churches and open air museums.
To a great extent, security is a question of resource distribution in relation to the organisation as a whole. How can objects be protected without affecting the rest of the organisation in a negative way? Another important issue that preservers must take into consideration is security in relation to accessibility; they often also have the responsibility of presenting and making accessible the cultural heritage for which they care for and are charged with preserving. In this sense, preservers differ from commercial dealers, as the latter do not have a corresponding responsibility to the general public.

SECURITY IN MUSEUMS IN THE NORDIC REGION

The level of security at museums differs greatly, depending on the objects concerned. Objects of lesser value may be displayed so that the visitor can touch them, while several different security devices typically protect objects of greater value. The general security level of Nordic museums is described here.

According to the questionnaire study, employees who are familiar with the collections and have noticed that objects are missing have called attention to missing cultural objects in 86 per cent of the museums victimized by thefts. Thefts discovered by security staff were reported by 10 per cent of the victimized museums. In order for thefts to be discovered by security staff, the theft must be conspicuous, or the thief must be caught in the act. Many thefts are not discovered until a specific object is sought, and subsequently discovered missing. In this case, it is difficult to ascertain if the object has been stolen or if it has disappeared due to some other reason. Thus, there is a strong likelihood that such disappearances will not be considered the result of theft. One interviewee related a case where a museum recovered a cultural object that had not even been missed, even though the theft had occurred several years earlier. The importance of inventories being done on a regular basis is demonstrated by the fact that 12 per cent of victimized museums say that disappearances were discovered during collection inventories.

Disappearances have been reported to the police by 75 per cent of the museums who lost cultural objects over the last five-year period. The reasons for not reporting the disappearances are low financial value of the objects or that the circumstances surrounding the disappearances have been unclear. Eighty-one per cent of the affected museums have insurance, but only 44 per cent informed their insurance companies of the disappearances. The most common reason given for not reporting loss to insurance companies is that the excess exceeds the value of the object that disappeared; 19 per cent of affected museums provided this explanation.

One way to find stolen objects is to watch the antique market. From a national perspective, it is possible to keep track of trade in valuable cultural objects, as there are few players on the specialised market. From an international perspective, however, such surveillance is an overwhelming task for most victimized institutions. It may be possible to keep track of large auction houses, but this is hardly possible in the case of international dealers.
In the questionnaire study, 31 of the museums (22 per cent) that have lost cultural objects in the past five years say that they know where some of the objects have gone. In response to a follow-up query concerning where the objects were discovered, most responded that the objects were found inside the country. When objects have been discovered outside the country, auction houses in Germany, France and Denmark have typically been involved in the sale of the objects. Responses to open-ended questions concerning the circumstances of the discoveries are quite varied, which makes it difficult to compare them using specific categories. Seven museums stated that it was the police who discovered the objects, seven stated that the objects were discovered at auctions, antique dealers or second-hand markets, and four museums say that the objects were returned.

The overall level of security of the Nordic museums is generally high according to the questionnaire study as shown in Table 11. Ninety per cent of the 576 responding museums have some sort of night-time alarm, while the corresponding figure for daytime is 52 per cent. Only 83 per cent of the museums indicated that they use some sort of lock at night; this is a surprisingly low figure, especially when 90 per cent say that they use an alarm at night and it is extremely unusual to use an alarm without using locks. One possible explanation for the low percentage of reported lock usage may be that the view of locks is normalised, resulting in the use of locks being taken for granted, and not therefore indicated in the questionnaire response. Thirty per cent of museums say that they use security guards or surveillance cameras. In the Other category, the most common response was that employees take on a surveillance role. Seventy-eight per cent of museums also have extra security equipment for some of the objects. The 4 per cent of museums that reported not having any sort of security system are primarily open-air museums.

![Security in Nordic museums](image)

Table 11: Security in Nordic museums (n=576).

Registration of objects is another important security aspect for museums. In addition to their usefulness in keeping objects organised, inventory records
are an important source in ascertaining information on objects that have been stolen. Inventory information is required by the police in order to identify recovered objects.

Sixty-three per cent of all questionnaire study respondents indicated that all of their cultural objects are registered. Thirty-four per cent indicated that parts of their collections are registered, while three per cent stated that their collections are not registered. One possible explanation for only 63 per cent having complete registers is that museum collections are often quite extensive. A normal-sized museum typically has approximately 50,000 objects in its collections.28 For that reason, many museums often register groups of objects such as porcelain services, dining room furniture or excavated coins rather than individual items. This type of registration is efficient in terms of saving working time, but it allows parts of a group of objects to disappear without this becoming apparent from the register.

Photos of objects are also an important security aspect in terms of registration as this facilitates searching for lost objects. To recover an unlawfully exported cultural object with the assistance of the UNESCO Convention, a photo of the object is required for authentication. Twenty per cent of all responding museums in the questionnaire study answered that they have photos of all the objects in their collections. As with the case of registers, this low proportion can be explained by the large scope of the collections. Seventy-six per cent indicated that they have photos of some of the objects in their collections, and 4 per cent indicated that they lack photos altogether.

In order for the register to be useful, inventories must be carried out regularly and kept up to date. Inventories are also a method for discovering missing objects. Figure 19 shows how often inventories are carried out at museums according to the questionnaire study. Just over half of the responding museums carry out regular inventories on an annual basis or more frequently. A third of the museums make inventories less frequently than every fifth year or not at all, which means that these registers are not used to discover lost objects.

---

28 The Swedish National Council for Cultural Affairs, museum statistics.
According to the questionnaire study, 35 per cent of all museums lack routines for what should be done when a cultural object is discovered missing, as shown in Table 12. Fifty-nine per cent of the museums responded that filing police reports in connection with the discovery of missing cultural objects is routine.

Only 34 per cent of the museums indicated that updating registers is routine after a disappearance. That insurance companies are contacted, or an internal investigation is carried out, are other routines mentioned by approximately 2 per cent of the museums.

Based on the interviews, it appears that general opinion among museum officials is that a re-evaluation of security issues in museums has begun.
Naturally, the recent spectacular museum thefts in Norway and Sweden play a role in this re-evaluation. A Swedish museum officer believes that security issues are more urgent now because of reforms that resulted in free entry to state-owned museums in Sweden. The substantial increase in visitors primarily consists of persons unaccustomed to visiting museums, which places new demands on security. Staff reinforcements or additional financial resources have not been forthcoming. Another problem is the negative side of digitalisation.

All the collections that are now digitally accessible provide a smorgasbord for any malicious powers who are interested (Interviewee 107, museum officer).

SECURITY IN LIBRARIES IN THE NORDIC REGION

The primary undertaking of a library is to lend books, new and old, to the general public. In some libraries with large collections of valuable books, special routines are in place to supervise the collections. For example, it is common that valuable books may only be read in the library’s reading rooms and not borrowed. However, there are also many libraries that do not have a great number of valuable books and where specific routines for these books are non-existent. In a report to the Ministry of Culture on thefts from the Royal Library in Copenhagen, areas of security were listed as registering new books, lending, returning, access and inventory (The Ministry of Culture, 2005).

According to the questionnaire, overall security is high at Nordic libraries, as shown in Table 13. With only one exception, all the libraries that responded to the questionnaire study say that they have some sort of security system at night, while 82 per cent responded that they use a security system during the day. Fifty-three (53) say that they have security guards at night, and 32 per cent have extra security for some books. One librarian commented in the questionnaire study that an important security aspect is having written routines for books that can only be read on library premises, and security routines include an ID check as well as checking the book before and after it is borrowed.
Forty-eight per cent of all the library respondents answered that they have routines in place for what should be done when a book is discovered missing. Contacting the police (22 per cent) or updating the register were the most frequently reported practises.

Thieves from the Royal Library in Stockholm have resulted in an extensive investigation of library security throughout Sweden by the above-mentioned library during the course of 2005. The aims of the project is to identify the scope of cultural heritage book thefts from Swedish libraries, highlight the issue of increased security surrounding these works, and develop methods and means of assistance for technical documentation and owner identification of old and valuable collections.

In the course of reviewing the interview material, three areas of poor library security become apparent. These are:

- Inadequate staff routines
- Inadequate inventories
- Poor security prioritisation

Based on the results of the interview and questionnaire studies, these three areas are presented separately below.

**Inadequate staff routines**

Inadequate staff routines have been indicated as the factor that enables insider theft at libraries. Several interviewees believe that background checks of applicants during the hiring process are not strict enough. Employees should also be more vigilant and report suspicious behaviour by fellow employees. At some libraries, one single person is responsible for specific collections, which increases the possibility of insider theft. Staff who spend a great deal of time working alone with collections are also considered risk factors.
Inadequate staff routines also affect the extent to which a clear overview of books can be maintained. One interviewed library employee says that employees occasionally keep valuable books from the library’s collection on bookshelves in their offices. Another factor that complicates overviews and theft awareness is incorrect placement of books. Evidence of this is that only 7 out of 22 libraries (32 per cent) that have lost books over the last five years have reported the disappearances to the police, according to the questionnaire. Many library thefts are, thus, not discovered until the books appear on the market. Eight of 23 libraries (34 per cent) say that they know what happened to some of the objects that disappeared. Most stated that the books were sold inside the country, but Germany and the UK were also indicated as known end destinations.

**Inadequate inventories**

Book registers are a necessary tool for libraries. Inventories are, nevertheless, a fairly unusual phenomenon, as shown in Figure 20. Over half of the responding libraries say that they never carry out inventories. Only 23 per cent make inventories every fifth year or more frequently. One possible explanation for this lack of inventories could be that as the collections are so comprehensive, inventories are difficult. One librarian commented in the questionnaire that inventories are a necessary security tool, but they are impossible to perform due to lack of resources. Another circumstance that complicates inventories is that a large number of books are always out on loan.

Inadequate inventory and registration are also indicated in the interview material as serious security problems. As a result of this deficiency, it is often difficult to determine which books have been stolen. One problem brought to light is that books are often described very generally when they are catalogued. Because the distinguishing features of specific

![Figure 20: Frequency of library inventories (n=109).](image)
One librarian commented in the questionnaire that security could be improved if it was possible to finance digitalised registers.

**Poor security prioritisation**

Even if many libraries have relatively high levels of security, it is clear from the interview material that they make incorrect security prioritisations in some instances. One interviewed antiquary believes, for example, that libraries are too static when they set boundaries for determining a valuable book. The antiquary maintains that security prioritisation should be based on market rather than cultural heritage value. In terms of the present security situation, there are books in open reference libraries that are more valuable on the market than books and manuscripts stored in more secure locations.

SECURITY IN NORDIC ARCHIVES

As previously mentioned, documents in Archives are most often registered in files with related documents rather than individually, meaning that individual documents can disappear without being noticed when an inventory is made. This means that thefts may not be noticed until objects are discovered on the market. From a security perspective, this means that thefts are not seen as a major problem, and security issues are not prioritised.

All 54 responding Archives in the questionnaire survey say that they have some sort of security at night, and 89 per cent have daytime security (Table 14). This means that Archives have a higher frequency of perimeter protection than other preservers. Twenty-eight per cent of Archives say that they have extra security in place for some archive documents.

![Security in Nordic Archives](image)

Table 14: Security in Nordic Archives (n=54).

In terms of internal security, however, this situation is not so positive. Only 43 per cent of the Archives indicated that they have registers for all their documents, and 34 per cent for some of their documents, as shown in
Figure 21. Photos of archive material are unusual. Thirty-three per cent of the Archives say that they have photos of some objects. Forty-two per cent of the Archives say that they make inventories.

Figure 21: Registers in Nordic Archives (n=54).

SECURITY IN CHURCHES

Security in churches is characterised by the desire to keep buildings open and accessible to the general public, which often entails an increased theft risk for cultural objects in the church.

Thefts from churches are to a large extent reported to the police. Ninety-five per cent of the Swedish churches that were victimized during the past five years filed police reports. Victimized churches in other Nordic countries also show a high propensity to report thefts. When thefts are not reported, it is due to the object having low financial value or that the circumstances surrounding the disappearance are unclear.

Only a small proportion of victimized churches say that they know where the missing objects have gone; in Sweden the number is approximately 17 churches, or 18 per cent. In five instances, objects were discovered in different places on the antique market: at a Swedish auction house, at an auction house in Copenhagen and London, at an antique dealer in the Netherlands and at a foreign second-hand bookshop. Three churches stated that the police recovered and returned objects, while ten churches stated that objects were found or returned. Returned objects are often recovered in the vicinity of the church.

In the course of reviewing the interview material, four areas of general inadequacies in church security become apparent. These are:
- Inadequate perimeter protection
- Inadequate inventories
- Inadequate security routines
- Poor security prioritisation
The following is a presentation of each of these areas based on the results of the interview and questionnaire studies.

**Inadequate perimeter protection**

As previously mentioned, churches have an especially difficult security situation in terms of protecting cultural objects as one of the church’s objectives is to be open and accessible to visitors. This conflict is obvious in the questionnaire material as churches reported a significantly lower level of security than other respondents. Swedish churches are exemplified in Table 15, as the number of observations in the Swedish material is high and because churches in other countries provided similar responses. As shown in Table 15, 14 per cent of all Swedish churches that responded lack nighttime security systems. The corresponding figure for daytime is 36 per cent. Surveillance by staff is the primary response presented by the Other category. Forty-one per cent of churches say that they have additional security for some cultural objects.

![Table 15. Security in Swedish churches.](image)

**Inadequate inventories**

According to the questionnaire study, Swedish churches are better at keeping inventory records than other Nordic countries. However, this information should be considered with the understanding that Swedish churches are more victimized by theft, and, thus, take these issues more seriously than other countries. Swedish parishes, for example, are obligated to report their inventories and any changes to the county administrative board in accordance with the Act Concerning Ancient Monuments and Finds. According to the questionnaire study, 90 per cent of all the churches that responded

---

In cases where one respondent reported different security levels for different churches, the security level of the majority of churches has been registered.
say that they have inventory records for all of their cultural objects, while churches in other countries reported lower levels: 57 per cent in Finland, 46 per cent in Norway and seven to nine churches in Denmark (shown in Table 16). One interviewee who works in the church explained that some Swedish parishes refuse to send their inventory records to county administrative boards due to fear that once the records become available to the public, they can be used as *theft catalogues*. Nine out of 10 churches in Denmark, Finland and Sweden say that they make inventories of the registers on a regular basis. The corresponding figure in Norway is 7 out of 10.

Photos of cultural objects are central to recovering stolen objects. Of all responding Nordic churches, between 19 and 45 per cent say that they have photos of all their cultural objects (see Table 17). The majority of churches in all of the countries say that they have photos of some objects, which could be interpreted as that the process of taking photographs of objects has begun. Between 10 and 20 per cent completely lack photos.
Inadequate security routines
According to the questionnaire study, 49 to 67 per cent of all responding Nordic churches say that they have routines for what should be done if a cultural object disappears. Routines often include contacting the police. Beyond contacting the police, there are generally no other routines except for 27 per cent of Swedish churches that say that they update their inventory records.

Swedish churches are experiencing improved security work due to grants they receive through antiquarian compensation for churches. In many parishes, consultants have been engaged to review security, which interviewees find positive since parishes have a difficult time dealing with these issues themselves.

Work related to these issues is very slow in churches. It takes a long time and is sluggish; the democratic process is very time-consuming in this type of organisation. Discussions and debates are endless. Furthermore, ecclesiastical elections are held every fourth year, which often results in the replacement of people; a consequence is that this work requires patience and information, information over and over again. It is actually a bit odd that laymen administer this important cultural heritage. Many of them are, of course, more interested in ecclesiastical activities than in acting as property managers and preservers of cultural heritage. In addition, many elderly people are active in church activities as they have plenty of time. Most important now, however, is that custody and maintenance plans are established (Interviewee 79, church employee working with antiquarian issues).

Poor security prioritisation
In Table 15, it was shown that 41 per cent of Swedish churches had strengthened security for certain objects. As previously mentioned, cultural objects in churches often have a strong connection to the region and church to which they belong. This means that objects are often considered part of the church rather than separate objects. Due to this approach, objects are easily taken for granted and, thus, not considered valuable or theft-prone, which may affect protection negatively. It is clear from the interview material that churches, in the same manner as libraries, occasionally make incorrect security prioritisations. One interviewed antique dealer, for example, told about a church where the vicar believed that the silver candlesticks in the church worth a few thousand kronor were the most valuable items that the church owned; he had no idea that the church also had a pair of renaissance brass candle sticks worth close to a quarter of a million kronor. Another example is the following quotation from a valuer, detailing the theft of a 14th century object from a church.

It had probably been in the church from the beginning. As the issue concerned a claim for compensation, the insurance company contacted me for a valuation. At a foreign auction, it is possible that the object could have fetched between SEK 20,000 and 30,000; at a Swedish auction perhaps SEK 100,000 when taking origin into consideration. The insurance company was prepared to pay the latter sum without hesitation. But when I inquired about how it had been stored, it turned out that it had been hung openly from a steel wire on a nail. Unbelieva-
ble! If it had been found in a home, an alarm and safe would have been required for any compensation to be awarded at all, but this shows how bad the situation is from both sides regarding much of what we have in our churches (Interviewee 39, valuer).

SECURITY IN NORDIC OPEN AIR MUSEUMS

Approximately 75 per cent of the open air museums in Sweden in the questionnaires study have some sort of security system both day and nighttime. Most common is the use of locks, but about half of the protective societies also have alarms. A third of the open air museums have extra security equipment in place for some objects. One interviewed chairman of a local history association says that the association had hidden the finest objects. According to the same person, some local history centres have implemented a ban on visitor photography, as there are suspicions that some individuals attempt to locate willing buyers for objects before stealing them.

Eighty per cent of all responding Finnish open air museums say that they have security systems at night, and a somewhat lower percentage says they have such systems during the day. Most common here are locks, but approximately half of the societies with security systems also have alarms. Forty-six per cent of Finnish open air museums have extra security equipment for some objects.

Ninety-three per cent of the Swedish and 78 per cent of the Finnish open air museums that have been victimized reported the thefts to the police. The high frequency of reporting among Swedish respondents can be explained by the selection of open air museums that reported thefts to their insurance companies.

Of all responding open air museums, 74 per cent of the Swedish and 63 per cent of the Finnish societies say that they have registers for all of their cultural objects (see Table 18). Eighty-one per cent of the Swedish and 73 per cent of the Finnish societies make inventories of their collections.

Table 18: Registers of cultural objects in Swedish and Finnish open air museums.

SECURITY IN OTHER GOVERNMENT AGENCIES AND INSTITUTIONS

Government agencies and institutions often have art, either private or borrowed, on their premises. The interview study results present an image
of inadequate documentation for some of this art as well as uncertainty regarding responsibility. One interviewed restorer says that art on loan can be affected by inadequate security. Art can be damaged during transport, placed in closets or moved by the person who had the painting on an office wall to a new location when changing offices. There is even one instance described in the material where a supervisor promised an employee that he could take a painting even though it was only a loan.

Borrowed documents can also be handled irresponsibly as the following case exemplifies. A library had lent unusual documents to an institution.

A library employee visited the institution and discovered that the documents were kept on shelves in a space that was open to the public. The library employee alerted the institution but unfortunately, some documents disappeared.

SECURITY FOR NORDIC DEALERS

As for the preservers the security situation for dealers is mainly an economic issue, but they are not obliged to make cultural heritage accessible to the general public and have more opportunities to protect their objects.

SECURITY IN NORDIC AUCTION HOUSES

According to the questionnaire study, security in Nordic auction houses is generally high, as shown in Table 19. In addition to the protection indicated, half of the auction houses say that they have extra security equipment for some cultural objects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Security</th>
<th>Night</th>
<th>Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No security</td>
<td>0 3 25</td>
<td>27 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locks</td>
<td>0 1 25</td>
<td>17 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alarms</td>
<td>0 1 8</td>
<td>9 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guards</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveillance camera</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19. Security in Nordic auction houses (n=28).

Only four of the seven auction houses that were victimized during the last five years claimed that they had reported the thefts to the police. The most common reason for not reporting theft is that the value of the objects was too low or that it was not worth the effort. In three of seven cases, auction
houses stated that thefts were reported to insurance companies. Low value was also the most common reason given for not reporting the theft.

Inventory records at auction houses consist of registers of objects and sellers, descriptions of the objects in the auction catalogue and possibly a photo of the object. A majority of all responding auction houses, 20 out of 28, say that they have registers for all of their cultural objects, 3 say that they have registers for some objects, and 4 auction houses say that they have no registers. Fourteen auction houses have photos of all their objects, and eleven of some objects. The frequency with which registers are reviewed and updated is not evident from the questionnaire study, but one interviewee who works at an auction house stated that internal reviews carried out at that auction house are rather inadequate. According to this person, objects submitted for auction can remain in storage for up to half a year or disappear for six months without being noticed.

Nineteen of all the 28 responding auction houses say that they have routines for what should be done when an object is discovered missing. Contacting the police is the most common measure taken, but in general there are no other routines.

SECURITY IN NORDIC ANTIQUE SHOPS

The general security level for antique dealers is low in comparison to both auction houses and museums, as Table 20 demonstrates. The proportion that says they use “other” security systems is, however, slightly higher; “Other” includes safes and metal bars, for example.
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Table 20: Security in antique shops.

The interview study gives a concordant picture of an informal alarm system amongst colleagues. As previously mentioned under Thefts from antique dealers, it is relatively common that organised gangs target antique dealers. Several antique dealers in the interview study say that they usually lock
their doors when they see suspicious people outside their shops, and ring to warn colleagues in the same neighbourhood.

There is a strong sense of solidarity between antique dealers. If a suspicious person is seen in the area, colleagues ring to warn one another (Interviewee 96, antique dealer).

Eighty-one per cent of the 52 antique dealers who have lost cultural objects during the past 5 years say that they filed reports with the police, and 56 per cent say that they filed a notice of loss with their insurance company. The reasons for not filing reports in both cases were that the value of the object was too low or that it was pointless. From the interview material, however, a somewhat different picture emerges. Most of the interviewed antique dealers say that they do not usually file police reports for theft. The stated reasons, however, are the same as those given in the questionnaire responses; that is, that it is pointless to file a report as nothing ever comes of it. Some antique dealers say that they had previously reported thefts, but stopped doing so because it was so pointless. Some antique dealers also said that they did not file police reports because the inconvenience of filing was more than what the stolen object was worth. A third reason that was not apparent in the questionnaire study, but emerged during the interviews was that the reason for not filing police reports was that there were no receipts for the stolen objects as they had been purchased “black”.

Twenty-three per cent of the victimized antique dealers (12 antique dealers) say that they knew where the stolen objects had gone. In these instances, objects had usually been sold to another dealer (reported by 5 antique shops) or that the object was recovered by the police or found in the possession of the thief in question (reported by 4 antique shops).

In all of the Nordic countries, there are regulations for how used goods may be sold, which means that second-hand dealers must maintain records of all objects that they purchase and sell. These laws are intended to prevent the sale of stolen goods. Despite this, only 52 per cent of all responding antique dealers say that they have registers for all of their objects. Twenty-two per cent say that they have registers for some of their objects, and 27 per cent say that they have no registers for objects inside the organisation. Photos of objects are even less common; only 12 per cent have photos of all of their objects, 59 per cent of some objects and 29 per cent lack photos altogether.

SECURITY IN NORDIC SECOND-HAND BOOKSHOPS

Of all the responding Nordic second-hand bookshops in the questionnaire study, 64 per cent say that they have night-time security systems, and 28 per cent say that they have daytime security systems. These are very low figures compared to the other groups of respondents. Those who do have security systems mainly use locks and alarms. Twenty per cent say that they have extra security systems for some objects.

Thirty-two per cent of the Nordic second-hand bookshops that were victimized by theft during the past five years say that they reported thefts of cultural objects to the police. Also here, the reasons for not reporting the
thefts were that nothing would result from the report or that the value of the books was too low. Sixteen per cent of the second-hand bookshops say that they had reported thefts to their insurance companies; the theft of items whose value was less than the excess was usually not reported.

Nine of the second-hand bookshops say that they know what happened to some of the objects that were stolen. In half of the cases, objects were discovered on the market and in the other half with collectors. One interviewed second-hand bookshop owner said that the business arena is so small that virtually everyone knows if a valuable book has been stolen. An interviewed prisoner convicted of cultural heritage crime confirms this description.

*The book market is completely different to the art market, for example. Books are a pretty specialised area. Everyone knows each other and what books have been stolen, and they react when rare books suddenly appear on the market* (Interviewee 44, prisoner convicted of offences related to cultural heritage crime).

Approximately one-third of all second-hand bookshops say that they have registers for all their cultural objects, one-third have registers for some of their cultural objects and one-third have no registers. None of the second-hand bookshops say that they have photos of all their objects, but 30 per cent say that they have photos of some books. Sixty-eight per cent say that they make inventories.

Forty-six per cent say that they have routines for when an object disappears. Contacting the police and informing colleagues are the most common routines.

**SECURITY FOR NORDIC CRAFTSMEN**

Many craftsmen work with objects on site, which means that the customer is responsible for protecting the object. This might be the restoration of an object in a church building. For cases where work is done on the craftsman’s premises, the level of security is high. Eighty-nine per cent of all 99 craftsmen in the questionnaire study say that they have some sort of security at night and 69 per cent during the day. The high level of security is due to the nature of a craftsman’s place of work; it does not have to be open to visitors, and can be locked and opened for booked customer visits.

**SECURITY IN NORDIC PAWNSHOPS**

The security situation at pawnshops is generally high, and many of those who received the questionnaire chose not to respond because they did not want to reveal information about their security systems.

**OTHER AREAS**

In addition to preservers and dealers, other areas have also been victimized by cultural heritage crime. Security aspects for these areas will be dealt with in the following section.
Seventy-eight of the 135 respondents that work on archaeological excavations (58 per cent) say that they use some sort of security system. Information placards (31 per cent) and enclosed areas (36 per cent) are common. Nineteen per cent say that they use other security measures such as locking up valuable objects. Some respondents say that they avoid the media during ongoing excavations in order to protect the excavation site from looters. Limiting information to the media about an ongoing excavation is a method also mentioned in one of the interviews.

SECURITY AROUND SHIPWRECKS

Protection of shipwrecks is regulated in the Nordic countries by legislation concerning ancient monuments and finds. Common for the different acts is that shipwrecks are protected for 100 years after they occur. There is a special law in Sweden that gives exclusive rights to salvage shipwrecks less than 100 years old. Information on this legislation is presented in more detail under *Theories and research on cultural heritage crime* under the heading of *Cultural heritage legislation and its application*.

One interviewed archaeologist says that in Finland, one shipwreck has been turned into an underwater park where anyone can dive. The idea is to spare other wrecks by letting everyone dive on a specific shipwreck. However, even recreational divers try to prevent shipwreck plundering because it spoils the diving experience. One interviewed recreational diver says that many of the recreational divers who do not take objects, often keep the wrecks secret to protect them from being plundered.

In the course of reviewing the interview material, two areas of inadequate wreck security become apparent. These are:

- Lack of legal knowledge
- Inappropriate legislation

*Lack of legal knowledge*

It becomes clear from several interviewees that information about legislation has not reached the general public, even if the situation has improved during the past ten years. Even though recreational divers should be aware of the law, they are not. The following case description is an example of a recreational diver who had little awareness of the legislation.

A marine biologist received a telephone call from some recreational divers who had made an exciting find. When they arrived at his office, they handed over a bag of coins that they had found at the shipwreck. The coins were from the 17th century. The marine biologist informed them they were guilty of wreck plundering. The divers were very upset. They thought that they had done a good deed.

Not only the general public has poor knowledge of this legislation, however; it becomes clear from the interview study that many police and prosecutors also have inadequate knowledge. According to one interviewed marine
archaeologist, the police do not always know who to contact in relation to these matters. There is also a degree of confusion surrounding concepts.

**Inappropriate legislation**

Several interviewees pointed to various inadequacies in the legislation, and claimed that it is toothless. For example, the Swedish 100-year-regulation is considered poorly conceived.

> A boat sinks today. The law starts to apply in one hundred year’s time. What happens in the meantime? Someone obtains a permit to dive on the ship. Objects disappear. Objects are sold. In one hundred year’s time, the ship will be empty. That means that the law protects ships that aren’t interesting. The legislation is based on a false premise (Interviewee 12, marine archaeologist).

Another interviewed diver says that recreational divers who report shipwrecks are not always allowed to dive on them, which means that they do not want to report their finds. According to the interviewee, the legislation is inflexible and encourages “law-abiders to become non-law-abiders.”

**POLICE, SURVEILLANCE COMPANIES AND INSURANCE COMPANIES**

Interviewed police emphasize their meagre resources and inadequate awareness of the cultural heritage crime area. According to the interviewed police officers, cases where police authorities show commitment to cultural heritage crimes are the result of individual police officers acting on their own personal interest. This often leads to the police officer being commanded to a different post, or that he/she has to follow the interest privately. An interviewee who traces stolen goods on behalf of insurance companies says that these companies work very differently to the police.

> The police work differently to us. They often work at county level. The police want to find an offender. A crime has been committed. Insurance companies are interested in the goods aspect. Police work until they have a basis for prosecution. They don’t care about the goods like we do. When they find the thief, they close the door. The goods always take second place (Interviewee 24, traces stolen goods for insurance companies).

**AWARENESS, KNOWLEDGE AND STRATEGIES FOR PREVENTING ILLEGAL EXPORT**

The purpose of legislation on restricted removal of certain cultural items is to prevent the depletion of cultural heritage by preserving objects in their original environments and contexts. The laws, which are described in more detail under *Theories and research on cultural heritage crime*, define which objects should be protected and establish regulations for issuing permits. In theory, the laws are functional and permit applications are handled correctly. In practice, however, there are a number of problems with the legal provisions in terms of ensuring compliance. Customs often have neither the authority nor the resources to control what is taken out of the country, and focus instead on controlling imported goods. Responsibility for obtaining an export permit rests entirely with the owner of the cultural object.
A basic condition for compliance with this legislation is that the person concerned knows that it exists. The next step lies in understanding how the law is applied; in this case, how to apply for an export permit. The third step presumes general acceptance of the law and that measures are taken to avoid its violation. In order to identify any problems with the legislation, three questions were asked in the questionnaire study concerning awareness of the law, knowledge of how it is applied and strategies for preventing illegal export.

Awareness that legislation exists concerning removal and export is generally high amongst the group of actors in the questionnaire study. Table 21 demonstrates the reported awareness that legislation exists amongst different categories of dealers and museums. The table shows that Norwegian respondents generally reported a lower level of awareness than other countries. Only half of the Norwegian auction houses, for example, say that they knew about the legislation; in numbers, this amounts to only three auction houses, although all three were influential market players. Norwegian antique dealers also reported an alarmingly low level of awareness that legislation exists. The numbers presented here indicate the general awareness that legislation exists that regulates the removal of cultural objects. Hence, when analysing responses, it must be remembered that it is every citizen’s obligation to be aware of the laws that apply, which could mean that the figures are somewhat higher than the actual level of knowledge. It is also important to point out that the categories of respondents who answered the questionnaire are experts on cultural objects (except for carriers). Thus, it should not be interpreted that the resulting high levels presented below represent the average person on the street.

| Table 21: Awareness of the existence of legislation concerning movement/export (n=924). |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Antique dealers | Auction houses | Second-hand bookshops | Carriers | Museums |
| Sweden | Norway | Denmark | Finland |

Table 22 shows the knowledge level of the different categories of respondents regarding how to apply for permits. Museums and second-hand bookshops reported a slightly lower level of knowledge here compared to other groups of respondents. In general, all of the groups show a lower level of
knowledge than level of awareness. This means that those who know about the legislation do not always know how to apply for an export permit.

Table 22: Knowledge of how legislation is applied (n=913).

The proportion of respondents who say that they take measures to avoid illegal export of cultural objects is low, except for auction houses and carriers as shown in Table 23. Among antique dealers, over half of the respondents in all of the countries say that they take no measures to avoid illegal export, except for Sweden, where the proportion was slightly higher. If measures are taken, it is more a question of obtaining information about the legislation. Museums that have strategies for preventing illegal export are underrepresented in each of the countries.

Table 23: Reports of strategies for preventing illegal export (n=902).
The three tables presented above (Tables 21, 22 and 23) can be seen as three steps for preventing illegal export. The first step represents awareness that legislation exists, the second represents knowledge of how legislation is applied, i.e. how to apply for permits, and the third step represents strategies for preventing illegal export. By comparing the situations in these three steps, it is possible to determine exactly where crime prevention measures should be applied.

Table 24 shows the relation between these three steps. In general, the level of awareness is high, the knowledge of how legislation is applied is slightly lower, and formulated strategies are significantly lower. Auction houses constitute the only category of respondents where the proportion of those who answered positively is over 80 per cent for all three steps.

This analysis can be interpreted in two ways. First, it is possible that the respondents are aware of the legislation and how it should be applied, but do not wish to take preventative measures as they do not support the legislation. Second, it is possible that respondents are aware of the legislation and how it should be applied, but do not know how to prevent illegal removal and export. A reasonable conclusion is that the combined interpretations constitute a basis for explaining the figures.

The situation presented above applies for experts in the cultural heritage area. The general public is not equally aware that legislation exists. In order to study this, a random sample study was carried out in December 2005, where 80 people were surveyed in two groups. Forty belonged to the “general public”, and were surveyed at the Stockholm Central Station; 40 were generally interested in antiques, and surveyed on their way to or from a major auction house in Stockholm. In the general public group, 31 of 40 (78 per cent) said that they were not aware of the existence of this legislation as presented I Table 25. Six of the interviewees (15 per cent) were awa-
re of the existence of this legislation, but not what it entailed, and 3 people (8 per cent) said that they were aware of the existence of the legislation and what it entailed. In the group that was generally interested in antiques, awareness of the legislation was slightly higher, and only 8 people (20 per cent) say that they were not aware of any such legislation. Fourteen people (35 per cent) say that they were aware that the legislation existed, but not what it entailed, and 18 people (45 per cent) say that they were aware that the legislation existed and what it entailed.

![Graph showing awareness and knowledge of export legislation among the general public and the public interested in antiques.](image)

Table 25: The general public and public interested in antiques’ awareness and knowledge of export legislation (n=80).

Many of those who were aware of the legislation said that their information had been obtained from television programmes that focused on antiques, where regulations for removal had been discussed. Some of those interviewed had also seen information when travelling in other countries, and had indirectly understood that such regulations existed in their own country.

**Motives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motives</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial motives</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Blackmail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Collections (investment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Status-seeking motives</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Souvenir hunting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Collections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Psychological (status, self-confidence, identity)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political motives</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Blackmail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 22: A section of the analysis model. The complete model is shown on pages 24-25.
As previously mentioned in the section of theories and research, there are different motives for cultural heritage crime. In the Nordic questionnaire study, a question was asked about the motives for thefts and removals that had taken place during the past five years. The results are presented in Table 26. Preservers and dealers have been separated. The table reflects the respondents’ subjective assessment of what the motive was, which may not necessarily correspond with the offender’s motive. The different motives are discussed under each respective heading.

Table 26: Assessment of possible motives for thefts and removals during the past five years (n=468).

**FINANCIAL MOTIVES**

The decidedly most common motive for cultural heritage crimes is financial gain. This has been established at all levels and in all areas treated in the study. It is confirmed by the literature, questionnaire responses and especially the interview study. The financial motive can be fulfilled in several different ways: by selling the object, blackmailing the owner of the object or the insurance company, or keeping the object as an investment.

**SELL**

Our studies confirm that the most effective way to fulfil a financial motive is to sell the object. Table 24 shows that in both groups, most of the respondents could not assess what the motive was; this was reported by 51 per cent of the respondents. Amongst the respondents who could make an assessment, the most common response, at 41 per cent, was financial motive. For *dealers*, it was more common that a financial motive was assumed to be the motive for the crime (68 per cent) than that they did not know what the motive might be (27 per cent).

Financial gain by selling the illicitly removed object was also the most common motive in the interviews. It is not always the person who steals the object who deals it. As mentioned under *Targets and objects*, the interview material shows several instances where a client commissions a theft and then deals the goods. This is particularly likely when the object in question
is unique and has high financial value. Some interviewed police, however, are of the decided opinion that most art thefts have not been commissioned. This assumption is based on several instances where paintings have been discovered carelessly hidden in places such as a basement or the boot of a car, often in close proximity to the crime scene. The interviewed police say this indicated that the thief could not dispose of the goods. The thieves lacked both knowledge of the paintings’ values and contacts for selling them. The interviewed police say that when stolen art is sold, it is often transferred to a fence.

_In most cases, there is no connection between what the stolen art is worth and what the thief is paid. The thief is a craftsman, an entrepreneur, and his primary concern is getting paid. The true value of the art is not an issue until the fence sells it. The thief’s motive is money, only money, which is why he does not care much about the value. A thief might be satisfied with ten thousand kronor even though the art is worth ten million_ (Interviewee 72, police).

The same interviewee describes conditions by explaining that in “theft economics” a painting might be worth ten thousand, for the fence perhaps one hundred thousand, and converted to “media economics”, the value may reach millions.

Concerning shipwreck plundering, the interview material indicates that only a few of those who plunder shipwrecks are driven by financial motives. It is considered difficult to make money by plundering shipwrecks, and it costs a considerable amount to dive at great depths. In case descriptions where recreational divers carried out systematic plundering aimed at selling the objects, they have chosen wrecks from the 18th century where objects and material such as bogwood have been sold to buyers and businesses in Sweden and other countries. There is no evidence in the interview material that recreational divers make a living from plundering; the interviewees described it more as a lucrative hobby for a few interested people.

**BLACKMAIL**

Blackmail was judged to be the most unusual motive in the questionnaire study. In total, only one per cent of the victimized respondents made the assessment that this was the motive. To carry out blackmail by stealing a work of art and then demanding a ransom from the owner is usually referred to as _artnapping_. The thief or fence tries to obtain money for stolen works that are difficult to sell because they are so well known and valuable. One interviewee employed by an insurance company traces the history of artnapping in Nordic countries to the theft of Munch’s _The Scream_ from the National Museum in Norway in 1994 (another version of the painting was stolen from the Munch Museum in 2004). In this case, the thieves demanded a considerable sum of money for the painting, but the situation was solved when the thieves were arrested and the painting was returned. According to several of the interviewees, this type of artnapping is no longer worthwhile as museums have meagre financial resources. Rather, several interviewees indicated insurance companies as the targets of thieves or fences when attempting to sell back stolen art. The following quotation from an interviewed police describes a possible situation.
The thief or fence then has an idea of what the art is worth – in more spectacular thefts, the market value or insured value of the art is published in the newspapers – and offers the insurance company, either in person or through an agent, an opportunity to buy the art back for a percentage of what the compensation would have been (Interviewee 72, police).

Opinions vary about how widespread this practice is and how it is carried out, depending on who is interviewed. According to interviewees who work in the insurance industry, buy-backs do not happen. They speak about tip-off money. This means that insurance companies do not negotiate with anyone who is directly or indirectly involved in the theft. According to one interviewed police officer, this is mostly a rhetorical explanation because insurance companies have no way of knowing. According to interviewees in the insurance industry, only minor sums are paid out. The reason being that they want to avoid creating a market for buying back stolen art. An interviewed police officer said that this is already the case, however, and buy-backs are sometimes the primary motive for the theft; that is, the thief has no intention of selling to a fence, and contacts the insurance company directly. One interviewed insurance employee confirmed that buy-backs exist, but that they are unusual.

COLLECT (INVESTMENT)

There is no evidence in the data to suggest that offenders usually steal objects and collect them for their own financial purposes. It seems to be more common that collectors driven by financial interests purchase objects rather than steal them personally. This type of collector category is described under Buyers in the market section of the model. This refutes the myth that private galleries exist with very valuable, stolen works of art.

STATUS-SEEKING MOTIVES

A motive that is frequently discussed in connection with art theft is status, in the form of a criminal who seeks higher status in his/her criminal network by stealing a painting that is supposedly impossible to steal. But status-seeking motives need not be so spectacular, they can also describe a collector who wants to complement his/her collection to increase status in collector circles, or a tourist who wants to take a souvenir home to show friends and acquaintances.

SOUVENIR HUNTING

According to the questionnaire results, the motive behind 7 per cent of the thefts from preservers and dealers was that the offender wanted a souvenir. According to comments in the questionnaire, this seems to be a common phenomenon at museums, for example, that visitors take small, accessible, cultural heritage objects from exhibitions as souvenirs. One interviewed museum employee says that a diver’s knife and even a pair of uniform buttons had disappeared, and that the suspected motive was souvenir hunting. Cultural heritage objects belong to the most frequently stolen object category at museums, and these objects usually have a low financial value
(see Targets and objects for more details). This could indicate that the souvenir-hunting motive constitutes one of the threats to collections of cultural heritage objects.

COLLECTIONS

Following financial motives, the next most common motive for the illicit removal of cultural or art objects was a historical or aesthetic interest in the objects, and the status that a collection can bring. The difference between this group and the collectors under the Buyers heading in the market section of the model is that collectors in the production section do not buy objects; they remove them illicitly. In the questionnaire study, completing a collection was assumed to be the motive in 11 per cent of the thefts. The most common examples presented by the interview material of people who illicitly remove objects to complement their private collections are certain types of coin collectors, book collectors and recreational divers.

For recreational divers who illicitly remove objects, the descriptions varied people who had a few objects from shipwrecks in their homes, to people who had almost a complete museum in their homes.

Objects end up on a shelf someplace where no one else can enjoy them. Many recreational divers have old finds lying about. For divers, the finds are rarities. They are very important. It is “cool” to be a diver and have finds at home, and it strengthens your identity as a diver (Interviewee 40, diver).

Objects that shipwreck divers collect are not necessarily unique or old, but the variety of objects is great. According to one interviewee, binnacles, steering wheels, lanterns and ship’s bells are attractive objects, as are certain types of material such as bogwood. According to the interviews, many of the salvaged objects were kept at the recreational divers’ homes as decoration, in recreation rooms, for example, or in the garden. For recreational divers who take objects, their interest in collecting varies. Some give the objects away or trade them, while some are serious collectors who document their finds and research the ships they find.

PSYCHOLOGICAL

One type of motive often highlighted when well-known works of art are stolen is that the offender wants to raise his/her status in criminal circles by showing that he/she can take objects that are supposedly impossible to steal. The reason for this is that world famous works of art are also very difficult, it not impossible, to sell. There is some speculation about obsessed collectors who want to own the greatest works of art even if they cannot show them to anyone, and that they purchase these famous works. But this
was not confirmed by our study; on the contrary, several interviewees main-
tain that the stories of eccentric collectors are pure myth. Financial motives
appear stronger, even for the most spectacular thefts. However, the fact
that increased status in criminal circles is a desirable side effect of these
thefts cannot be eliminated.

POLITICAL MOTIVES

Illicitly removing a cultural object or art for political motives is not a
common phenomenon in the Nordic region. There is only one example in
the data of a politically motivated situation. This case concerns a person or
group that uses the acronym AKBR, which is deciphered as the Anti-fascist
Committee for the Rights of Children (in Swedish). AKBR has accepted
responsibility for the large-scale theft of invaluable art from churches in
Northern Sweden between 1994 and 2003. AKBR demanded entry permiss-
ion or amnesty for men who have been deported but still have children in
Sweden. AKBR claims to have taken these objects “with the intention of
persuading the government to change its legislation” (Sundvalls Tidning,
February 17, 2004). They threatened to destroy the objects at the end of
2001, but there is no evidence that this has taken place.

Service functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tradespersons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Register and archives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 23: A section of the analysis model. The complete model is shown on pages 24-25.

Different service functions are needed for illicit removal.

TRANSPORT

Forwarding agents can be used to transport cultural objects, furniture for
example. In the case of international carriers according to the interview
material, the practise of checking whether objects have export permits vari-
es. According to one interviewed forwarding agent, some agents demand
full control in order to facilitate border crossings. They want to know
exactly what they are transporting and will inform the customer if an
export permit is required. Other firms are less particular, sometimes beca-
use they are not aware of the regulations and other times because they do
not care.
TECHNICAL EQUIPMENT
There are different types of technical equipment that facilitate illicit removals. Side scan sonar systems can be used to locate shipwrecks, and GPS for navigation. Metal detectors can be used for illegal excavations.

CRAFTSMEN
There is no indication in the study results that restorers come into contact with stolen goods to any great extent. One interviewed Swedish restorer gave this information.

Swedish restorers do not receive Swedish stolen goods. The risk of discovery is too great. Any Swedish restorer, no matter who it is, would be very hesitant about suspected stolen goods. On the other hand, it is not impossible that stolen goods from Europe are renovated in Sweden. We are not familiar with the objects, and the risk of discovery is also slight (Interviewee 68, restorer).

VALUATION
Increased accessibility to information via the Internet and price lists, has also made it easier to find out what an object is worth. One interviewed antiquary says that objects could be valued by sending a photo to foreign auction houses. Some interviewed archaeologists claim they have been asked about the value of photographed archaeological objects.

REGISTERS, ARCHIVES AND THE MEDIA
Several interviewees say that trade in cultural objects was once exclusively for collectors and dealers, who required long experience and extensive knowledge. This has now changed because of increased public access to information. There are now registers and databases of where archaeological objects and cultural items are located. These registers and databases can be used to identify theft targets. One example in Sweden is Medieval images, which is accessible via the Internet and lists ecclesiastic heritage objects with photos and information about where they are located. The Swedish Maritime Museum’s wreck register and the Register of Ancient Monuments, which lists archaeological sites, are two other examples. Some of the interviewees called these registers theft catalogues. There is an ongoing debate in the museum world about easy access versus preservation.

Target based summaries of illicit removal and security section
This section presents brief summaries of each of the targets in the production section.
SUMMARY: NORDIC MUSEUMS

THEFT INCIDENTS

Each year during the past three years, an average of ten per cent of the 578 museums that took part in the questionnaire study have lost cultural objects. Sweden has the largest proportion of museums that lost cultural objects during the past three years, 19–20 per cent per year, while other Nordic countries give a lower percentage, between 5 and 13 per cent.

TYPES OF THEFT

The most common scenario is that cultural objects disappear from museum exhibitions during the day. Of museums victimized by theft, 31 per cent say that thefts have taken the form of burglary. Concerning insider thefts, 15 museums, or 9 per cent of the victimized museums, say they believe an employee is responsible.

TYPES OF STOLEN OBJECTS

The most common types of cultural objects stolen from museums are cultural heritage everyday objects such as tools, household tools, fabrics, china and toys.

SECURITY

A majority of the museums that responded (90 per cent) have some type of alarm at night, and about half during the day (52 per cent). Of museums that lost cultural objects during the past five years, 75 per cent reported the incident to the police. The reasons for not reporting the incidents to the police were that the financial value was considered too low, and that the circumstances surrounding the disappearance were unclear.

Concerning the registration of objects, 63 per cent of all the responding museums say that all of the institution’s objects are registered, and 20 per cent say they have photos of all objects in their collections. More than half of the museums perform regular inventories every year or more often. A third of the museums perform inventories less often than every fifth year or not at all, which means that these registers are not used to discover missing objects.

SUMMARY: NORDIC LIBRARIES

THEFT INCIDENTS

Each year during the past three years, 12 per cent of the 120 libraries in the questionnaire study have lost cultural objects. This relatively high level is due partly to the fact that it is sometimes difficult to know whether books have been stolen or simply misplaced somewhere in the library.

TYPES OF THEFT

The most common scenario is that cultural objects disappear on weekdays when the library is open, and visitors are considered to be the most common offenders. The type of offender varies from collectors who are more or
less obsessed and will go to great lengths to find a particular book, to people who are commissioned to steal a specific book. Concerning insider thefts, 3 of the 24 libraries that have lost cultural objects during the past five years say they believe an employee is responsible.

TYPES OF STOLEN OBJECTS

The most common types of cultural objects stolen from libraries are books from the 1500–1800s, maps and illustrations.

SECURITY

All libraries in the questionnaire study except one say they have some type of security system during the night and 82 per cent have a security system during the day. In the interview study, three areas are specified as general security flaws in libraries. These are staff routines, inventories and security prioritisations.

Of the 22 libraries that say that books have disappeared during the past five years, seven have reported the incidents to the police. More than half of all libraries say they never perform inventories, 23 per cent perform inventories every fifth year or more often.

SUMMARY: NORDIC ARCHIVES

THEFT INCIDENTS

Of the 54 Archives in the questionnaire study, four say they have lost cultural objects during the past five years. Thefts of individual objects from Archives are difficult to detect, which means that the actual number of thefts is difficult to quantify.

TYPES OF THEFT

When the circumstances surrounding the thefts have been known, objects were stolen from the reading room during the day. Concerning insider thefts, one Archive says it believes that an employee is responsible.

TYPES OF STOLEN OBJECTS

The most common types of detected stolen cultural objects from Archives are letters, and envelopes with stamps.

SECURITY

All Archives in the study say they have some type of security at night, and 89 per cent have security during the day. Concerning registers, 43 per cent of the Archives say they have registers of all documents, 33 per cent have photos of some objects. Inventories are performed by 42 per cent of the Archives.
SUMMARY: NORDIC CHURCHES

THEFT INCIDENTS

Swedish churches experience more theft than churches in other Nordic countries. Each year during the past three years, about five per cent of the 652 Swedish churches have lost cultural objects. The other Nordic countries had a lower selection of churches in the study. Between one and two per cent of the 88 Norwegian churches in the questionnaire study say they have lost cultural objects each year during the past three years. The equivalent figure for Finnish churches is three per cent of 52 churches. In Denmark, one of nine churches has reported losing cultural objects during the past three years.

TYPES OF THEFT

According to the questionnaire study, thefts take place in churches equally as often at night as during the day. Thefts usually take place at weekdays when the churches are empty and unattended. Concerning insider thefts, one church believes that an employee is responsible.

TYPES OF STOLEN OBJECTS

The most common types of cultural objects stolen from churches are candlesticks and church plate.

SECURITY

Security in churches is characterised by the fact that a church wants to open its doors to the general public, which also implies a greater theft risk for cultural objects kept in the church.

The study identifies four areas as general security flaws in churches. These are perimeter protection, inventories, security routines and security prioritisations.

Of the Swedish churches, 14 per cent say they have no security system at night and 36 per cent have a security system during the day. Concerning inventories, 90 per cent of Swedish churches say they have inventories for all cultural objects. The equivalent figure in Finland is 57 per cent, Norway 46 per cent and seven of nine churches in Denmark. Between 19 and 45 per cent of the Nordic churches have photos of all cultural objects, while between 10 and 20 per cent have no photos at all. Of the Swedish churches that report losing cultural objects during the past five years, 95 per cent have reported the incidents to the police.

SUMMARY: FINNISH AND SWEDISH OPEN-AIR MUSEUMS

THEFT INCIDENTS

Of the Swedish open-air museums that have reported thefts to insurance companies between 2000 and 2004, 30 of the 50 reported theft incidents concern cultural objects. Of the 46 Finnish open-air museums that were studied, 7 report losing cultural objects during the past three years.
TYPES OF THEFT

The most common circumstances surrounding thefts from Finnish and Swedish open-air museums are burglaries at night. Ninety per cent of thefts from the Swedish open-air museums and 56 per cent of the Finnish open-air museums were burglaries.

TYPES OF STOLEN OBJECTS

The most common types of cultural objects that were stolen are old everyday objects such as tools and household utensils.

SECURITY

Between 75 and 80 per cent of the Swedish and Finnish open-air museums have some type of security system during both day and night. Concerning open-air museums with registers of all cultural objects, 74 per cent of Swedish and 63 per cent of Finnish open-air museums have registers. Of the open-air museums that have lost cultural objects, 93 per cent of the Swedish and 78 per cent of the Finnish open-air museums have reported the incidents to the police.

SUMMARY: NORDIC AUCTION HOUSES

THEFT INCIDENTS

Each year during the past three years, an average of five of 28 auction houses say that cultural objects have been stolen.

TYPES OF THEFT

The low number of observations in the questionnaire study makes it difficult to draw any conclusions about the most common circumstances surrounding thefts from auction houses. Of the nine auction houses victimized by theft during the past five years, six say that the thefts took place during the day, five on a weekday and six say they took place during staffed hours. The auction houses believe that the most common offenders are visitors.

TYPES OF STOLEN OBJECTS

The objects reported stolen from the auction houses in the questionnaire study are pictorial art, sculptures in bronze and porcelain, silver goblets, candlesticks and jewellery. Some of the stolen objects are from the 1900s.

SECURITY

The general security level at the auction houses is high. Four of the nine auction houses victimized by theft during the past five years say they reported the incidents to the police. The most common reasons for not reporting the thefts are that the value of the objects was too low or that it was too much trouble. Of the 28 auction houses, 20 say they register all cultural objects, 3 say they register some objects and 4 auction houses say that have no registers at all.
SUMMARY: NORDIC ART AND ANTIQUE DEALERS

THEFT INCIDENTS

Each year during the past three years, an average of 12 per cent of the 207 antique dealers in the questionnaire study say they have experienced theft of cultural objects. The victimized antique dealers report an average of three theft incidences per year.

TYPES OF THEFT

The most common circumstances are that the cultural objects are stolen from the shop or exhibition during staffed hours during the day, but 42 per cent of the victimized antique dealers say they have been burgled. Antique dealers believe that the most common offenders are visitors (48 per cent) and burglars (33 per cent), but also organised gangs (13 per cent). Two antique dealers in the questionnaire study believe they have experienced insider thefts.

TYPES OF STOLEN OBJECTS

The most common types of stolen cultural objects are silver and other precious metal objects such as silver cutlery and candlesticks.

SECURITY

Twenty-two per cent of all antique dealers have an alarm during the day, and 62 per cent at night. There is also an informal alarm system, where antique dealers warn each other when gangs operate in the area. Of the antique dealers victimized by theft during the past five years, 81 per cent have reported the incidents to the police. The reasons for not reporting the incidents are that the value of the stolen object was too low, and that it was pointless and not worth the trouble. Another reason could be that there were no receipts for the stolen objects because they had changed hands illegally. Only 52 per cent of the antique dealers had registers of all objects despite the fact that this is a legal requirement in Nordic countries.

SUMMARY: NORDIC ANTIQUARIAN BOOKSHOPS

THEFT INCIDENTS

Each year during the past three years, an average of 12 per cent (18 of 83) of antiquarian bookshops say that cultural objects have been stolen. The antiquarian bookshops that were victimized by theft report an average of four theft incidences per year.

TYPES OF THEFT

Books that disappeared from antiquarian bookshops are usually stolen from the shop (according to 30 of 34 dealers) rather than stocks. Seven of the 34 antiquarian bookshops victimized by theft name burglaries, the rest are unspecified thefts. Most thefts have taken place during staffed hours during the day, and the offenders are usually considered to be visitors. Con-
cerning insider thefts, two antiquarian bookshops believe that an employee is responsible.

TYPES OF STOLEN OBJECTS
The most common type of stolen cultural object from antiquarian bookshops is literature from the 1900s.

SECURITY
Of the Nordic antiquarian bookshops in the study, 36 per cent say they have no security at night and 72 per cent claim no daytime security. About one third have registers of all cultural objects and one third have no register at all. Thirty two per cent of the antiquarian bookshops victimized by theft during the past five years have reported the incidents to the police. The reasons for not contacting the police are that it seemed pointless and that the value of the books was too low.

SUMMARY: ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES

INCIDENTS OF ILICIT REMOVAL
Incidents of illicit removal from archaeological sites are difficult to quantify because it is difficult to know whether objects have been taken. The number of unrecorded cases in this crime area is probably high. Of the 145 respondents in the questionnaire study who work with excavations, three have reported thefts from archaeological sites during the past five years.

TYPES OF ILICIT REMOVAL
Signs of illegal excavations sometimes indicate that metal detectors may have been used.

TYPES OF OBJECTS
In cases where respondents say that objects have disappeared, these are primarily everyday objects and jewellery.

SECURITY
In the questionnaire study, 58 per cent of the respondents who work with archaeological excavations say they use some type of security system.

SUMMARY: SHIPWRECKS

INCIDENTS OF ILICIT REMOVAL
It has not been possible to measure the scope of illicit removal of cultural objects from shipwrecks.

TYPES OF ILICIT REMOVAL
According to the interview study, the illicit removal of cultural objects from shipwrecks ranges from opportunistic theft, where a diver takes an object on an arranged diving trip, to organised shipwreck plundering where divers locate a shipwreck through their own research and active searching.
TYPES OF OBJECTS
The types of objects taken, according to the interviews, range from drinking vessels, ship’s bells, coins, binnacles, steering wheels, engine-room telegraphs, lights, canons or materials like bogwood.

SECURITY
The protection of shipwrecks is regulated through monument legislation in Nordic countries. In the interview study, two areas are identified as general security flaws in relation to shipwrecks. These are knowledge of existing laws, and inappropriate legislation – such as not protecting shipwrecks less than 100 years old.

SUMMARY: ILLEGAL EXPORT
INCIDENTS OF ILLEGAL EXPORT
The illegal export of cultural objects is difficult to quantify and the number of unrecorded cases is probably high. In the questionnaire study, four per cent of the respondents say they know of cases where cultural objects have been exported in violation of national laws.

TYPES OF ILLEGAL EXPORT
Not all illegal export is deliberate, however. According to the interview study, illegal export is often due to ignorance and carelessness on behalf of the person who exports the object.

TYPES OF ILLEGALLY EXPORTED OBJECTS
The most common type of illegally exported cultural object reported in the questionnaire is furniture.

SECURITY
The interview study points to a number of problems concerning legislation on illegal export in regard to the need for legislation and what it should protect. Supervising compliance is also problematic. Customs officers have neither the means nor the authority to control what is taken out of the country, so they focus on imported goods.

SUMMARY: ILLEGAL IMPORT
INCIDENTS OF ILLEGAL IMPORT
Illegal import is also difficult to quantify and even here, the number of unrecorded cases is probably high. In the questionnaire study, three per cent of the respondents say they know of cases where cultural objects more than 100-years old have been removed from their country of origin in violation of national laws, and then imported into a Nordic country.

TYPES OF ILLEGAL IMPORT
The interviews suggest that most illegal import is deliberate, where the dealer who intends to sell the objects ensures that someone else is liable.
TYPES OF OBJECTS

The most frequently reported object categories are archaeological finds and furniture (claimed by 10 respondents each) and art, which were reported by 10 respondents, of which 9 gave sacred art. Three respondents say they know about cases of illegally exported books.

SECURITY

Controlling the illegal import of cultural objects is particularly difficult because it builds upon legislation in the object's country of origin. This places great demands on the expertise of customs officers who inspect goods during import procedures.

SUMMARY: OTHERS

NORDIC RESTORERS

According to the questionnaire study, tradespersons as a group are not victimized by theft of cultural objects. Of the 104 restorers in the questionnaire study, three report thefts of cultural objects during the past five years.

PAWNSHOPS

Pawnshops do not handle cultural objects to any great extent. None of the 30 pawnshops in the questionnaire study have reported stolen cultural objects.

NORDIC CARRIERS

None of the carriers who responded to the questionnaire study report thefts of cultural objects.

Legal market for cultural objects

Trade in cultural objects mainly takes place through the art and antiques market, antiquarian bookshops or via auctions. Another recently emerged arena is Internet auctions, which is developing rapidly. The players are both established auction houses that expand their operations to the Internet, and new companies that are created for Internet-based auctions. This study includes a special sub-study of Danish on-line auctions. The results of this sub-study are presented under Case study: the Internet in this chapter.
Dealing in used objects always raises the question of how to handle stolen goods. Compared to other crimes such as narcotics trafficking where all transactions are illegal, illicit traffic with cultural objects is difficult to overview because the black and white markets are so closely intertwined. An analysis of the black market must therefore begin with an overview of the market in general. The players in this market are antique dealers, antiquarian booksellers, auction houses and private people who buy and sell objects.

Museums, Archives and libraries are also important players because they determine the value of objects when buying. All objects in a museum’s collection are classified as cultural objects, which means they are part of our cultural heritage.

Museums also play an indirect role as a source of inspiration. Our material includes collectors and other people from the antiques business who speak about the significance of visiting museums when they were children for their future career choice or interest in collecting.

A key issue in the antiques sector is the array of different interests. The common denominator for dealers and preservers is their interest in art, history and cultural heritage objects. But there is a fundamental difference in their view of cultural heritage objects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illegal market</th>
<th>Grey zone</th>
<th>Legal market</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marketplace for illegal objects only</td>
<td>Marketplaces that &quot;unknowingly&quot; mixes legal and illegal cultural objects</td>
<td>Markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money and credit systems</td>
<td>Marketplaces that knowingly mixes legal and illegal objects</td>
<td>Service functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laundering cultural objects (Illegal objects become legal)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laundering money (Black money becomes white)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 24: A section of the analysis model. The full model is shown on pages 24-25.
One interviewed antique dealer says:

_The antiques market only sees the object, not the context. In the antiques market, an object has no relation to its original period and culture, just a market value – and all objects are reduced to money. Museums see the larger picture, a context. Unfortunately, the antiques market sets the agenda today and museums have not communicated their picture of the context; they have neglected their role as educators._ (Interviewee 150, antique dealer)

Museum activities have also changed a great deal over time, while the antique dealer’s role is more or less the same. When they were established during the second half of the 1800s, museums were filled with objects, and museum officers of the time were more like today’s antique dealers (Arcadius, 1997). In today’s museums, or at least cultural heritage museums in the Nordic region, the context has become more important – especially in more contemporary exhibitions – and questions like who made the object and how it was used are just as important as the object itself (Floris and Vassström, 1999). Modern museums collect knowledge rather than objects. A worrying consequence of this, say some museum professionals, is that the knowledge of objects once held by museum curators has now been transferred to antiques market representatives. This upsets the balance of trust that once existed.

One interviewed museum officer says that although they need and depend upon each other, there is an important functional difference between the antiques market and museums. He says the public need to know how museums and the antiques market differ. He also says they influence each other. Television programmes like Antikrundan (Antiques Roadshow) inspire an interest in antique objects, despite their pecuniary angle. And this increased interest benefits museums. On the other hand, Antikrundan’s experts adopt antiquarian attitudes when they speak about patina and not stripping paint with lye, or sprucing up antiques rather than showing prudence and learning more about them.

The interviewed museum officer says:

_A museum has to comply with ICOM’s code of ethics, which means that we cannot mix museum activities with antique dealing. It is not appropriate for a museum to lend its premises to antique fairs unless the limitations of each respective operation are clearly defined._ (Interviewee 107, museum officer)

Another important aspect is the difference between morals and legislation. Many of the arguments for preservation have strong moral undertones, and these are not always captured in the wording of Acts.

**ANTIQUE DEALERS**

The spectrum of art and antique dealers in the Nordic region spans the entire field, from traditional, well-established companies with chic addresses, to looser operations with no salesroom but large storerooms outside urban centres or in rural areas.
There are also endless “second-hand shops”, “bargain shops”, etc that sometimes sell antique objects and are essentially antique traders. These shops or stalls are more or less permanent. Many of them appear during the summer months in the tourist season.

1. Dealers with shops – “established” antique dealers
2. Dealers with “back pocket offices” – a network of colleagues, find specific objects for their customers. Have no real storerooms, buy and sell on a “just-in-time” basis
3. Dealers with large storerooms but no shops. Wholesalers.
4. Occasional dealers – with no shops. Only seen at antique fairs.

Established art and antique dealers in Nordic countries are affiliated with different national trade associations. Membership in these also means membership in Confédération International des Négociants à Oeuvres d’Art (CINOA), which was founded in 1935 and represents around 5,000 art and antique dealers who must adhere to the by-laws and ethics of their own associations (www.cinoa.org).

Just as museums are internationally affiliated with ICOM (International Council of Museums), which has established a code of ethics for museum professionals, CINOA also aims to establish a code of ethics for the international art and antiques market. But as previously mentioned, there is a major difference in the attitude towards objects. This is typified in CINOA’s statutes, where one of the confederation’s goals is to promote the abolition of restrictions on the import and export of cultural objects.\(^\text{30}\)

**DENMARK**

In Denmark, art and antique dealers are organised through Dansk kunst- og Antikvitetshandler Union, which has just over 40 members.

**NORWAY**

Norway’s trade association for art and antique dealers is Norges kunst- og antikvitetshandleres forening which currently has around 40 members.

**SWEDEN**

There are two trade associations in Sweden, Sveriges Konst och Antikhandlarförening with around 60 members and Förenade Antik- och Konsthandlare with more than 70 members.

**FINLAND**

Finland has two trade associations: The Association of Finnish Antique Dealers and Suomen Taied-ja Antiikkikauppiaiden yhdistys.

\(^{30}\) Statutes of CINOA Article 2 Ch. 3 http://www.cinoa.org/about.cfm.
The interviews show that antique dealers acquire objects from people and contacts who they know and trust, usually other dealers and private people, but also from deceased estates and auctions.

Most of the interviewed art and antique dealers were keen to point out that their business was based on trust. We must be able to trust each other and the people we do business with. Otherwise the whole industry will go under, is a common remark. Many say they never buy from people off the street, and many add that they check provenance wherever possible. Provenance means origin, and knowing how the object has passed between owners and preferably, where it originated. In other words, knowing something about the object’s history. This is also a preventive measure, to avoid handling stolen goods.

One interviewed Finnish antique dealer says there are three types of people who sell objects to antique dealers. The first category is people who have large collections and sell pieces they no longer want. The second group is people who sell their own objects for financial reasons, because they need the money. The third category is shady characters who probably have something to hide. These are the people you should not do business with, claims our interviewee. It is also common for antique dealers to buy and sell from each other. Many are specialised, and they tell each other if they see something they know another dealer wants. The antiques market is a small world where most people know, or at least have heard of each other.

Many antique dealers say that everyone in the business has different channels, and is probably reluctant to reveal their own buyers and sellers. To be successful, you have to have a feel for the market, know what objects are in demand and where to find them, and get the right prices.

Illegal trade seems to constantly lurk around the corner. There are many dealers in our material who say they have all been tempted at one time or another to make a good deal by buying illegal products, stolen objects or fake art. The difference is that some fall to temptation, while others do not. Many of the interviewees also feel that people in the antiques industry are loyal to each other, that there is a strong bond between antique dealers.

People who view antique dealers as untrustworthy are ignorant, claims one of our sources. That is a huge myth. What is more, says the same source, museums all over the world are full of stolen objects. It may have been the case once upon a time that people did not care where objects came from, and that one or two antique dealers probably did the wrong thing, but most antique dealers are normal, decent people who cannot afford to ruin their chances by doing something stupid, says one person. But you probably buy stolen goods at sometime or other, no matter how careful you are, he adds.

According to the questionnaire, only 65 per cent of dealers say they bought cultural objects during the past year. However, this number probably indicates that many of the antique dealers view their objects as commercial rather than cultural objects. This is yet another example of how dealers and preservers view objects differently. Of the dealers that view their objects as cultural objects, the most common buying source was: other dealers
(88%), private people (78%), deceased estates (56%) and runners (23%). Ninety five per cent of the dealers who bought objects during the past year claim they controlled the person selling the objects. The most common method was to request proof of identity (90%) or alternatively, that the person was known to them (20%).

Of the dealers who bought objects during the past year, 70 per cent say they checked the objects. The most common control was provenance (57%). Seventeen per cent say they checked the objects in the stolen goods register with the police.

Antique dealers sell mostly to private people (64%). The second biggest buyer category is other antique dealers (48%). A surprisingly large number of dealers (20%) also sell to museums.

**ART DEALERS/GALLERY OWNERS**

The difference between art dealers and antique dealers is sometimes difficult to define. Some art dealers sell antiques, and some antique dealers sells art. Some of the practitioners call themselves art and antique dealers. They belong to the same trade association. While antique dealers operate across a fairly broad field, art dealers and gallery owners work in smaller circles, with fewer but closer networks between artists, buyers and sellers. Many art dealers say they never buy from anyone except dealers, auction houses and people they know. According to our interviews, it is not unusual that you are born into the business. Many have inherited their shops or businesses from parents or relatives, and taken over the clientele and artists.

Art dealers can work in different fields; some are in fact simply art dealers, i.e. they buy and sell art. But they can also buy on commission for a client, or showcase a number of artists. A gallery owner markets an artist and charges a percentage of the purchase price. A museum can only exhibit the works of the artists with the permission or participation of the gallery owner. The gallery owner also charges the museum a fee for exhibiting the artist. Another common service provided by art dealers is valuations on behalf of insurance companies. Art dealers also act as brokers of Nordic art to foreign buyers, especially museums.

Even though the classic image of the “art spiv” has disappeared – smart suit, expensive watch, “Merc” and a mixed bag of authenticity amongst the paintings in his boot – more than one of the interviewees say that the industry is not scruple-free. One art dealer says that art dealing has two layers: a few dealers with “established businesses” who are successful, and a large number with “back pocket offices” who seem to deal in anything.

Even so, many consider serious art dealing to be more respectable than auctions because there is a guarantee and a personal relationship, which means that you can return a painting. *Because I sold a good painting, I can always buy it back again or exchange it*, says one dealer. *You can’t do that with an auction house.*

A widespread opinion amongst the interviewees is that the industry has changed dramatically during recent years. The auction houses are progressively taking over the market, and competition has created a different climate. Dealers could once buy at auctions and sell at galleries. This margin no
longer exists. And neither do the same clientele buy investment art in the shops. Young people want colour, says one art dealer. But several interviewees say that even auction houses are losing ground because the taxation department scrutinizes who submits what to auctions.

AUCTION HOUSES IN THE NORDIC REGION

Exactly how dealing is distributed between the art and antiques market and auction houses is difficult to assess.

According to the auction houses’ own figures (SOU 2005:3, page 56), Swedish auction house Bukowskis generated a turnover of around SEK 330 million in 2003, and Stockholms Auktionsverk slightly more than 280 million during the same period.

In general, valuable objects are sold via auction houses. Bukowskis Auctioneer, Stockholms Auktionsverk and Uppsala Auctionskammare dominate the Swedish market. Denmark’s leading auction houses are Bruun-Rasmussen, and Hagelstams plays a major role in Finland. In Norway, Blomqvists Kunsthandel dominates the market. There are also a number of smaller-sized auction companies across the entire Nordic region.

The Nordic auction houses collaborate with the international antiques market through different alliances. Bukowskis is a member of International Auctioneers (IA), a group formed by eight leading auction houses in the US and Europe. IA holds around 1,150 auctions annually, serves more than 400,000 clients around the world and auctions more than 500,000 objects each year (SOU 2005:3, page 56). Scandinavian Auctions is another group, a partnership between Blomqvists Kunsthandel in Oslo, Bruun-Rasmussen in Copenhagen and Stockholms Auktionsverk.

HOW DO AUCTION HOUSES WORK?

Auction houses are a transit place for antiques. A marketplace where objects can change hands without buyers and sellers ever needing to meet or know about each other. From the time of consignment to completion of the sale, auction houses never own the objects. The previous owner owns the object until it receives a new owner through the auction. The auction houses receive objects, publish catalogues and arrange sales. Their revenues are made by charging a percentage of the sales price. Auctioneers are interested in the best price possible, to satisfy their clients and maximise their own profits. There is no fixed or recommended price at auctions. The market decides the price on each separate occasion. This also means that unlike the art or antiques trade, the object cannot be returned. Bidders determine the price, and next time it might be higher.

Another important and profitable activity for auction houses is valuation. Valuations are performed on behalf of private people but also for insurance companies. Major auction houses make countless valuations every year.

There is also some collaboration between museums and the antiques market on export issues. In Sweden, Nordiska museet and the National Museum of Fine Arts carry out preliminary assessments of objects that are
put up for sale in general quality auctions as a service to the auction houses, by going through the objects in advance and marking some of them with a preliminary export prohibition.

In Denmark, there is an agreement between the Danish Commission on Export of Cultural Assets, which is the National Cultural Heritage Agency’s supervisory authority for the export of cultural objects from Denmark, and the auction houses. This agreement means that the Danish Commission on Export of Cultural Assets can review the catalogues prior to auctions to check whether any objects are subject to an export prohibition. If not, no further control is needed. If any of the objects need an export permit, the auction house is informed. According to the agreement, the information is not communicated before the auction to avoid affecting the price.

The questionnaire shows that the cultural objects sold by auction houses come from all player segments. All auction houses acquire goods from private people and deceased estates. All but one acquires objects from antique dealers.

Objects are usually sold to private people and antique dealers, although museums are also reported as buyers.

One auctioneer in Denmark tells how Danish people that own valuable cultural objects sometimes move abroad. They are not aware of the legislation and decide to sell some of their valuables. The auctioneer says that only professionals are familiar with the legislation.

**ANTIQUARIAN BOOKSHOPS**

Online antiquarian bookshops now complement the traditional antiquarian sector with its centrally located shops. High rental costs in city centres and electronic developments have lead to increased trade in antiquarian books via the Internet. This enables less centrally located storerooms and lower costs.

There are also a number or organisations and financial groups for antiquarian booksellers. Like art and antique dealers, some antiquarian booksellers in the Nordic region are organised into national trade associations. These were founded in the 1900s and have devised a code of ethics for the rare book trade. The national associations are also connected to the international federation, the International League of Antiquarian Booksellers, which represents 20 national organisations and has more than 2,000 booksellers worldwide. National associations in the Nordic region are presented below.

**DENMARK**

The Danish Antiquarian Booksellers Association was founded in 1920. The Danish association is one of the oldest, only the British (1906) and French

---

31 In order to know how cultural objects are acquired, the questionnaire asked whether they are purchased or acquired in some other way. Unfortunately, only 7 of 28 auction houses say they acquired cultural objects during 2004, or answer questions concerning the circumstances.

32 [http://www.ilab-lila.com](http://www.ilab-lila.com)
(1914) associations are older. The goals are to promote antiquarian bookshops by maintaining quality, stimulating lawful trade, increasing technical and professional knowledge, and representing and supporting individual members in contacts with state and local governments and others.

NORWAY

The Norwegian Antiquarian Booksellers Association was founded in 1942. The association could not appear publicly without the permission of Nazi authorities, so its existence was kept secret until 1948. The goals of this association comply with its Danish equivalent.

SWEDEN

The Swedish Antiquarian Booksellers Association was founded in 1936. The association has the same goals as its Nordic sister associations. Its code of ethics establishes that booksellers will promote the sector’s code of ethics regarding authenticity, reporting damage or defects, clear marking and taking all reasonable measures to ensure that purchased material is the seller’s property, etc.

FINLAND

The first Finnish antiquarian bookshops were founded in Turku in the 1840s. The Finnish Antiquarian Booksellers Association – the joint non-profit making association – was founded in 1941 in Helsinki. Today, the federation has 24 members from all over Finland. The association protects the interests of its members and has a code of ethics that comply with other Nordic countries. The Finnish Antiquarian Booksellers Association arranges annual internationally recognized book fairs. Another antiquarian booksellers association in Finland is Suomen antikvaarisit kirjakauppiaat ry.

HOW DO ANTIQUARIAN BOOKSELLERS ACQUIRE THEIR OBJECTS?

According to the questionnaire responses, 71 per cent of the antiquarian booksellers bought cultural objects during 2004. Most dealers buy from private people (69%), deceased estates (62%) or other dealers (51%). Runners are also mentioned (17%).

The objects are bought from shops, fairs or auctions in most cases (around 40% for each category). Online auctions are fairly common (19%) as well as ads in newspapers (10%) and on the Internet (9%).

WHO ARE THE BUYERS?

Private people are the largest group of buyers (71%) followed by institutions, museums and dealers (around 40%). The antiquarian book sector is a special niche in antique dealing. Knowledge levels are high amongst both private people and colleagues.

---

33 http://www.antikvar.dk/abfinen.html
34 Information from http://www.antikvariat.no
35 Information from http://www.svaf.se
36 Information from the Association’s website http://www.antikvaaratit.net
dealers and buyers. This is a highly specialised sector, comparable to coin and stamp collecting. Everyone knows each other and what books they have, who sells respectively buys what, who owns what, etc. The objects are usually sold in shops or directly to customers.

**MUSEUMS AND OTHER PRESERVERS**

As mentioned earlier, museums take a role in the antique market when they buy objects. Mostly major museums buy objects, however - mainly art museums and those that specialise in other cultures, such as ethnographic museums. The otherwise most common method for museums to acquire objects is to accept gifts and donations. Of the interviewed museums in the questionnaire, 66% say they acquired cultural objects during 2004. Eighty-four per cent of these museums acquired objects from private people, 47% from dealers and 35% from deceased estates.

Objects are typically acquired through personal contact (82%). Auctions are also common (42%). Shops, runners, online auctions and antique fairs are less common (21%, 13%, 8%, 7%).

Only every second museum, or 52 per cent of the museums that bought objects during the past year say they control the person selling or donating goods. The most common method is requesting proof of identity, or that the person is known. According to ICOM’s code of ethics, evidence of lawful ownership is required.

A surprisingly low figure, a mere 59 per cent of the museums say they control the objects they acquire. Perhaps even more surprising is that only 55 per cent demand documented provenance of the object, which is such a central issue in ICOM’s code of ethics.

**PAWNSHOPS**

Pawnshops are a phenomenon unique to Finland and Sweden. Valuable objects can be pawned in a pawnshop. The objects that are not redeemed are sold at auctions. According to the questionnaire responses, pawnshops do not handle many antiques. In the interview material, a pawnshop in Finland says it has customers from all social spectra. Antiques that are pawned include old Finnish, Swedish, Russian and English table silver, paintings, jewellery and works of art. Ninety six per cent of the pawned objects are redeemed. This figure is even higher for antiques.

A receipt is required for electronic equipment or new objects. As a receipt cannot be requested for old objects, personal information about the seller is required. One interviewee claims that pawnshops are not right place for stolen goods. “I really doubt that Finnish pawnshops are doing shady business,” he says. “It would be too risky. You wouldn’t last long. All the pawnshops in Finland are controlled by RATA (the Financial Supervisory Authority)."

*"If it looks like the customer and the object don’t match, we don’t accept the object. We don’t need to give a reason. Every now and then somebody tries to pawn something that is “inherited from grandma”. Then we ask for the estate
inventory deed. Then the person says he’ll go and get it, but he never comes back."

“Antiques are usually redeemed but if they are ever put up to auction, you know there’ll always be certain antique dealers and private collectors bidding for them.”

FLEA MARKETS

Flea markets lie on the outskirts of antique dealing. They are a second-hand market for practically everything. There are flea markets everywhere. The quality is uneven – sometimes curios, but mostly junk. According to the interviews, antique dealers in Finland believe that flea markets damage genuine antique dealing, because they attract disreputable dealers and sell stolen objects. Flea markets lack the control mechanisms practised by antique dealers who check the ID of both customers and sellers. One antique dealer says that objects once brought by people to antique shops now go to flea markets. It happens that people bring an object to an antique shop for a valuation. Then they go to the flea market and sell it there.

NEWSPAPERS/TV

Newspapers and magazines are also important players in the antiques market, both the cultural section of the daily press that follows auction sales and reflects trends in the antiques market, and magazines that try to exploit this huge interest in antiques in their efforts to attract new readers. The auction houses also work via newspapers.

This huge interest in antiques is also reflected in television programmes: Antikrundan in Sweden and Hammerslag in Denmark. The format is based on people who show their antiques to antiques experts for a valuation. Even though everyone maintains that their prime interest is learning something about an object and its history, it is not unlikely that the dream of discovering a valuable treasure is also a prime interest.

RESTORERS

Restorers are tradespersons and belong under the Service functions heading. Restorers are organized in associations. Many restorers run their own businesses and work alone. Some are employed by the larger museums, where they usually work with the museums’ own collections, or are assigned to other museums that buy services from the larger museums. Restorers are specialised in different areas, e.g. textiles, metal, polychrome wood, fine art, etc. Restoring a painting usually involves cleaning, and removing varnish. Restoration is the simplest measure. A restorer also carries out renovation, conservation and other repairs that all have an impact on the object.

Clients are antique dealers, museums and private people. Sometimes auction houses assign restorers to determine the authenticity of an object.
SERVICES FUNCTIONS

The antiques market depends upon different service functions. Many of these functions are provided by the players themselves – restorers for example, who conserve paintings and restore furniture. An antique dealer or auctioneer valuates objects for private people, estates or insurance companies. Art dealers can have different agency assignments, etc. Transport and forwarding services are also required.

CASE STUDY: THE INTERNET

Online auctions are a new marketplace for trade in cultural objects. This new, rapidly growing arena is problematic because of the large number of products that change hands so rapidly. Trade is difficult to overview and control, and clouded with suspicions of irregularities. In order to gain some insight into the area, a study of online auctions in Denmark has been implemented.

The key areas addressed in the study revolve around questions like: Who are the players in the online market? What is the size of the market? What objects are sold online? Is it possible to trace stolen objects on online markets?

The online auctions in this study are divided into three categories: conventional online auctions, monitored online auctions and autonomous online auctions. The division is based on the amount of contact with experts in the art and antique market.

- **Conventional online auctions** have the same format and formalities as physical auctions. Auction houses value the objects and place lots[^1] for sale on their website. Auction houses publish the lots in online catalogues, and auction them over a period of days. A good example is Bruun Rasmussen, one of the oldest and most renowned auction houses in Denmark.

- Lots in **the monitored online auctions** are also valued and published on an auction house’s website. In monitored auctions, however, the flow of lots is steady. Objects can be placed at any time, though usually during office hours. Auction house Lauritz went online in 2000, and is a typical monitored online auction. The auctions at Lauritz.com usually run for seven days.

- **Autonomous online auctions** merely provide contact between buyers and sellers, and do not at any point have any physical contact with the objects they sell. eBay, with over one hundred million registered members, is the world’s biggest e-commerce company.

Since 1995, eBay has expanded to 23 local websites, and services countries all around the world. Eleven of these countries are in Europe, including Sweden and Germany. National websites provide services in local languages.

[^1]: A ‘lot’ is an item or group of items that is offered for sale as one unit
but all sites enable searches on lots placed locally, nationally and internation-
ally.

eBay offers millions of objects for sale every day in over a thousand
categories. A worldwide search on all categories results in 14,451,846 lots available for purchase. eBay’s Full Year 2004 Financial Report shows consolidated net revenues of approximately $3.3 billion. All lots are valued and placed by the vendor, which means there is very little control over the objects that are sold, to whom and for what price.

A worldwide search on the ‘Antiques’ category produces 251,952 lots, and 359,964 lots under the ‘Art’ category. The worldwide search for objects available to bidders in Denmark produces 251,372 lots in the ‘Antiques’ category and 359,194 in the ‘Art’ category, which suggests that most of the objects in these categories can be shipped around the world.

A closer look at the lots placed in Denmark shows they are placed by very few vendors. In the ‘art’ category, only 7 vendors place almost 95 per cent of the lots; in the ‘antiques’ category four vendors have placed 76 per cent of the lots. The vendors are predominantly art and antique dealers who have expanded their conventional business with e-commerce.

All auction websites offer free membership and request a minimum of information, such as name, address and e-mail address. After registering, members receive an e-mail to confirm membership and can start bidding.

Objects from an important Danish collection of flint tools were discov-
ered in a general eBay search on April 1, 2005. These objects where sold under two different usernames, but all objects were placed in Germany. The photographs and descriptions of the lots were similar, suggesting that both usernames belonged to the same person. The CECA did not know the collection had been sold abroad and had never received an export permit application. This discovery presented a good opportunity to study the objects that were sold and their prices. All sales from these two usernames were monitored between April 1 and May 25.

By reviewing more than 150 lots listed by the two usernames, it was discovered that 37 lots had originated from one particular Danish collection and were sold for a total of €1,260. This particular collection originally included more than 15,000 objects and was sold to one person, so selling the collection piece-by-piece must be a lucrative business. Of the remaining lots, 81 were from other Danish collections or had Danish provenance. These were sold for a total of €6,740, or an average price of €83 per item.

At the time of writing, this case is being investigated by CECA.

SEARCHING FOR MISSING CULTURAL OBJECTS

Is it possible to search for specific stolen goods on online auctions? In an attempt to answer this question, we searched for objects that were listed as

---

38 Search made on April 20, 2005.
40 Searches made on April 20, 2005.
41 CECA is the Danish Commission on Export of Cultural Assets, the cultural heritage authority in Denmark. CECA is also the authority responsible for issuing export permits for cultural objects.
missing by the Danish police. The Danish police publish a list of missing objects on their website.

The Danish police have one main website. The website has a page that lists missing persons and objects. Of 54 precincts in Denmark, 31 have their own local websites. The public can publish details of missing objects on 13 of these lists. There is no consistency in how the missing objects are listed, however, and the person responsible for each individual case seems to decide where the objects are listed.

The information is sorted according to the international standard, Object ID\textsuperscript{42}. Object ID was developed by the Paul Getty trust\textsuperscript{43} and CoPAT\textsuperscript{44}. The purpose is to describe art and cultural objects, and help prove ownership. The description standard consists of 10 categories; one of them is a photograph of the objects. Most objects are photographed and valued. On average, the objects are only described according to 5 of the 10 categories recommended by Object ID.

The general quality of the photographs on the police website is relatively good. It is possible to identify the motifs and see the colour scheme. Almost all of the searches in this study are based on visual recognition.

One search on Lauritz.com for 48 specific objects required browsing through approximately 3,000 lots, which takes around 5-8 hours. Normally, a lot on Lauritz.com is open for bidding for about 7 days, which means that monitoring Lauritz.com alone for the 48 objects takes almost one workday per week. The Lauritz.com search service enables registered members to save their searches on the website. If a new lot matches the definition of the saved search, the member receives an email. Lots are scanned every day at midnight, after which emails are sent out.

Unfortunately, none of the stolen objects listed on the website of the Danish police where found during the searches.

THE INTERNET ANTIQUE MARKET

A few major players dominate the online auction market. In Denmark, Bruun-Rasmussen, Lauritz.com and eBay lead the three online auction categories described in this study.

The three auction types have different physical relations to the antique market. Conventional and monitored online auctions valuate the lots, and rely on assistance from personnel with knowledge of art and antiques, whereas autonomous online auctions rely solely on the expertise of their vendors and bidders. That means that there is no control of what is sold to whom, hence the word autonomous.

Conventional online auctions are the most secure type of auction because they have highly trained staff. However, the auction format is similar to monitored online auctions, and both types of auctions are subject to the same security breaches:

\textsuperscript{42} http://www.object-ID.com
\textsuperscript{43} http://www.getty.edu/
\textsuperscript{44} Council of Prevention of Art Crime http://www.copat.co.uk/
• Trade in stolen cultural objects. Because of their procedures for receiving objects, the auction houses are liable for offering stolen goods.
• Tax fraud. Knowingly selling new objects and applying the sales tax rate for used objects is one such example.
• Selling objects protected by the Washington convention, and other restricted objects.

Due to a lack of trained appraisers, monitored online auctions can make incorrect valuations or sell fakes. Bidders run the risk of being cheated because they cannot examine and touch the objects, as Chippendale & Gill (2001) mention in a study of Sotheby’s and.

Autonomous online auctions are even more prone to security breaches because they never, at any stage, possess or valuate an object:
• There is no control of trade in stolen goods or protected objects.
• Tax fraud by paying used sales tax instead of full sales tax – if vendors pay tax at all.
• Art fraud and other scams

Figure 3 illustrates how objects flow through the different auction categories, and the players involved. The main difference between conventional and monitored online auctions and autonomous online auctions is the fact that the latter category never possesses the objects. Conventional and monitored online auctions can physically minimize the risk for security breaches. For example, an auction house can request photo ID from a vendor before accepting an object.

When autonomous online auctions consider themselves as venues, as eBay does, they take no responsibility for security breaches. Only two player categories are considered – bidders and vendors. This makes illicit actions even more difficult to detect, and both bidders and vendors know they are not monitored. A vendor who wants to trade in illicit objects or commit any other illicit handling is free to do so.

Figure 25 The flow of objects through different auction categories.
CONCLUSION

The findings in this study show that players in the Danish online auction market are numerous. There are three types of online auctions: conventional online auctions, monitored online auctions and autonomous online auctions.

Secondly, there are vendors, the most important players in autonomous online auctions, and thirdly, bidders. The online auction market is vast, and numerous types of objects are sold. Any type of object can be sold anywhere. Monitoring the Internet is time consuming, and the results of our search for missing art were worthless. Conventional and monitored online auctions can actively minimise the risk for dealing cultural objects because they physically handle the objects that they sell. The only way to monitor autonomous online markets is through the Internet.

Selling enormous quantities rather than a few expensive objects generates the huge financial turnovers of online auctions. We found no trace of the stolen objects that had been reported to the police, and cannot verify that online auctions constitute a marketplace for stolen antiques. We can only note that this market is difficult to control.

Grey zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illegal market</th>
<th>Grey zone</th>
<th>Legal market</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marketplace for illegal objects only</td>
<td>Marketplace that “unknowingly” mixes legal and illegal cultural objects</td>
<td>Markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money and credit systems</td>
<td>Marketplaces that knowingly mixes legal and illegal objects</td>
<td>Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laundering cultural objects (Illegal objects become legal)</td>
<td>functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laundering money (Black money becomes white)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 26: A section of the analysis model. The full model is shown on pages 24-25
MARKETPLACES THAT KNOWINGLY AND UNKNOWINGLY MIX LEGAL AND ILLEGAL OBJECTS

The legal and illegal markets build an overlapping grey zone. This grey zone includes marketplaces that unknowingly mix legal and illegal objects, and those that do so knowingly. The degree of unknowingness can vary, and the aim might even be to remain ignorant of an object’s origin. It depends on what questions the dealer chooses to ask, or not ask (Massy, 2000, who refers to Barelli, 1985). The whole scale of dealers is presented in this section, from those who actively avoid handling stolen goods to those who knowingly mix illegal and illegal objects.

Cultural objects and money are whitewashed in marketplaces that knowingly and unknowingly mix legal and illegal objects. Illegal objects become legal when they are traded on the legal market. Black or criminal money is laundered by selling cultural objects for a very high price, or when the money is used to acquire cultural objects that are disposed of legally. This means that the different headings in the grey zone approach the problems from different perspectives: the unknowing or knowing mix of legal and illegal objects, and the laundering of cultural objects and money. The headings overlap, and some headings are grouped together.

According to the study results, cultural objects are stolen from dealers, institutions and authorities. But where do they go? Do stolen objects usually reappear on the legal market?

Trying to study the grey zone through interviews creates problems. Even if dealers do sell stolen objects, they are unlikely to admit this in an interview. On the other hand, they are usually willing to speak about the illegal activities of others (cp. Alalehto, 1999). It is also possible to gain an overview of the existence of stolen objects in the different sectors through an interviewee’s experience of being offered stolen cultural objects.

The interview material provides descriptions of dealers who also run another business on the side, i.e. through personal contacts. Some objects never end up in their shops, but are resold through their personal contact networks. These types of objects, according to the interviewees, are very valuable objects and to a certain extent stolen or illegally excavated objects such as coins. One reason why objects are sold like this, according to one interviewee, is that the customers are collectors who do not want anyone to know what they own. Another reason for anonymity could be to avoid Wealth Tax.

According to the interview study, it is rare that stolen objects are recovered. This could indicate that cultural objects do not reappear on the market, but is not supported by the other results. The Theories and research on cultural heritage crime section also describes how illegal cultural objects appear on the legal market. In the questionnaire study, 13% of the antique dealers say they have been offered stolen goods and 21% say they know of cases where stolen goods have been bought or sold. The most common types of objects are furniture (17 cases), silver or precious metals (13 cases), art (8 cases), sculptures (6 cases) and ecclesiastic objects (6 cases).

In the interview material, a large number of the interviewed dealers have been offered cultural objects at some time that they suspect were stolen. It
would thus seem that the reason why stolen cultural objects do not usually reappear is that the market for cultural objects is too large and complex to overview. As described in *Theories and research on cultural heritage crime*, many objects are difficult to identify, and there are thieves and fences who choose objects that are not unique - handicraft, for example.

Dealers suspect that objects are stolen when the sellers are drug addicts, or people who do not want to identify themselves or write a receipt. There are even cases where antique dealers have identified the objects because the antique books bore library stamps. The following case description is a typical example.

Two women came into an antique shop and wanted to sell a mirror. Unfortunately, the antique dealer had visited a crime scene the day before to carry out a valuation on behalf of an insurance company. The mirror was one of the objects that had been stolen.

As dealers are obviously offered stolen objects, the next question is how legal market players minimise the risk for handling stolen goods. We will now take a closer look at the security routines that dealers and other players in the various marketplaces say they have implemented to avoid handling stolen goods.

**DEALERS**

“Dealers” refers to antique dealers, antiquarian booksellers and art dealers. The main reason why dealers do not want to handle stolen goods, according to the interviews, is that they want to safeguard their reputation. Many of the dealers’ shops are family businesses that have built up their reputations over the years, and “being the subject of a police investigation” would be a total disaster. The picture conveyed by the interviews is that hearsay and reputation are important for antique dealers, and that these features have a direct financial impact on their businesses. They have a vested interest in staying above reproach. One interviewed antique dealer says that the damage caused by a police investigation would far outweigh any potential profits.

* A small percentage of antique dealers are involved in shady deals, but most antique dealers are just ordinary people who can’t afford to make a fool of themselves by doing something stupid. (Interviewee 96, antique dealer)

At the same time, there seems to be a strong bond between antique dealers. One example of this is described in the Production section under *Security*, where antique dealers rang and warned each other when gangs were operating in the area.

* There is a special kind of loyalty between antique dealers. Even if we know that someone is doing something illegal, we won’t report him. No one wants to be an informer. (Interviewee 97, antique dealer)
Several interviewees describe the antique dealing sector as layered, i.e. that some players are a cut above the rest. If an antique dealer runs an illegal business, he runs the risk of being stigmatized and barred from the innermost clique of antique dealers. But there are also examples of reverse relationships in the interview material, where everyone knows that a well-established dealer is running an illegal business but the person concerned is not excluded from the business network because he/she is too important in the sector.

Concerning the security routines employed by antique dealers to minimise the risks for buying stolen goods, several interviewed dealers feel that they do not receive enough information about objects that are stolen or missing. This is considered a problem. The national police are criticized in several interviews for their lack of information about stolen goods. According to one interviewee, the police were more active ten to fifteen years ago, when they sent out lists of stolen objects and came to visit.

There are also examples in the interview material of dealers who encountered problems when they personally tried to find out whether objects had been stolen or not. One art dealer says that he was offered a painting abroad and wanted to check whether it was stolen. The art dealer is a member of the Art Loss Register, but claims he has not received any log in details despite three weeks of reminders.

Other security routines implemented by dealers to minimise the risk for buying stolen goods are formal controls such as proof of identity. Of the antiquarian booksellers in the questionnaire, 98 per cent say they make demands on the seller. Proof of identity is the most common requirement. It should also be added that, according to the ethical guidelines for antiquarian booksellers, association members must make every effort to ensure that materials offered to him or her are the property of the seller. Concerning the control of objects, 62% say they check the objects. Provenance is the most common type of control.

But there are also informal controls in the form of objective assessments that the antique dealer makes of the seller. These assessments are typically selection mechanisms. The assessment controls identified in the interview material are:

- Typological assessment
- Normality assessment
- Biographical assessment

**Typological assessment**

In this type of assessment, the dealer makes a decision based on the visual attributes of the seller. The dealer rejects anybody who looks suspicious, such as drug addicts and alcoholics. This type of selection mechanism can be compared with research findings on how officials select individuals for scrutiny (Korsell, 2003).

This assessment control may also be used to determine whether a formal control is carried out or not. One interviewed antiquarian bookseller says
that he does not request personal details from “ordinary” people who want to sell cultural objects.

**Normality assessment**

Normality assessment means that the dealer considers whether the seller and the object go together (*cp.* Korsell, 2003). In other words, the seller might not look terribly suspicious but he or she offers an object that is not fitting, given the context. This can also apply to a location – if the dealer is offered goods in a parking lot, for example. One interviewed antique dealer gave the following description:

“You don’t want to buy copper pans from a guy that keeps them in the boot of his car.” (Interviewee 51, antique dealer)

**Biographical assessment**

A biographical assessment means that the dealer has some previous knowledge of the seller, such as where he or she works. The antique dealer can choose not to buy, because the person offers an object that is inappropriate considering his or her background. The material contains an example of library employees who come in to an antiquarian bookshop and want to sell books. The following case description is another example of how a biographical assessment provides a basis for rejecting a sale.

To summarise so far, the main reason why dealers want to avoid police investigations into stolen goods is to safeguard their reputations. Parallel to this is the desire to make a reasonable profit. The aim is thus to make the best deals possible while minimising the risk of being associated with shady deals (*cp.* Massy, 2000, who refers to Barelli, 1985).

The degree of security thinking when buying objects is determined by how much risk a dealer is prepared to take, in other words, how careful he is. Most choose to keep a very low risk level, to stay on the safe side, and even refuse deals that might not be illegal whereas others only reject obviously illegal deals, or are even fully aware that the objects they are buying are stolen. One interviewed antiquarian bookseller said the following when he told how a person had offered him a valuable book but did not want to write a receipt.

*You have to stay away from things like that. Although I have got business associates who’ve fallen for temptation and been burnt.* (Interviewee 4, antiquarian bookseller)
Some interviews give the impression that a few antique dealers suspect that stolen objects are being offered, but by not asking any unnecessary questions, they need never be confronted with any unpleasant facts that would undermine their own perception of being an honest person who just wants to make a living. In this way, the criminal and legal worlds can meet in a more discreet manner than if an addict comes in to the shop with objects that he/she should not possess. One example is an antique dealer who claims it is impossible to know whether an object is stolen or not. This statement is correct. As a result, the person concerned does not reflect too long on the fact that the goods might be stolen. The antique dealer can therefore neutralise the crime of receiving stolen goods, which will inevitably be committed by maintaining this attitude, and also create short-term benefits for his business. The antique dealer consequently claims that he has never requested proof of identity from anybody selling objects.

The different levels of knowingness for both buyers and sellers concerning whether an object is stolen or not are illustrated by the following scenario model. The analysis of the four different scenarios is based on the buyer/seller and dealer roles.

![Scenario model of the different degrees of knowledge of an object’s origin.](image)

A. **BUYER/SELLER DOES NOT KNOW THE OBJECT IS STOLEN – DEALER KNOWS THAT THE OBJECT IS STOLEN**

*Person who buys cultural objects from dealer*

In this scenario, the dealer knows that the object he is about to sell is stolen. The context is a marketplace that knowingly mixes legal and illegal objects. In reference to the theory chapter, this activity usually falls under the fence category known as *integrative front*, i.e. the focus on stolen goods is more or less the same as for legally acquired objects.

The person who buys the cultural object from the dealer in this scenario does not know the object is stolen. The degree of “unknowingness” can vary, however. The customer may be completely unaware that the cultural object is stolen and not have any reason to suspect that this is the case; or selective “unknowingness”, where the customer does suspect that the object is stolen but does not ask any questions. The customer does not want to risk knowing that the cultural object is stolen.
**Person who sells cultural objects to dealer**

The person who sells a cultural object to a dealer in this scenario does not know the object was once stolen. The degree of “unknowingness” here can vary from total ignorance of the object’s background to some form of suspicion, which is counteracted by avoiding any new knowledge of the cultural object.

The dealer can identify the object, however, and may well understand that the object was once stolen. Nonetheless, the dealer agrees to buy the cultural object. Once again, this probably describes a fence with an integrative front because the seller approaches a dealer who sells these kinds of objects.

**B. BUYER/SELLER KNOWS THAT THE OBJECT IS STOLEN – DEALER KNOWS THAT THE OBJECT IS STOLEN**

**Person who buys cultural objects from dealer**

The dealer in this scenario is a fence with an integrative front who operates in a marketplace that knowingly mixes legal and illegal cultural objects. Dealing in illegal cultural objects is so large-scale that several customers know this takes place. This actually attracts buyers to the shop who know they can buy cultural objects for a good price.

**PERSON WHO SELLS CULTURAL OBJECTS TO DEALER**

In this scenario, the dealer – a fence with an integrative front, knowingly buys stolen objects. Even the person who sells the objects knows that they are stolen, and he or she may also be the thief. The dealer may place standing orders with the thief for certain types of cultural objects or for specific objects. The dealer can also buy stolen objects from thieves who make occasional visits because they know the dealer buys stolen goods (cp. Steffensmeier, 1986).

**C. BUYER/SELLER DOES NOT KNOW THE OBJECT IS STOLEN – DEALER DOES NOT KNOW THE OBJECT IS STOLEN**

**PERSON WHO BUYS CULTURAL OBJECTS FROM DEALER**

Neither the person who buys a cultural object nor the dealer who sells it in this scenario knows that the cultural object is stolen. The degree of “unknowingness” can vary from total unknowingness to selective unknowingness. The most likely situation is total unknowingness on both sides. The cultural object may once have been stolen and the dealer can have acquired it in such a manner that there is never any reason to suspect that this might be the case.

In the case of selective unknowingness, the dealer who sells the object has probably chosen not to reflect on the background of the cultural object when he originally bought it.
Person who sells cultural objects to dealer
In principle, this is the same as the previous scenario. However, in the case of selective unknowingness, the person who sells the cultural object has probably chosen to ignore any suspicions of the object in question.

D. BUYER/SELLER KNOWS THAT THE OBJECT IS STOLEN – DEALER DOES NOT KNOW THE OBJECT IS STOLEN

Person who buys cultural objects from dealer
In this scenario, a customer understands that a dealer is selling a stolen object and buys without informing the dealer that the object is illegal. This situation is considered uncommon. In cases where it does occur though, less discerning dealers have probably chosen to remain “unknowing” about the object’s background when it was bought.

Person who sells cultural objects to dealer
In this scenario, a person who knows that the cultural object is stolen, it could be the thief or anybody else, sells the cultural object to an “unknowing” dealer. The dealer is either totally unaware of the object’s background, or chooses not to reflect on whether the cultural object is illegal or not.

The circulation of an illegal object through the scenario model
Each time a stolen cultural object is sold, it moves further and further away from its illegal status, i.e. the circumstances surrounding the purchase give fewer reasons to suspect that the object is stolen. The following fictitious case description illustrates this process. The letters in brackets correspond to the different scenarios in the model.

A thief has contact with an antique dealer who systematically mixes legal and illegal cultural objects in his shop. The thief knows what types of objects the antique dealer is interested in, and every time he comes across these types of objects, he sells them to the antique dealer. This time he has stolen an antique candlestick and takes it to the antique dealer. The dealer expects the candlestick; he knows that it is stolen and that the seller is the thief, but that does not stop him from buying it (B). The candlestick is put on display in the shop, and one week later a customer comes in and sees it. The customer knows that this antique dealer has a bad reputation, but does not know whether this particular candlestick has been stolen or not. And even if it was the case, how could she know? She does not find any reason to suspect stolen goods and buys the candlestick (A). A few months later, she tires of the candlestick and decides to sell it to an antique dealer - maybe she can sell it for more than she paid. She takes the candlestick to an antique shop, and shows it to the dealer. The dealer is interested in the candlestick and assesses the seller to rule out any irregularities. The seller is courteous and seems to know a lot about antiques, so there is no reason why he should suspect stolen goods. The antique dealer buys the object (D). The illegal object has now been laundered.
AUCTION HOUSES

Auction houses differ from dealers because they sell objects for others. This means that auction houses never own objects; they merely function as brokers between buyer and seller. The buyers and sellers need never meet or know about each other.

The interview material identifies four themes that are significant for the security routines that help auction houses avoid handling stolen cultural objects. These themes are:

- Provenance
- Control
- Customer relations
- Legal right to anonymity

Provenance

Auction catalogues rarely mention provenance. This makes it difficult to know whether objects are illegal or not. One example is coins, where coins are individually described but not their provenance. Several interviewees feel that auction companies should be under an obligation to specify the provenance of unusual objects. In the questionnaire study, six of the 28 auction houses say they check the provenance of objects.

Control

Several interviewees say that control mechanisms to prevent the handling of illegal objects at auction houses are defective. Like antique dealers, interviewees who work at auction houses say they do not receive enough information about objects that are stolen or missing. For example, one interviewee who works at an auction house feels that Interpol should work harder to find missing objects.

Another interviewee who works at an auction house says that measures to prevent the handling of stolen goods consist of nothing more than requesting identification from anyone who consigns goods and adding their Social Security Number to a data register. According to the interviewee, one of the reasons why more detailed controls are not implemented is lack of time.

*It would take too much time to check everything more carefully.* (Interviewee 48, works at an auction house)

The financial aspect of controlling seems not only linked to the increased costs for implementing them, but to the business at large. The same interviewee claims to know enough about laws that apply for the business but is not interested in knowing more unless someone spells it out, because it will not benefit business. Another interviewee who works at an auction house tells how they are currently selling a collection of objects from another part of the world. The interviewee is not particularly interested in finding out how the collection arrived here, however.
We don’t dig too deep. That’s not our job. (Interviewee 52, works at an auction house)

In the questionnaire study, all of the seven auction houses say they request proof of identity from people who consign objects. One auction house says it checks Interpol’s database, another auction house says it checks police registers.

Some interviewees maintain however that the obligation to request proof of identity is not carried out, and consigning goods without providing a Social Security Number or any other personal details is certainly possible. One interviewed antique dealer says that one way to sell suspicious cultural objects is to sell them through an auction house in another country.

If you’ve got a piece of furniture with a shady background you can always send it to an auction in [another Nordic country]. The controls are not very thorough and as a dealer, you can avoid the responsibilities that you would have to take if you sold it in your own shop. (Interviewee 54, antique dealer)

In addition to formal controls, the auction houses carry out the same informal controls as dealers. In other words, auction house employees rely on subjective assessments as a form of selection mechanism when deciding whether to accept an object for an auction. One interviewee who works at an auction house explains that he usually suspects irregularities when there is no obvious reason why an object is being sold in this town, i.e. when objects come from other regions and have an unjustifiably high value.

Customer relations

One reason why auction houses do not always request proof of identity could be that they want to maintain good relations with their customers. The interview material shows that sellers are central to the survival of auction houses and every effort is made to keep them happy, for example if the legal right to anonymity was suspended. This leads to a balancing act between security and good customer relations. The business cannot afford to lose customers because of control mechanisms.

We can’t ask too much of our customers. It would scare them away. (Interviewee 48, works at an auction house)

Legal right to anonymity

Auction houses protect the anonymity of both buyers and sellers, which makes it even more difficult to control the status of objects. Maintaining the integrity of buyers and the sellers is central to auction houses. The interview material contains examples of how auction houses have solved problems without involving the police, for example when a customer discovered an object in the auction catalogue that had been stolen from him. An interviewee tells of another case where the seller and former owner reach an amicable agreement together with the auction house, and explains, “Gentlemen can handle these things themselves”.
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LAUNDERING CULTURAL OBJECTS (ILLEGAL OBJECTS BECOME LEGAL)

The process of making illegal cultural objects legal is discussed under Marketplaces that knowingly and unknowingly mix legal and illegal objects. Briefly, this describes how objects acquire legal status when they reach auction houses or established sellers.

LAUNDERING MONEY (BLACK MONEY BECOMES WHITE)

These studies do not produce any concrete evidence that money is laundered through trade in stolen cultural objects. On the other hand, many interviewees say this is so. Further studies are needed to investigate this type of money laundering.

Illegal market

Figure 28: A section of the analysis model. The full model is shown on pages 24-25.

MARKETPLACE FOR ILLEGAL OBJECTS ONLY

A marketplace for solely illegal objects comprises fences who do not sell stolen cultural objects through the normal commercial channels. These people sell stolen goods only. They may also be vendors who sell stolen cultural objects alongside of and separately to their legal businesses, for
example a carrier who also sells antiques. According to an interviewed prisoner who was sentenced for offences related to cultural heritage crime, fences that only sell stolen objects are unusual. The few fences who do operate like this, however, can function as clients for specific cultural objects or for certain types of cultural objects. They might also buy cultural objects from thieves who work independently. According to some interviewed police, the latter means that the fence buys the cultural objects without having a buyer. In this case, the fence is sufficiently well off to tie up his money for a longer period of time, but probably does not pay the thief much.

**MONEY AND CREDIT SYSTEMS**

On several occasions throughout the studies, we heard that stolen art was used as collateral in criminal transactions. The object would then constitute security for payment of the debt. We found no concrete evidence to suggest that this was the case, however, and the idea seems to be mere speculation or hearsay. One argument in favour of collateral, though, is that a large amount of stolen art never appears on the market. The data in the interview material supports this theory that art is used as collateral in the illegal world because stolen paintings have been found in the possession of drug offenders. One interviewee who carried out his own research into art thefts says that valuable works of art are occasionally used as guarantees or payment in drug transactions. The interviewee also claims that the most common reason why stolen art appears in narcotics environments is that drug traffickers usually have international contacts and can sell stolen art through these channels.

There are also interviewees who say that people have rung and wanted their paintings valued over the phone. The valuers have never seen the paintings but the person has described them in detail and named the artist. According to interviewees, this indicates that the paintings have been used as collateral.

**Buyers and other owners**

![Diagram](image)

Figure 29: A section of the analysis model. The full model is shown on pages 24-25.

The interview study indicates that cultural object buyers are usually driven by financial motives. Although some people buy cultural objects for aesthetic and cultural reasons, the interview material does not support the role of eccentric collectors in this context. Only in book and coin contexts does our
data suggest that these people exist. Several interviewees claim that the image of the fanatical collector is a myth.

Summary of the results

Following this presentation of the results from the studies, the question is now: What is the scope of cultural heritage crime?

As the study spans the entire cultural heritage area, from the theft of rare books from antiquarian bookshops to shipwreck plundering and the loss of ancient objects from museums, it is not possible to summarise the extent of cultural heritage crime in just a few words. The answer to the question is rather that cultural heritage crime varies according to object, target and country, and that the area has not been sufficiently investigated to make conclusions in some areas.

PLENTY OF PILFERING, FEW MAJOR THEFTS

We have not studied thefts from private homes and collections. A reasonable assumption would be that most stolen cultural objects are taken from private homes (cp. Massy, 2000). Most cases of stealing and receiving cultural objects are related to private property, and these objects are not necessarily valuable or unique.

The studies have surveyed thefts from churches, museums, Archives, libraries, open-air museums, antique shops, auction houses and antiquarian bookshops. In the preservers group, according to the questionnaire study, Nordic museums have been most victimized by thefts. Primarily cultural heritage everyday objects are stolen from museums, where not every object has a particularly high financial value. Many thefts are therefore opportunistic and as a result, most crimes take place during the day. Open-air museums are more subject to burglaries because they are not open for as long as larger museums. Open-air museums also lose a great deal of not particularly valuable objects, but their local significance usually implies a major cultural heritage loss. The same applies for churches, where the loss of cultural objects, regardless of their financial value, has a major impact on the local community.

Even libraries are seriously affected, more than museums in terms of percentages, but only a few libraries took part in our study. Libraries differ from other theft targets because mainly rare and valuable books, maps and illustrations are stolen – objects that are in demand on the international market. It is also an area where thieves make commission and knowledge-based choices.

Compared with museums, Nordic churches - except for those in Sweden, are relatively protected from threat. An important difference, however, is that church thefts to a major degree involve unique and valuable objects. Church thefts should therefore be taken more seriously than what is indicated by the total number of thefts. Swedish churches have experienced many thefts and a “wave of thefts” has been described. It should be emphasized, however, that the study of Swedish churches is more comprehensive than churches in other countries. The Swedish study shows that knowledge
of church thefts rarely extends beyond the congregation and the situation is probably similar in the other countries. The problem is probably under-estimated.

The dealers group, consisting of antique dealers, auction houses and antiquarian booksellers, is highly victimized by theft. According to the questionnaire study, dealers are more victimized than preservers. This can probably be partly explained by the higher rate of discovery compared to preservers. At the same time, dealers are especially vulnerable to theft because potential buyers must have access to objects. The focus on financial value and price marking also attracts unskilled thieves who make opportunity-based choices. As in churches, silver objects disappear most.

Our assessment is that thefts of cultural objects are comprehensive because they attract all types of offenders, i.e. offenders driven by commission, knowledge, market or risk-motivated choices, and generalists. Many of the objects that are stolen, however, are neither financially valuable nor hold major cultural heritage significance.

A smaller percentage of stolen objects are significant, however. Libraries, churches and museums are particularly vulnerable. Improving security routines could prevent many of these thefts, and thefts from other groups. Lack of knowledge about the scope and structure of the thefts and poor risk assessments have meant that security is often misdirected and ineffective (for proposals, see also Measures to prevent cultural heritage crime). One area that should be taken more seriously than it is today is insider theft.

**LOOTING AND PLUNDERING**

Illegal excavations and shipwreck plundering are difficult to detect because it is impossible to know what disappears. There are also ancient monuments and shipwrecks that are still undiscovered and undocumented. Our studies have surveyed the scope and structure of looting and plundering at a very general level.

The questionnaire study reflects the difficulty of discovering these crimes, as few people have been able to comment on the area. Of the 145 respondents who work with excavations, only three say that objects disappeared from archaeological excavation sites. The interviews confirm that illegal excavations take place. Some interviewees say that this could be a major local problem, but not a general problem.

The plundering of protected hundred-year old shipwrecks and illicit removal of objects from newer ships appears in the study as a much greater problem than archaeological excavations. The reason of course is that these objects are more visible and accessible than objects buried under the ground. Shipwrecks are also a target for collectors who take objects as souvenirs. The information on shipwrecks is based completely on interviews and is therefore difficult to determine the exact scope of the problem.

Lack of data makes it difficult to assess the seriousness of the situation, and we propose further studies. With serious reservations, we believe that illegal excavations are predominantly a local problem whereas shipwrecks are a larger, structural problem.
ILLEGAL MOVEMENT/EXPORT

We have encountered a major problem when trying to overview illegal movement/export. Of all respondents, only 62 (four per cent) say they know of cases where cultural objects were exported in violation of national laws. The interviews indicate that this may be a far greater problem than indicated by the questionnaire. The interviews have been difficult to evaluate, however, because great expertise is required to know what objects are covered by the legislation. In addition, some illicitly exported objects could well have been exported legally with a permit. The interviewees’ assessments often reflect their own opinions of what should, or should not, be protected.

A major problem is the lack of consensus on laws, and criticism has been directed at the fact that objects from the 1900s are not protected, and that a more effective method than prohibitions would be government purchases or incentives (for proposals, see Measures to prevent cultural heritage crime).

The data that is available makes it difficult to assess the scope of the problem. For many objects, the market solves legislative intentions because the demand for many protected objects is greatest in their country of origin. There is an international market for some objects, however. We believe that illegal export is a problem we don’t know its dimensions.

ILLEGAL IMPORT

Because focusing on illegal import would have required major studies outside of the Nordic region, this area has only been treated generally. As mentioned above, a high level of expertise is needed to detect cases of illegal export. Demands on expertise are even greater in relation to illegal import. Not only do objects require assessment, but knowledge of legislation in the country of origin is also needed.

The questionnaire study confirms the difficulties of describing illegal import in the receiving countries alone, where only 38 respondents (3 per cent) say they know about cases of illegal import. The interviews suggest that Nordic countries constitute a relatively small market for objects that are imported illegally. The objects that are encountered in the interviews, however, are from China. The interview material suggests corrupt permit-application procedures in the countries of origin.

Illegal import is a major problem from an international perspective, not least because it has a detrimental effect on the gathering of archaeological knowledge. It should also be noted that the consequences of illegal export from Nordic countries do not compare with the looting of poor countries’ heritage through illicit excavations.

LEGAL MARKET, GREY ZONE AND ILLEGAL MARKET

Describing the illegal market alone for cultural objects is impossible. The legal and illegal markets overlap to build a grey zone where a major part of trade in stolen cultural objects takes place. A stolen object on the illegal market can travel via the grey zone to the legal market where it receives
“legal status”, i.e. the circumstances no longer suggest that the object has been stolen.

The illegal market is the market that only deals in stolen goods. The players are fences who only sell stolen goods. According to the study’s interview material, fences who only sell stolen objects are uncommon, but the few fences who do operate like this can function as clients for specific cultural objects or for certain types of cultural objects.

The grey zone comprises antique dealers, antiquarian booksellers, auction houses and art dealers who knowingly and unknowingly mix legal and illegal objects. In the questionnaire study, 13 per cent of antique dealers say they have been offered stolen goods and 21 per cent say they know of cases where stolen goods have been dealt. Most dealers, according to the interview study, care about their names and reputations and do not want to be associated with illegal business. To avoid buying stolen goods, the dealers rely on formal controls such as proof of identity, and informal controls such as assessments based on the seller’s appearance, behaviour or other circumstances surrounding the objects that are offered.

According to the questionnaire study, 70 per cent of the dealers who bought objects during the past year carry out controls. The most common form of control is asking about an object’s provenance (57 per cent). The problem with trade in cultural objects is that the market is vast, and the turnover of cultural objects is huge. As a result it is difficult to identify stolen objects. The majority of cultural objects that are stolen are neither unique nor extremely valuable, in contrast to media reports.

The degree of care taken by dealers to avoid handling illegal objects varies. Most choose to be very careful, to stay on the safe side, and even refuse deals that might not be illegal. Some dealers reject only obviously illegal deals, while others are fully aware that they are buying stolen goods. The interview study indicates that while some dealers suspect that an object is stolen, they avoid “knowing” by not asking any unnecessary questions. In this way, the criminal and legal worlds can meet in a more discreet manner than if an addict comes in to the shop with objects that he/she should not possess.

Auction houses differ from dealers because they merely function as brokers between buyers and sellers. Buyers and sellers remain anonymous, which makes it difficult to control objects. Another complicating factor is that many objects lack provenance. In the questionnaire study, six of 28 auction houses say they check the object’s provenance.

Another market that is even more difficult to overview is trade in cultural objects via the Internet. In the study of Danish Internet trade, no stolen objects that had been reported to the police were ever identified.

**NEED FOR FURTHER RESEARCH**

Libraries and Archives belong in a separate category because these thefts are difficult to detect. The number of unrecorded cases is probably high. Further studies in this area are needed.

---

45 A national study of thefts from libraries is currently ongoing at the Royal Library in Sweden.
Church thefts in Norway, Denmark and Finland require further study to determine the scope and structure of the problem.

Illegal export is an area that is difficult to outline – possibly because the people who export the objects are usually their owners. Customs checks of goods that leave the country are also restrictive. It is thus difficult to compile data in this area, and the problem should be studied separately.

Illegal import is also an area that requires further research.

Risk assessment methods for the individual institutions and dealers victimized by cultural heritage crime are also needed, based on an analysis of the circumstances surrounding cultural heritage crime.

The fence’s market and how illegal objects are laundered on the legal market require more research than this project could accomplish.
Measures to prevent cultural heritage crime

Based on the results of the empirical study, we have divided our crime prevention proposals into four main areas.

- Measures to prevent the theft of cultural objects.
- Measures to prevent the illegal movement, export and import of cultural objects.
- Measures to prevent illegal trade in cultural objects.
- Measures to facilitate the recovery of illicitly removed cultural objects.

The measures are divided into these four areas to provide a better overview. Some of the areas overlap. Measures to prevent illegal trade in cultural objects will also affect thefts as the market for stolen goods deteriorates. There are summaries of each section at the end of each sub-section, and a summary of the study’s measure proposals in general at the end of the chapter.

Measures to prevent the theft of cultural objects

To prevent the theft of cultural objects, the measures described in the theory section must be implemented in our model’s production section. These measures are aimed at obstructing the production of stolen cultural objects for the market. Because we proceed from illicit removal as a form of theft, the following factors must be observed. Security levels create opportunities for committing a theft, and how objects are stored affects both choice of target, and the offender’s motive.

Discussions on measures to prevent the theft of cultural objects usually focus on security solutions. Lack of resources is often blamed for not achieving a desired level of security. Achieving first-class security would not pose a problem if the financial resources were available. Most players in the field have limited financial frameworks, however, and cannot afford to spend large amounts on security. The challenge is thus to utilise existing resources as effectively as possible. In model terms, the aim is to adapt the security arrangements in the box to the different types of objects that must be protected at the present time, to the targets that hold the objects, and to the different motives that drive the offender to steal certain objects.

SECURITY PLANNING

Defective security prioritisations are a problem area that reappears in all sub-areas of the study, which indicates a major need for more systematic security planning. Some churches routinely lock the church silver away, but leave irreplaceable and sought after medieval wooden sculptures unprotect-
ed. Effective use of resources requires risk analyses to identify the objects that are most vulnerable and attractive. Consideration must also be made for the different motives and resources of potential offenders. Security planning is an overall measure that includes all other measures for preventing the theft of cultural objects that are presented below.

In cultural institutions where the handling of cultural objects is secondary to other activities, such as churches or public libraries, it is vital that all employees understand that valuable cultural objects are kept on the premises and that they constitute a theft risk. This may seem obvious, but there are several examples in the study material where libraries do not handle valuable cultural objects any differently to other objects.

As the motive for thefts is usually financial, it is important to proceed from a market perspective when assessing the objects that are particularly theft-prone and in need of extra protection. The study results show that objects with cultural heritage value are prioritised in security assessments, while objects with high financial value are relatively unprotected. The risk definitions should constantly be redefined and updated as the market changes.

In addition to identifying objects that are theft-prone, the most theft-prone time of day should also be defined. The questionnaire study shows that many institutions focus on locks and alarms at night, while around half of the thefts take place during the day when the institution is open to the general public. To a large degree, this means that security initiatives are misdirected and not adapted to the real risk situation.

The international museum organisation ICOM (The International Council of Museums) has produced Guidelines for Disaster Preparedness in Museums, where the first step is an emergency risk analysis that has been divided into two stages: the identification of threats to the museum, and an evaluation of these threats (ICOM, 2005). By implementing this type of analysis, the museum can formulate a security strategy for minimising risks. According to ICOM, the security plan should be reviewed each year. This would be a suitable procedure for museums, libraries, Archives, churches and dealers. When formulating the plan, statistics on the scope and nature of thefts described in this report could complement the player’s own experiences.

An important question in this context is how cultural institutions can be motivated to design security planning when guidelines from museum associations and others have not so far had any major impact on the situation. One alternative is that the responsible authorities in each respective country establish requirements for security planning in major cultural institutions. In cases where cultural institutions are government-funded, the requirements can be linked to rewards for the implementation of security planning, and financial sanctions for non-implementation.

**KNOWLEDGE BASE**

It is important that disappearances from institutions are documented in order to reveal patterns, and as such enable crime prevention measures.
This can turn a negative event into something positive, and prevent future thefts.

Systematic knowledge is necessary for adopting crime prevention measures. Thefts of cultural objects are a constantly varied pattern of opportunities, objects, targets and motives. There is a lot to be gained at national, and preferably even higher levels, from compiling current statistics, analysing crime reports and producing crime prevention measures in the cultural heritage area. In the long term, building a common and constantly updated knowledge base is a vital strategy for monitoring the development of cultural heritage crime.

As a first step, conferences can be organised and exchanges can take place between institutions within a country or the entire Nordic region, aimed at sharing experiences in security planning, for example. As a direct result of this project, the Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention will now change the criminal code for reported offences in order to differentiate between thefts related to cultural objects and other thefts. This will dramatically improve the quality of statistics for cultural heritage crime in Sweden.

ACCESSIBILITY, AUTHORIZATION AND RECRUITMENT

One area that affects both dealers and preservers is accessibility to objects, authorisation and recruiting staff.

ACCESSIBILITY

Accessibility to collections, shops and storerooms is regulated via security systems. The most effective security system for each organisation is individual and, because of limited space, this report will only treat security systems at a very general level. The basis for choosing a security system should be the security planning described above. It is important to proceed from the actual risk situation to avoid investing money in ineffective solutions.

Closed circuit television (CCTV) cameras are a security solution that is often discussed in relation to cultural objects. For some preserving institutions such as libraries, churches, museums and Archives, the filming of regular visitors would be considered intrusive. Some preserving institutions have been authorized to use CCTV cameras, however, including Åmål church and Gothenburg University Library, both in Sweden.

Visitors have direct access to valuable cultural treasures in some libraries and Archives, which from a security perspective is an obvious risk. Our studies also show that thefts take place in these situations. It is important that well-planned security measures are in place for borrowing and returning cultural objects, and that staff members implement them. Security risks are minimised by checking a person’s identity when borrowing, only allowing objects to be handled in supervised places, and checking cultural objects when they are returned. The study shows that illustrations and maps are cut out of books, and documents are removed from folders. The contents of books and folders should thus be checked to ascertain that all material is intact.
The study shows that many of the dealers are victimized by gangs. One person distracts the shop assistant while others steal. In general, less valuable objects are stolen. One crime prevention method used by some dealers is to ring around and warn colleagues that a gang is operating in the area. Another method is to lock objects in showcases as watchmakers do.

In addition to physical access to objects, digital access creates security risks through search-enabled databases that are accessible to the general public. Institutions must understand that these functions are sometimes used to identify theft targets, which the study shows take place. It is thus important to consider very carefully what cultural objects should be accessible to the general public, and what information is included. Avoiding descriptions of the object’s physical placement could obstruct scouting.

Scouting usually takes place on the actual premises. Staff should make a note of any odd behaviour from visitors, such as spending an unusually long time in front of one object and ignoring others. Another crime prevention measure used by some interviewees is not allowing photographs of the collections as this could provide a perfect opportunity for a potential offender, who can show the photos and then steal to order.

AUTHORISATION AND RECRUITMENT

The accessibility problem applies not only to the general public but also internally, where authorised staff may constitute a risk factor. The questionnaire study shows how several cultural institutions, especially libraries and museums, believe that insiders are responsible for a significant percentage of thefts, which is also confirmed by the interviews. This is also supported by descriptions in Theories and research on cultural heritage crime. Preventing these types of thefts requires working practices that make it difficult to commit the offence. It is usually recommended that only a small group of employees have access to the most valuable material. This limits the number of possible offenders if a theft does take place. That only one person has access to the material is also a security risk, however, because the social control exercised by colleagues is missing. Another suitable routine could be that some tasks require several authorised people, such as removing an object from a register.

Registers, recurring revisions and controls are all methods that prevent internal theft and embezzlement. One suitable method could be that some controls are regular and systematic, while others are random (cp. Brå 2005:10). Regular and systematic controls could span important risk areas. Random controls are fair, everybody can be controlled, and new risk areas exposed. Registration and documentation are treated more closely under Summary of measures to prevent the illegal movement, export and import of cultural objects.

In addition to risks for insider theft, inadequate measures and carelessness by staff can also constitute a pending security risk. To avoid this, all members of staff must be aware of the security risks. In cases where temporary staff members have not been trained in security measures, one alternative could be to restrict their authority.
Security aspects should be considered when recruiting new staff. Some preserving institutions have informal recruiting regulations where collectors of certain objects are not employed because of the risk for insider theft. And recruitment is not the only sensitive area in internal security work. Employees can be influenced and recruited for criminal purposes (Brå 2005:18). A particular risk factor could be people with financial problems (Cressey, 1953; Brå 2005:11).

**ILLEGAL EXCAVATIONS AND PLUNDERING**

The circumstances surrounding illegal excavations and shipwreck plundering are slightly different to other types of theft. The criminalization of searching with metal detectors means that searches decline to some extent but for those searches that continue, the finds will never be known. Permits for metal detectors are required in Sweden, which according to one expert means that found objects are never reported to the responsible authorities. Denmark allows searching for archaeological finds with metal detectors, and finders are more inclined to show their objects to an expert.

It is important that legislation on the protection of ancient remains and shipwrecks is met with acceptance. The study shows, however, that there is no consensus on these laws or how heritage is best protected. One way to increase acceptance, and which according to the interviews is practised by some Swedish diving clubs, is that a diving club adopts a shipwreck to make sure that nothing disappears. The same basic idea has been introduced through regulation in Norway, where foreign divers can only explore Norwegian shipwrecks in the company of Norwegian divers who are expected to have more respect for ancient Norwegian monuments. Similar sponsorships have also been introduced in Sweden for rune stones. In Finland, the Marine Archaeology Unit at the National Board of Antiquities in collaboration with recreational divers has arranged an underwater shipwreck park, Kronprins, outside of Helsinki to increase understanding for the protection and preservation of underwater cultural heritage.

**POLICE WORK**

Thefts of cultural objects constitute a marginal problem for police compared to other areas. Stolen object registers are not always suitable for cultural objects. In Sweden, there are no photos of objects in the stolen goods register, which makes identification difficult. Photos are included in Danish police registers, but police working methods can cause problems. Not all objects are registered nationally and may require searches via local websites.

The problems caused by poor police documentation are not only national because objects move across borders. As Interpol’s register is only kept on CD-ROMs, a web solution would be desirable, preferably at international level.

Traditionally, police investigate thefts until they have sufficient evidence to support a conviction. The focus lies on prosecuting an offender. Police work focuses on the offender rather than the stolen goods. The police spend very little time looking for lost property compared to a missing persons
register. From a cultural heritage perspective, recovering the stolen objects wherever possible is more important than punishing the offender. In the cultural heritage crime area, crime prevention authorities should devote more time to cultural objects than they do at present.

Many interviewees say that to investigate crimes, police need more knowledge of the area. This is actually quite difficult to implement because it would require in-depth knowledge of archaeological finds, antique books, art, shipwreck finds, etc, and cultural heritage crime constitutes a very small part of police work. One proposal that could help police handle thefts in this area more effectively is to appoint contact persons with special knowledge in the field who could offer assistance. It is not reasonable to demand specially trained police officers in each specific area. In Norway and Denmark, police and customs officers have lists of people they can contact for expert advice. Following this project’s seminars with experience sharing between the countries, Swedish Customs also produced lists.

**SUMMARY OF MEASURES TO PREVENT THE THEFT OF CULTURAL OBJECTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Security planning:</th>
<th>Museums and other institutions must continually implement security planning in order to prioritise security measures based on systematic risk assessments.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge base:</td>
<td>Fundamental to crime prevention work with theft is gathering and analysing information on theft, and using this knowledge to construct measures. In the long term, a common knowledge base at national level should be developed but preferably at an even higher level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility, authorization and recruitment:</td>
<td>Increased awareness of the significance of cultural objects should reduce the risk for theft by borrowers, visitors, customers and others. To reduce the risk for insider thefts, authorisation for handling certain objects should be restricted, recruitments should be implemented with care, and controls should be performed continuously.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorships:</td>
<td>Protecting ancient remains from illegal excavations and plundering through legislation and formal controls is difficult. A complementary method could be that recreational diving clubs and other similar groups “adopt” certain ancient monuments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police work:</td>
<td>The police should devote more resources to recovering stolen cultural objects. This could include better registers and photographs. These registers should be international and accessible to the general public. Police and customs should also co-operate with experts in the cultural heritage area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measures to prevent the illegal movement, export and import of cultural objects**

Movement refers to customs legislation and applies to goods that are taken from one country to another within the EU. Export refers to goods taken out of the EU to a third country. Illegal movement and export refers to protected cultural objects that are taken out of a country without a permit.
Import, according to the UNESCO Convention, is objects that are removed from their country of origin in violation of the laws in that country.

To prevent the illegal movement, export and import of cultural objects, crime prevention measures must be applied in both the production and market sections of our model, to refer back to the theory chapter.

The elements impacted by crime prevention measures are firstly, the production of illegal cultural objects for a foreign market or, in some cases, cultural objects from other countries for our national markets, such as looted objects. Because we assume that illicit removal takes the form of illegal movement, export and import of cultural objects, the following factors must be considered. The security surrounding the object. Security also includes control by supervisory authorities and customs. Also important is where these objects are stored, i.e. the targets. Unknown objects in private homes are very difficult for authorities to control. Finally, the offender’s motives. Knowledge and acceptance of laws play a major role here.

Secondly, to prevent the illegal movement, export and import of cultural objects, we must introduce measures in the market section where legal markets play a primary role for buyers of objects who then take them out of the country through illegal movement or export. This can also include importing objects acquired on foreign markets. In addition to opportunity, object, target and motives, we now have legal market, illegal market and the overlapping grey zone between these two markets.

The scope of cultural objects that are removed from a country in violation of its national laws is very difficult to assess. As indicated earlier, however, there is a great deal of material in the study to suggest that the illegal export of protected cultural objects is comprehensive. Our methods have not quantified the illegal export of cultural objects; we have only surveyed the problem area briefly.

There are many parallels between measures to prevent the illegal movement, export and import of cultural objects and general measures to prevent illegal trade in stolen cultural objects. The reason being that trade is by far the strongest motivation for moving cultural objects illegally or transferring stolen goods. However, measures to prevent illegal trade in cultural objects are treated as a separate crime prevention area below, because this predominantly refers to stolen goods.

REVISE LEGISLATION

All Nordic countries have legislation that prohibits the export of some cultural objects. Roughly, the regulations protect cultural objects that are over a certain age and sometimes a certain financial value. Taking protected objects out of the country requires a permit issued by an antiquarian authority. The study points to a number of problems with this legislation.

The first and most fundamental problem with the legislation is uncertainty over what we really should be protecting, and why. Nordic legislation that limits the movement of some types of cultural objects is aimed at preventing further depletion of national cultural heritage. Views on whether or not the legislation is needed vary.
Several Nordic countries have valuable productions of objects from the
1900s of international high quality. These include furniture, glass, ceramics,
jewellery and other handicrafts. International demand for these cultural
objects is high and several interviewees who know the trade claim that
important parts of this modern heritage are already “lost” in the sense that
they have been removed from the country. The legislation does not protect
these objects because they are not old enough. Instead, objects that are
easily accessible are protected, if we can believe some of the interviewees. In
some cases, the demand for Nordic cultural objects is greatest in the Nordic
region and there is no market motive for moving or exporting them. Many
interviewees have questioned the purpose of the legislation and what it
really protects because of this type of argument.

CINOA, the international federation of art and antiques dealers, aims to
“promote the abolition of restrictions on the import and export of cultural
objects (CINOA, 2005)”. Even amongst those who support the laws,
opinions are divided on their exact formulation, i.e. the objects that should
be protected.

According to our assessment, these problems indicate that the legislation
is not adequately supported. In turn, it also means that regulations will not
be effective because the legislation presumes a high degree of voluntary
participation, which leads us to the other problem, control systems.

Trade between EU member states is not subject to regular customs
checks. The focus has now been shifted to goods that enter the EU from
third countries. The risk of being discovered for illegally moving stolen
goods within the EU is minimal. In addition, individual customs officer’s
knowledge of cultural objects is restricted to customs controls. Much
greater expertise is needed to suspect the illegal movement or import of
cultural objects.

A third problem is that the legislation is difficult to accept, and
knowledge of the regulations is scanty. The provisions are complex, with
different limits for years and values. A common view held by people
applying for permits is that the laws are too complex and detailed. For
administrators, the level of detail provides an important basis for
assessments, and they usually complain that the laws are too unspecific and
unclear.

One problem with Norwegian legislation is the floating frameworks for
institutions that make decisions about export permits for some object
groups.

This does not generally cause problems, however, and is usually solved
through mutual understanding between the institutions.

If there are doubts, ABM-utvikling decides whether the object is covered by
the legislation, and the institution that will handle the application.

A prerequisite that is often criticized in the legislation is object categories
with a floating age limit, i.e. “objects older than 100 years”, as opposed to
fixed age limits such as “objects produced before year 1650”. Floating age
limits mean that objects covered by the legislation can change from year to
year. The construction aims to cover even contemporary heritage but can
also lead to large numbers of objects being exported before they are covered by the legislation.

Our assessment is that legislation should be revised, primarily to explain what should be protected. Great pains should be taken to formulate a theoretic basis for the protection of cultural objects, which is a prerequisite for ensuring that legislation is generally accepted. In this context, alternatives or complements to prohibitions and permits should be considered. These could take the form of incentives or other systems for protecting cultural heritage. Another suggestion is that governments purchase more objects for museums. The argument is that purchasing is a more effective method for keeping objects in the country than relying on disputed legislation of which compliance is neither guaranteed nor controllable. This would ensure that objects become accessible to the general public, and that purchasing systems are strengthened; the underlying aim would be to protect the national cultural heritage. One proposal that could help the government acquire cultural objects is to offer collectors who donate their collections a deduction for taxes paid on their purchases, as in the United States.

**DISSEMINATE INFORMATION AND INFLUENCE ATTITUDES**

The most important prerequisite for legal compliance is that those concerned are familiar with the provisions. Most people will avoid breaking laws if they know they exist (see outline in Korsell and Nilsson, 2003). But despite the obligation of each citizen to be informed and law abiding, this is not always the case. Laws concerning restrictions on the export of cultural objects are probably one of the least familiar legal categories.

A smaller test study shows that the general public knows there are provisions to restrict movement and export, but it does not understand what the legislation contains. People who are interested in antiques are slightly more informed, more than half are familiar with the legislation and what it means. The questionnaire study shows that law awareness is highest amongst those working in the cultural heritage area, and these are the people targeted by information initiatives. A common view held by those working in the cultural heritage area is that the general public is not familiar with the legislation. As mentioned, our test study only confirms this to a certain degree. It does show however that there is a great need for knowledge dissemination amongst both the general public and people who are interested in antiques. Lack of knowledge is problematic because the barriers that usually prevent the general public from breaking the law are not present.

The questionnaire study shows that mainly the larger auction houses provide information about the legislation. This can be explained by their collaboration with supervisory authorities. According to the questionnaire, museums and other cultural institutions play a very minor role in spreading information about regulations. There are no brochures at airports or any other easily accessible information.

Increased international trade also means that foreign customers buy cultural objects from Nordic markets. The likelihood that they are aware of the legislation if the seller does not tell them is even less than for domestic
buyers. It is thus vital that auction houses and antique dealers inform their customers about export laws. It is also important that Internet auctions take the same responsibility. There is some collaboration in Denmark, Sweden and Finland between the larger auction houses and permit-issuing authorities that check auction catalogues before auctions and set preliminary export prohibitions on objects that require permit applications. This is considered a service to customers and auction houses, aimed at preventing the illegal export of objects due to ignorance. The problem is having enough time to check all auction catalogues and object categories. If some objects in a catalogue carry a preliminary export prohibition, it is easy to imagine that all other objects can be exported freely. General information about laws is still important even though other initiatives are in place.

The study shows that auction houses, antique dealers, antiquarian booksellers and museums to a high degree know about the legislation and that knowledge levels regarding practises are also high, although somewhat lower than awareness. Only a small percentage of dealers and museums say they take measures to prevent illegal movement and export, however. The conclusion of the analysis is that this depends upon a combination of two factors: that dealers and museums do not want to introduce measures because they do not sympathise with the legislation, or that they want to abide with the legislation but do not know what measures they should take.

SUPPORT FOR LEGISLATION

A serious problem arises when the institutions that handle cultural objects do not sympathise with the legislation because it is through these that the general public, who are not usually familiar with the legislation, come into contact with protected objects. These institutions must take responsibility for informing the general public about the legislation, which would otherwise be ignored without a genuine understanding of the regulations.

Good arguments are needed to convince those who do not sympathise with the legislation to change their minds. The reasons for protecting cultural objects must be explained - how it is positive for all players because the objects remain in the country and can be handled here.

We have previously suggested that legislation needs revising and that the fundamental objectives of protective legislation should be properly investigated. If a revision is ever implemented, the investigation should allow time for in-depth dialogue with industry players. It should also include a discussion on the role of dealers.

In the short term, a task that is central to preventing illegal movement and export is the spreading of information. This applies for those who handle cultural objects commercially but also museums, libraries and Archives who work to preserve and protect cultural heritage. The questionnaire study shows clearly that public institutions have an as yet unexploited potential for spreading knowledge about the legislation.

STRATEGIES TO PREVENT ILLEGAL MOVEMENT, EXPORT AND IMPORT

In cases where dealers and museums sympathise with the legislation but do not know how to introduce measures, strategies are important. Museums
can probably work much harder to spread knowledge about the legislation via exhibitions and information showcases at the museum, and via websites. Authorities must demand that museums prioritise the spreading of information about restrictions on the movement and export of cultural objects.

INFORMING THE GENERAL PUBLIC

There are other ways of informing the general public of legislation than via dealers and museums. One method discussed at the project seminar in Copenhagen in 2005 is to set up information boards or showcases at airports where different types of protected objects are illustrated together with information about the legislation. This method is used to communicate information about other legislation such as export protected animals and plants. Other channels for passengers are video information on flights or information in in-flight magazines, which has been recommended by the Heritage Watch project in Cambodia (Heritage Watch, 2005). Similar information campaigns could also be implemented in museums, libraries and Archives.

For museums with archaeological objects, information campaigns could be combined with information that it is illegal to use metal detectors on ancient remains. Information about legislation is easier to communicate in the archaeological area, because permits applications are required for all objects. In other areas, it may be necessary with illustrated examples to help the public understand what types of objects are covered by the legislation. Another channel for spreading information about export legislation is via carriers. It is important that transport and forwarding companies have links to the legislation on their websites, and that they do not transport cultural objects covered by the legislation without permits. A suggestion from a forwarding agent in the interview material is that carriers offer to handle permit applications. In this way, the forwarder can ensure that he/she is not moving goods illegally.

SUPERVISE LEGAL COMPLIANCE

A general problem with legislation, according to all countries, is supervising its compliance. Theoretically, the laws provide good protection for cultural objects but their compliance is difficult to supervise.

The authorities that are responsible for administrating export regulations have limited resources for supervising legal compliance. First of all, many objects never pass by the authorities because permit applications are never made. Secondly, it is not possible to guarantee that objects with export prohibitions remain in the country. The study indicates a degree of overconfidence in the capacity of authorities to control this situation. Authorities are expected to monitor the antiques market abroad, but none of the responsible authorities in any of the countries have enough resources to do so at present.

Permit-issuing authorities see the role of border controls and customs officers as a necessary filter that will guarantee protection at national borders. But the resources available to customs for controlling export are limi-
ted; any opportunities for implementing such a systematic filter are slight (Hansen, 2004). As mentioned, controls are focused on objects brought into the country, not out. Any actions implemented by customs are temporary initiatives, based on indications and suspicions. Under the Dutch chairmanship of the European Union, illicit traffic in cultural objects was presented as an area for discussion, followed by research (The Ministry of Education, Culture and Science, 2004). The inquiry highlighted the overlap between tax and non-tax offences and claimed that increased control of cultural objects would also benefit the investigation of tax offences, and vice versa. Because they generate an income, customs authorities prioritise customs duties, and this could be one area that is receptive to increased control.

The presentation of a movement and/or export permit for the customs office is not a realistic demand. According to Swedish Customs' regulatory framework (see Customs Administration's Powers at Swedish Borders with other EU Member States Act) valid movement permits are not required by customs when taking objects to another EU member state. On the other hand, export permits are always required when exporting objects to a third country. This presupposes however that the exporter declares the goods correctly, i.e. with the correct commodity code on the export declaration and reference to any required expert permits. These errands are stopped by the computer system and transferred to the “red channel”. A customs officer has to decide what action to take, demand substantiating documents such as invoices, and in some cases inspect the goods.

Most export declarations are handled electronically, i.e. documents and goods are not checked. This means that a consignment of peasant furniture with an export prohibition can be declared as furniture and pass by customs unnoticed. The Danish customs system has a separate goods declaration category for cultural objects, unlike other Nordic countries. If used correctly, a separate goods declaration category makes it easier to carry out random inspections and control the goods. If the code is missing, however, cultural objects are included in other more general codes and are difficult to differentiate. The code can also mean that any objects declared incorrectly, i.e. as furniture instead of cultural objects, can avoid control if the controls focus solely on the correct customs declaration.

Another problem that can arise at border controls when a customs officer discovers cultural objects is the assessment of whether the objects require a movement and/or expert permit or not. As mentioned, this requires a great deal of expertise in the cultural heritage area and more than can be required of a customs officer. The area is usually considered too limited to prioritise special training. Danish Customs held a two-day course for customs officers that included a review of legislation and suitable routines. Important information about the area was distributed during the course (Told – Kulturavsgjenstande, 2005).

Crucial to supervising legal compliance is a functioning collaboration between customs, and cultural authorities with expertise in the cultural heritage area. Customs officers who feel unsure of objects should be able to seek advice from an expert to determine whether objects require export permits or not. In Norway, attempts have been made to facilitate collabora-
tion via a contact list with direct numbers to specialists in the cultural heritage area (Temakontrollen, 2004). This initiative seems to function well and has lead to greater involvement from all affected authorities. The Norwegian Theme Control Project (Temakontrollen) may also provide the solution to a problem experienced by other Nordic countries: lack of collaboration between customs, cultural authorities and the police. Following this exchange of knowledge between Nordic countries, Swedish Customs also produced contact lists.

Another method for improving communications between the different authorities is to organise meetings around specific issues. In Sweden, the National Heritage Board summons an export group several times each year to discuss the movement and export of cultural objects. Two seminars have also been organised within the framework of this study with representatives from customs, police and cultural authorities in all Nordic countries, and made valuable contributions towards creating contacts and sharing ideas.

**IMPROVE ADMINISTRATION PROCEDURES FOR MOVEMENT AND EXPORT PERMITS**

The general view of Nordic supervisory authorities is that the administrative side of legislation, i.e. the handling of movement and export applications, functions relatively well.

Norwegian ABM-utvikling’s specialists say that routines for filing permit documents should be improved. At present, the original document is sent to the applicant. The permit-issuing institutions keep one copy and send another copy to ABM-utvikling. This procedure means that ABM has material from all permit-issuing institutions that contain valuable empirical information, which should be systemized and filed in a separate database. This will require a great deal of work but discussion has begun. Another advantage of a database is that it would facilitate further control and investigation if the need arises.

An important issue to consider when handling applications for export permits is whether the documents will be public or not. The situation has sometimes arisen in Norway where the media has requested information about how some objects are handled and approached the institution that had made the decision. Both the applicant and the institution consider this a problem because criminals can also use this information to trace objects. In reference to the principle of public access to official documents, all names and addresses associated with the object have been removed. Art players have objected to withholding this information from the general public because they claim it is easier to identify and trace noted works of art if the public knows they are in circulation.

Experts at the National Board of Antiquities in Finland claim that important information about cultural objects is not always included in their applications. This can lead to problems because an issued expert permit is difficult to cancel. The application form should contain more specific questions about provenance. The value of the objects should also be given for import, and not only for export.
### Revise legislation
Legislation to prevent the movement and export of cultural objects is considered complex, and the basic objectives are questionable. The legislation should be revised, and the theoretic basis should be carefully formulated.

### Disseminate information and influence attitudes
Regardless of whether the legislation needs revision or not, knowledge of the regulations is poor and museums and other cultural institutions are an as yet unexploited resource for spreading information about the regulations that apply. One idea is that information should be available at airports, as in-flight information and in flight magazines. All larger cultural institutions and dealers should provide links to downloadable brochures on legislation.

### Supervise legal compliance
Customs controls should be improved and the expertise of customs officers should be raised. Collaboration should also increase between customs and cultural authorities. One idea could be to organise training for customs officers and produce lists of contact persons in the cultural area who can assist customs with the operational tasks of inspecting objects, which has already been implemented in some of the countries. E-mail lists can be used to spread important information quickly. Organising seminars and other meetings where people from different authorities can get to know each other and facilitate collaboration is also recommended.

### Improve administration procedures for movement and export permits
It should be considered whether applications for movement and expert permit should be confidential, to encourage applications from people who, because of the theft risk, do not want it known that they own valuable cultural objects. It should be possible to process and analyse information about permits for control purposes.

---

### Measures to prevent illegal trade in cultural objects
All trade and opportunities for financial gain generate a black market, which also applies for trade in cultural objects (Temakontrollen, 2004). Both dealers and customers know that stolen and fake cultural objects appear on art and antique markets. It is often difficult to determine whether a dealer knowingly or unknowingly sells stolen and illegally imported goods. As a large percentage of trade in cultural objects takes place between the dealers themselves, objects can pass hands many times before they reach an end customer. This fact makes it even more difficult to determine an object's origin. In order to prevent illegal trade in cultural objects, i.e. trading with stolen, illegally exported, moved or imported objects, measures must be implemented in the market section of our model.

As financial motives usually underlie the illegal handling of cultural objects, effective suppression of illegal trade in cultural objects also requires an indirect suppression of the thefts. Increased control of the goods on the market makes it more difficult to sell the stolen goods. The same applies for illegally imported objects – if there was no market, objects would not be
imported. Suppressing illegal trade in cultural objects is therefore central to reducing crime in the area in general.

GUIDELINES AND REPUTATIONS

Trade associations for cultural object dealers have formulated a number of guidelines for how to avoid handling illegal objects and these are described in the legal market section. Despite these ethical codes, there are still major problems with illegal trade.

In the questionnaire study, all auction houses and the majority of antique dealers and antiquarian booksellers claim that they make demands on people selling cultural objects. Most say they also check provenance. But the interviews show that checks of a cultural object’s provenance are usually defective and that some dealers only do what is necessary to “keep the law off their backs” and avoid being incriminated. This is a survival strategy in an industry based on trust. The survey shows that dealers make typological, normality and biographical assessments before they buy, to determine the risks for buying illegal objects and, for some dealers, to avoid damaging their reputations. In other words, some dealers make a risk assessment of the probability for being accused of handling stolen goods or gaining a bad reputation, rather than making an ethical assessment of the object’s real provenance.

This situation is not particularly controversial because dealers in this industry, like every other industry, are dependent upon revenues from sales and cannot afford to refuse objects that their rivals will accept and sell. This makes it difficult to maintain a strictly ethical approach, as ethical codes usually advocate. The ethical codes have more impact on some dealers than others.

A complementary strategy for influencing the behaviour of dealers would be to introduce the valuation system that is already used by some dealers for risk assessments, and thereby raise the risk for handling illegal objects through increased control.

CONTROL

Control of trade in cultural objects should be a combination of increased police controls and demands on individual controls by dealers and other buyers.

POLICE CONTROLS

In Nordic countries, all trade in used commodities is regulated by similar laws, which means that professional trade in used products in auction houses, antique shops or antiquarian bookshops must be registered in advance. The sellers have to number their goods and keep a register of offered objects. In Denmark, dealers have to register all products they buy in a “politibok” together with names, addresses and social security numbers. The equivalent in Norway is a “skraphandelbok”. All products that are purchased for more than SEK 300 are registered. Several dealers in the interview material say that this is an effective measure keeps fences at bay.
Reporting trade in cultural objects also creates opportunities for tracing stolen objects.

The police do not prioritize legal compliance in the handling of cultural objects. Our interviews show that controls of goods and sellers are defective – the police do not have enough resources to check whether journals and registers match product lines, and the control of dealers is slipshod. Many dealers express disappointment and irritation over the lack of interest shown by police in relation to thefts, or when trying to contact police about illegal trade in cultural objects. This could be explained by the fact that police prioritize theft before receiving, which should be questioned because the receiving lead usually constitutes a bottleneck in the flow of stolen goods (The Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention, 2006). Concentrating police initiatives on receiving activities would be more effective. Initiatives aimed at fences would have a greater impact because a fence usually handles stolen goods from a number of thieves. In turn, the climate for thieves would become tougher because it is more difficult to sell stolen goods. In addition, illegal trade in cultural objects is sometimes considered a typical fence niche, which would bring the crime to the frontline of police tasks rather than the periphery, which is where cultural heritage crimes usually hover today.

Increased Police controls of dealers would make it more interesting for dealers to record their purchases and sales. Improved accounting practices would also simplify police work when trying to trace illegal objects.

One problem with legislation on trade in used goods is that it is not adapted to the new marketplace created by Internet trade, i.e. it is unclear whether international Internet auctions based in one country are covered by that country’s legislation.

INDIVIDUAL CONTROLS

Police efforts to control trade in cultural objects can be facilitated by demanding that antique dealers implement their own controls. One example could be that dealers are obligated to check registers of stolen objects. In Denmark, the police database register of stolen cultural objects is accessible to the general public. It should be possible to make such a demand on dealers. Unfortunately, some missing objects reports are only locally accessible in the Danish stolen goods register.

A number of respondents in the interview study have also requested lists of stolen objects from the police so that they can “keep their eyes open”. A subscription to new postings in a theft database would ensure that information is disseminated effectively.

There are also international theft databases for cultural objects. Interpol administers a register of stolen works of art that is currently available to subscribers on CD-ROM. By making this database accessible to the general public via the Web, demands for individual controls by dealers could be introduced.

In regard to checking theft registers, it is important that dealers only need to check one register in order to avoid extra work. There are a number of different theft databases at present, and dealers sometimes have to
browse through these continually. Even if all theft registers are good, there should be one official theft register that includes all thefts.

To prevent illegal trade in illegally imported, exported or moved objects, it is vital that dealers check provenance. An excellent example from the study is one institution that applies a 30-year rule for provenance, i.e. when buying cultural objects, it only accept objects with a verifiable provenance that stretches at least 30 years back. *Old collection* provenances are not accepted.

The best method for encouraging dealers to apply a similar rule is that buyers demand known provenance. It is important with information campaigns like those described in the first crime prevention section, where measures to prevent the theft of cultural objects are discussed. Demands from buyers also mean that prices will indicate whether provenance is known or unknown. It is important that preserver institutions provide good examples and maintain strict regulations for provenance when buying cultural objects.

One problem created by increased focus on provenance is false provenances.

**SUMMARY OF MEASURES TO PREVENT ILLEGAL TRADE IN CULTURAL OBJECTS**

| Guidelines and reputations: Some dealers make a risk assessment when buying cultural objects to determine the risk for negative effects. Raising the risk for negative effects will also encourage dealers to implement more thorough controls. |
| Police controls: Re prioritization of police resources to shift the focus from theft to suppressing receiving activities. |
| Individual controls: Demands on dealers to check theft databases when purchasing. This presumes however that databases become more accessible and easier to search than they are today. |
| Information: Information campaigns that target the general public about the importance of knowing an object’s provenance. |
| Good example: 30-year rule: when purchasing, cultural objects should have a known provenance of at least 30 years. |

**Measures to facilitate recovery of illicitly removed cultural objects**

Even though much can be done to prevent the theft and illegal movement of cultural objects, the illicit removal of cultural objects will always be a problem. It is thus important to introduce measures that facilitate the recovery of stolen or illegally moved objects in advance. In relation to our analysis model, cultural objects are considered “recovered” when the production of objects for the market or trade in objects is broken because of intervention.
by police or others, and that the object is returned to its original owner. Recovery is not linked to any specific part of the model.

REGISTERS AND INVENTORIES

Registers and inventories of collections is central to the recovery of stolen or illegally exported objects. To benefit from the UNESCO Convention on restitution of illegally exported cultural objects, the object in question must be documented in text and photos.

REGISTERS

Registers fulfil several security purposes. Firstly, they are effective tools for keeping track of collections and discovering when something is stolen. Secondly, they serve as documentation and facilitate the identification of objects if they disappear. The results of the questionnaire study show that registers are standard procedure in most operations. Archives, however, are the group of respondents that register their objects least.

A register is not always constructed for identification purposes when objects are recovered. One example is library documentations where the register usually consists of titles and years of publication, while descriptions that focus on unique features are missing. Another example of poor documentation is when objects are registered in a group, which is usually the case for Archives. This could mean that missing documents are never discovered because the actual folder remains. It is important that registers are constructed in a manner that facilitates identification. Registrations of damage, stamps or other distinguishing features are usually useful in this context.

For identification purposes, registers must include photos of cultural objects. The questionnaire study shows that photos are far less common than other documentation. Many of the tools used to recover cultural objects, such as web registers of stolen objects, are based on photos of objects.

INVENTORIES

Inventories are an effective instrument for discovering theft. If thefts are discovered quickly, the chances of recovery increase. According to the questionnaire study, there is great scope for improving inventories in a number of the areas studied. Only half of the museums perform inventories every year or more often, for example. This means that registers are not up to date and the inventories are useless for discovering thefts. Strained financial resources explain the lack of inventories. The challenge is therefore to maximise the effect of existing resources through planning and structuring. One way to perform cost-effective inventories could be to divide objects into different risk categories where group 1 is valuable objects with a high theft risk, and group 5 is less valuable objects with a low theft risk. Inventories can then be performed at different intervals according to the different risk categories - with the greatest frequency in
group 1, and less frequently in the others. This should of course be combined with random inventories to make controls unpredictable.

SECURITY ROUTINES

It is important that cultural institutions have routines for handling theft. Effective routines for police reports and databases for stolen cultural objects increase the chances of recovering objects. The questionnaire study shows that many institutions lack any such routines; the only routines that exist are usually contacting the police.

The most important security routine is that thefts are reported to the police as soon as possible and that a photograph and information about the object are produced and disseminated. That information is reported to the police quickly increases the chances of finding the person responsible for the theft. In addition to the police, it is also worth contacting sector theft registers such as ICOM’s Red List of objects stolen from museums. It is also a good idea to ensure that police report any thefts of valuable objects to Interpol’s Stolen Works of Art database so that information about the theft can be spread as quickly as possible. It is not necessary to report simpler objects to the international theft database because these are usually recovered locally.

The police should be consulted about contacting the media. In some cases, media attention can be useful for informing the general public and lead to important observations. But in other cases, avoiding publicity may prove a wiser strategy. Illegal excavations do not benefit from media attention because this sometimes inspires more looting. Avoiding media coverage is not always possible, however.

The object should also be registered as stolen in the internal register to reflect the current situation. Performing an inventory is also recommended to see whether any other objects are missing.

Security routines can often cause problems at workplaces with temporary and/or voluntary staff such as open-air museums or churches. In these cases, there should be easily accessible and brief information about security routines, preferably with a contact person who can provide more detailed instructions about what should be done in the event of theft.

POLICE WORK

The police are central to recovering stolen or illicitly removed objects. To recover illicitly removed objects, the police need information from those affected, as explained above.

In regard to police work, the focus should lie on recovering objects rather than prosecuting offenders, which is discussed in more detail in *Measures to prevent the theft of cultural objects*. 
SUMMARY OF MEASURES TO FACILITATE THE RECOVERY OF STOLEN OR ILLEGALLY MOVED/EXPORTED CULTURAL OBJECTS

| **Registers:** Registers should be constructed to enable the identification of specific objects. An important requirement is photographs. |
| **Inventories:** A cost-effective method for performing inventories could be to divide collections into risk categories where the more valuable objects are checked more frequently than others. Random inventories are also important. |
| **Security routines:** The police must be contacted as soon as possible and given photographs and information about the stolen object. |

Crime preventive conclusions: knowledge, prioritisation and control

Crime prevention measures were proposed in the previous section within the framework of these four areas: preventing thefts, preventing illegal movement, export and import, preventing illegal trade and facilitating the recovery of cultural objects. All of these proposals can be grouped under three overall headings:

- Knowledge
- Prioritisation
- Control

These three themes summarise the results of the empirical studies and the crime prevention analysis that was implemented in the seminars with the project reference group. The three themes are developed below.

KNOWLEDGE

The studies show that knowledge of cultural heritage crime is limited. This applies to both preserving institutions and dealers. It also applies to the police. There is no single authority with overall knowledge of this area. Thus, the measures and actions proposed are often inadequate, fragmented and uneconomical.

Many buyers of cultural objects who visit markets have good knowledge of art and culture, but do not know the objects for sale might be stolen, looted or otherwise illicitly removed. The buyers rarely ask questions about provenance, and the objects are usually presented as interior design items or collection pieces, i.e. without a history. This means that dealers do not have to demand provenance, nor their sellers and so on down a long chain of transactions. The size of the legal market combined with a lack of knowledge about the importance of provenance creates a breeding ground for a vast grey zone where illegal objects slip onto the legal market. One intervewee referred to “white trade in a black frame”.

Police and customs see cultural heritage crime as a marginal and odd crime category, far beyond the usual scope of criminal policy. But this study
shows how cultural heritage crime is firmly integrated with theft and receiving stolen goods. Through receiving, organized crime is also featured.

A knowledge base has previously been proposed for gathering, systematizing and analysing cultural heritage crime. This knowledge can then be used to develop security plans for museums and other cultural institutions. This improves security and curbs the illicit removal of cultural objects. By attracting attention to cultural heritage crime and raising knowledge of the crime, more buyers will ask questions – buyers at all levels of the supply chain. This will reduce the demand for illicitly removed objects. Increased knowledge amongst police and customs will bring cultural heritage crime into focus. This creates a need for future research in the area. Some specific areas that should be highlighted are illegal movement, export and import. The development of risk analysis methods for the targets of illicit removal, and current statistics for culture heritage crime are also central. The fence’s market and how illegal objects are laundered on the legal market is also a field that requires more research than was implemented by this project.

PRIORITISATION

As mentioned above, one of the reasons why museums and other cultural institutions have such poor knowledge of cultural heritage crime is because there are no overall statistics and analyses in the area. This leads to incorrect prioritisations. In the worst scenario, huge resources are invested in protecting the wrong objects at the wrong times from the wrong offenders.

Knowledge levels are also low amongst buyers, whether private people or dealers. Some buyers may also choose not to know too much by not asking questions. This leads to legally and morally incorrect prioritisations because illegal objects bring good profit margins when they are illicitly removed and have no “purchase price” in the first lead.

The prioritisations of police and customs resources have been questioned because they do not always account for the importance of cultural heritage crime in property crime, nor its connections with organized crime. The police prioritise catching offenders rather than recovering illicitly removed cultural objects, which is more important from a cultural heritage perspective. Customs officers check what is brought into the country, especially narcotics, but rarely objects that are taken out. In the culture heritage area, it is important to prioritise both the cultural objects that are at risk for illegal import into the country, and objects that leave the country illegally.

Increased knowledge leads to better prioritisation.

CONTROL

The studies show that many cultural objects are stolen during the day by visitors, and not always at night by burglars. Visitors cut illustrations from volumes in libraries and take document from folders in Archives. Employees also embezzle cultural objects. The problem is that everyday controls of visitors, borrowers and employees are defective.

The problem is even greater beyond the protective walls of institutions. Shipwrecks and ancient remains lie unprotected and are often plundered.
Thieves steal from shops, and gangs victimize antique dealers. Some crimes are planned and target specific objects. Shop employees embezzle and steal objects. Shops have similar security problems to museums.

Police controls of how dealers register their used goods are usually defective. The police have little contact with dealers in general. Resources are not wasted on tracing stolen cultural objects, and the registration of objects that are illicitly removed is defective. The risk for discovery is minimal. As mentioned, customs only check goods that are taken out of the country.

Increased control raises risks and helps prevent crime.

**KNOWLEDGE, PRIORITISATION AND CONTROL**

A combination of the three cornerstones: knowledge, prioritisation and control will reduce cultural heritage crime. Increasing knowledge is the first step, and provides a basis for prioritisation and control. We hope this report contributes to the first step.
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Appendix

Appendix 1. Method

A detailed description of the questionnaire study method is described below. A more general description is provided in the report section on methods. The questionnaire can be found in appendix 2.

Sending out the questionnaire

The questionnaires were sent out from cultural heritage authorities in each country who also signed the introductory letter together with the Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention. Logotypes from the cultural authorities and the Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention were included in the letter of introduction to enhance the credibility of the study. In Sweden, Norway and Finland completed questionnaires were returned to the respective cultural authorities. Questionnaires from Denmark were sent to Sweden for administrative reasons.

The introductory letter to the questionnaire set out the aims of the study and that the all answers would remain anonymous. The respondents also received a postage paid return envelope to return the form. Each of these envelopes was numbered to check where reminders should be sent. This is standard procedure for sensitive questionnaires as anonymity is preserved once the form has been removed from the envelope (Trost, 2001).

In Sweden the churches in the study were approached through regional church employees working with antiquarian issues. Eight (out of thirteen) dioceses that received a questionnaire also had to be sent reminders to return the form. In five dioceses the questionnaire was forwarded by, and returned to, the Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention for administrative reasons. The churches in these five dioceses did not receive reminders. This may have had a negative impact on the response rate but it was a practical necessity that in our opinion had a very minor effect on this study.

Groups

This inquiry covers different types of groups who are involved with cultural objects. The questionnaire was sent to 2,799 respondents in Sweden, Norway, Denmark and Finland. All project partners in the Nordic countries has taken part in the selection of players in the questionnaire study.

---

46 The Finnish National Board of Antiquities (Museiverket), The Danish Commission on Export of Cultural Assets (Kulturarvsstyrelsen), The Swedish National Heritage Board (Riksantikvarieämbetet) and The Norwegian Archive, Library and Museum Authority (ABM Utvikling, Statens senter for arkiv, bibliotek og museum).
Table 1: Questionnaires distributed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Questionnaires distributed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>1,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,799</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of questionnaires sent out was corrected after distribution due to reorganisations in organisations approached. Due to an error in Norway, where questionnaires were sent to libraries and carriers not involved with this issue, the responses in these categories can be used as stand alone cases only and not as a representative selection. These two Norwegian categories have also been removed from the figures presented above in order to provide a fairer representation of distribution in Norway.

A higher number of questionnaires were sent out in Sweden compared to the other countries. This is due to a more in-depth study of churches in Sweden where 886 churches were approached with the questionnaire (see below for details).

Selection of respondents

The selection of respondents differs from group to group depending on size and organisation. The overall goal has been to present a picture of cultural heritage crime in all victimized areas through sample studies. The cultural heritage authority involved in the project from each country determined who to approach in each field, and how many, taking into account structural differences in cultural institutions. The selection in the different groups is presented below. The respondents are divided into two groups: preservers and dealers.

PRESERVERS

In the selection of preservers of cultural objects for purpose of the inquiry, the focus was on public organisations such as museums, libraries, archives, universities and churches. Private collectors were not included in this study.

MUSEUMS

A total of 625 museums were approached in the four countries. The aim has been to cover all museums with cultural objects of interest in their collections.

In Sweden all national and regional museums were included. 56 out of 141 registered community museums were also approached. This selection was based on types of object they possess with the main focus on older and more valuable cultural objects. In total 101 Swedish museums were selected.

In Norway, all museums supported by the department of culture and churches, all university museums and all Lapland museums were selected.
Thirteen national museums, 4 regional art museums and the National Heritage Museum. Community museums were excluded as their collections were considered less relevant. In total 195 Norwegian museums were selected.

In Finland all museums in the annual museum statistics of Finland and Åland were approached to answer the questionnaire. The museum statistics cover all larger and more important museums as well as local museums. 164 museums were selected in total.

In Denmark all government granted-aided national and city museums were approached. This selection includes all museums with important collections of culture objects. In total 165 Danish museums were selected.

LIBRARIES

Most collections of valuable old books in Sweden are housed at the Royal Library in Stockholm. The questionnaire was also distributed to regional libraries and university libraries with older books in their collections. In total 23 libraries were selected.

In Norway the national library, university libraries, all community libraries, older city libraries and some school libraries with interesting collections were included in the selection, 29 libraries in all. Due to error the questionnaire was also sent to all professional libraries at research institutions and libraries at private and public colleges, in total 388 libraries. These libraries have few items of interest to this inquiry and therefore no reminders were sent.

In Finland the Helsinki university library and all provincial libraries, including Åland, were included, a total of 20 libraries. In Denmark the Royal Library and 6 associated research libraries have the most interesting books and were selected to take part in the study.

ARCHIVES

The study focused on larger Archives with valuable documents. Small local Archives were excluded in all four countries. In total 58 Archives were selected in all countries.

All regional and city Archives in Sweden were selected, 24 in total. In Norway 13 Archives were chosen. National and government Archives, union Archives, a popular archive and city Archives in Oslo and Bergen. In Finland 11 archives including the national Archives, all regional Archives including Åland were invited to take part. 10 Danish Archives with valuable cultural objects protected by Danish law were included.

ARCHAEOLOGISTS

In all four countries archaeologists connected to museums were approached through their museum. In Sweden there are also private freelance archaeologists. 18 such archaeologists registered with the Swedish National Heritage Board were included. There are no corresponding equivalents in the other countries.
A handful of universities with valuable collections of art were approached to take part in the inquiry. Two in Sweden, 2 in Denmark and 1 in Finland. In the Norwegian selection the universities are bracketed with the libraries.

**CHURCHES**

The selection of churches differs from country to country due to their different organisational structures and different approaches to selection. The results of the questionnaire are therefore presented individually for each country. In total 1,075 Nordic churches were asked to complete the questionnaire.

All Swedish churches within the state church were included in the study. Regional churches that are bracketed together for financial purposes were approached as one. Catholic churches and Jewish synagogues were also included in the selection. Free churches were excluded as this is a relatively recent movement unlikely to own valuable old cultural objects. A total of 886 Swedish churches and synagogues etc were included in the study.

In Norway 115 churches were approached in all diocese and ecclesiastical areas. The selection assumed that the regional heads of the churches were notified.

In Finland 9 cathedrals and 3 orthodox bishoprics were selected. 52 wayside churches were also chosen. These wayside churches are open daily during the summer months for tourists and the general public and are therefore especially vulnerable to theft.

Denmark has the smallest selection with 10 cathedrals from various parts of the country. It was considered too comprehensive to ask every community church to complete a questionnaire.

**LOCAL HISTORY MUSEUM ASSOCIATIONS**

In Sweden and Finland local cultural heritage is in the hands of small local museums that belong to the association of small museums. The corresponding organisations in Norway are “husflindslag” and “historielag” but these were not felt to be of much interest to the study and were not therefore included.

There are no corresponding equivalents in Denmark.

There are 3,000 local history museums in Sweden, which is too many for the purposes of this inquiry. Selection was made with the help of insurers of these museums that had dealt with theft claims since 2000. This enabled us to determine what proportion of thefts were cultural objects.

In Finland 60 local history museums were chosen. This covered most of the country although the majority were in western Finland as the more interesting collections are found there. The focus was on larger museums with several buildings and large collections.

**DEALERS**

Dealers are involved in the commercial aspects of cultural objects in terms of buying, selling and exporting. This group includes dealers in new and second-hand objects, including runners, pawnshops, conversers and shippers.
Obviously, cultural objects can appear at both larger and smaller auctions. However we have concentrated on larger auctioneers that regularly handle valuable cultural objects.

In Sweden, 14 large auction houses were included. Most of them are in the Stockholm area but there are others around the country. In Denmark 9 auction houses chosen by the Danish Commission on Export of Cultural Assets responded. In Finland all 7 large auction houses were included. Small local auctioneers were excluded in all countries.

In Norway all members of the national association of auction houses, antique dealers, antiquarian bookshops, art dealers and galleries were chosen. In order to cover antique dealers who are not members, other antique dealers listed in the phonebook were added. A total of 106 questionnaires in all these categories were returned.

**ANTIQUE DEALERS**

There are different categories of antique dealer ranging from flea market traders to high quality fine art dealers. This inquiry focused on dealers in cultural objects excluding second-hand stores and flea markets.

In Sweden all 128 dealers registered with either of the two large antique dealer organisations were included. This selection was based on the assumption that antique dealers trading in valuable cultural objects would be in this group. Similar selection was made in Denmark. This amounted to 32 antique dealers who are members of the national antique dealer organisation. In Finland there are two organisations for antique dealers. In the smaller one all 19 members were selected and in the larger organisation half, or 66 were picked. The selection of Norwegian antique dealers appears under auction houses above.

**ANTIQUARIAN BOOKSHOPS**

Members of antiquarian bookshop organisations were included in the selection. 62 members of the Swedish antiquarian organisation were picked. In Finland 39 bookshops from the two national organisations were included.

In Denmark antiquarian book dealers do not have their own organisation and were excluded from this study. The selection of Norwegian antiquarian bookshops appears above under auction houses.

**PAWNSHOPS**

The selection of pawnshops is restricted to the 36 members of the pawnshops association in Sweden and 11 registered pawnshops in Finland. Norway and Denmark do not have any pawnshops.
RESTORERS

In addition to the restorers working for museums there are also many in private practice. In Sweden all 86 private listed in the yellow pages were selected. In Denmark all 33 restorer workshops linked with national museums were included. Some of these work for museums while other are independent. In Finland 17 members of the association of restorers were chosen from different fields. In Norway all 23 private practice restorers were questioned.

SHIPPERS AND CARRIERS

Five Swedish and two Danish shippers and carriers known to handle cultural objects for museums were included. In Norway and Finland a wider range was picked. All 74 shippers and carriers listed in Norwegian phonebooks and all 78 listed in Finnish websites were chosen.

Response rate

Out of 2,799 questionnaires sent out, 2,111 responded – a response rate of 75%. As shown in table 2 Sweden, Norway and Finland had similar response rates while Denmark was 10% higher. This is probably due to more selective distribution in Denmark. Considering the questionnaire addressed many different areas, and that many areas did not apply to all respondents, the response rate is surprisingly high. This suggests these issues are important to the respondents.

Table 2: Number of selected respondents, replies and response rate for Sweden, Norway, Denmark and Finland.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Respondents (N)</th>
<th>Replies (n)</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>1,447</td>
<td>1,086</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,799</td>
<td>2,111</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The response rate differs between the different groups of respondents; see tables 3, 4, 5 and 6 below. Museums and Archives had the best response rate with 93% in both groups. Of 625 Nordic museums approached, 583 answered the questionnaire and 54 out of 58 Archives responded.

Swedish pantbanksföreningen

This selection was suggested by the chair of the restorer's organisation Nordiska konservatorförbundet as their member register was out of date.

Norwegian libraries are excluded from this presentation. Due to a selection error the questionnaire was sent to 359 libraries in Norway, most not of relevance for this study. No reminders were sent to libraries. 82 libraries did reply (23%). Excluding the Norwegian libraries the response rate suggests the material presented is very representative.
Library response rates were 6% in Sweden, Denmark and Finland. However, this was only 23% in Norway due to a selection error, see above. Fifteen out of 18 archaeologists (83%) answered the questionnaire, 97 out of 122 local museum associations (80%) and 801 out of 1,075 churches (75%).

Areas where cultural objects are more marginal generally had a lower response rate. 43% of carriers answered (69 out of 159), 60% of universities (3 out of 5) and 62% of the pawnshops (29 out of 47).

The response rate among restorers differs substantially between countries. Swedish and Finnish restorers had a response rate of 81% and 76% respectively while Norwegian and Danish restorers were much less responsive (48% and 30%). In total 104 out of 159 restorers answered (65%).

Auction houses, antique dealers and antiquarian bookshops had a response rate of 66% with 319 answers out of 482 in all four countries. In Sweden, Denmark and Finland where these three areas were separated, the response rate was slightly higher for auction houses (73%) and lower for antiquarian bookshops (63%).

Table 3: Selected respondents, replies and response rate in Sweden.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sweden</th>
<th>Respondents (N)</th>
<th>Replies (n)</th>
<th>Response rate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Museums</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archives</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auction Houses</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antique &amp; Art Dealers</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiquarian Bookshops</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawnshops</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shippers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restorers</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeologists</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local history museums Associations</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churches</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1447</td>
<td>1086</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: Selected respondents, replies and response rate in Norway.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Norway</th>
<th>Respondents (N)</th>
<th>Replies (n)</th>
<th>Response rate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Museums</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archives</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carriers</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restorers</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churches</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antique Dealers, Auction Houses &amp; Antiquarian Bookshops</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (including libraries)</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (excluding libraries)</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Selected respondents, replies and response rate in Denmark.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denmark</th>
<th>Respondents (N)</th>
<th>Replies (n)</th>
<th>Response rate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Museums</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archives</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auction Houses</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antique Dealers</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carriers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restorers</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churches</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Selected respondents, replies and response rate in Finland.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finland</th>
<th>Respondents (N)</th>
<th>Replies (n)</th>
<th>Response rate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Museums</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archives</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auction Houses</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antique Dealers</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiquarian Bookshops</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawnshops</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carriers</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restorers</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local History Museums Associations</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churches</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2. Questionnaire

The questionnaire in the inquiry was sent to respondents in all participating countries. It was translated into the respective language for each country and modified to take into account national circumstances, for example question 50 where age and value limits vary between the countries. The questionnaire attached is the Swedish version in English translation.
Questionnaire on theft, illegal removal and trade of cultural objects

Threat to cultural heritage
Over the past few years many valuable cultural objects have been stolen from churches, museums, archaeological sites and private residences. Many of these objects are priceless in terms of cultural heritage. At the same time the international trade in many cultural objects removed from their country of origin is illegal. Knowledge of criminality in the cultural heritage area is very limited. The Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention has therefore initiated a joint project with the Swedish National Heritage Board (SE), the National Cultural Heritage Agency (DK), National Board of Antiquities/Finland (SF), the Norwegian Archive, Library and Museum Authority (NO), police customs and Europol. The EU funded project aims to cast light on the illegal trade in valuable cultural objects in the Nordic region and to develop crime prevention measures.

Your participation is important for this inquiry
This questionnaire is part of our work to chart cultural heritage crimes and should not take more than 20 minutes to complete. To combat criminality it is important to understand how the exchange of cultural objects works, even on the legal market. This questionnaire is being sent to organisations involved with cultural objects and addresses issues such as thefts, security procedures, legal and illegal trading and import and export. Your participation is of major significance for ongoing crime prevention efforts in this area.

All replies will be strictly confidential
Participation in this study is voluntary and the completed questionnaires will be completely anonymous. No one working on the study will know who answered what. The reply paid envelopes are numbered purely to enable us to send reminders to anyone who has not returned the questionnaire. Returned questionnaires will be recoded and entered into a statistics program, after which the questionnaires will be destroyed.

The questionnaire has been produced by BRÅ in consultation with the Swedish National Heritage Board and other licensing authorities. The questionnaire has been inspected by the Swedish association of local authorities, association of county councils and Board of Regulations for Swedish Industry. If you have any questions about this questionnaire, please contact Sofia Elwér (08-5191 8268).

Thank you for your cooperation

Inger Liliequist  Jan Andersson
National Heritage Officer  Director General
Swedish National Heritage Board  Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention
Background

1) What area do you work in? (Mark one only)

☐ Museum
☐ Church
☐ Library
☐ Archive
☐ Local History Museum Association
☐ Auction Company
☐ Antique Dealing / Art dealing
☐ Books
☐ Pawnbroker
☐ Restorer
☐ Transport
☐ Archaeology
☐ University / College
☐ Other, please state

…………………………………………………………………………………………

Cultural objects that have been stolen or have disappeared

The answers in this section concern cultural objects that were stolen or otherwise disappeared from your organisation.

Cultural object refers to objects of artistic, historic or archaeological value irrespective of age. Examples of cultural objects are art, books, furniture, archive documents, archaeological finds, textiles, coins, stamps, glass, silver, ceramics and sacred objects.

2) Have cultural objects disappeared from your organisation?

☐ Yes, during the last five years
☐ Yes, more than five years ago
☐ No → go to question 15.
☐ Do not know → go to question 15.

3) On how many occasions have cultural objects disappeared?

2002 ..........times
2003 ..........times
2004 ..........times
4) How many cultural objects have disappeared from your place or work?

2002 ................
2003 ................
2004 ................

5) What types of cultural object have disappeared from your organisation?
(Please mark all that apply.)

A. □ Art → Specify type and period:………………………………

B. □ Archaeological find → Specify type and period…………

C. □ Sculpture → Specify type and period:…………

D. □ Book / Archive documents / Documents → Specify type and period:………………………………

E. □ Furniture / Mirrors / Boxes → Specify type and period:…..

F. □ Silver / Precious metals → Specify type and period:…….

G. □ Church inventories → Specify type and period:………..

H. □ Other, please state…….→ Specify type and period:……

6) Do the cultural objects that have disappeared have any features in common?

☐ No
☐ Yes → Please state. Please mark all that apply.
  ☐ High financial value
  ☐ High cultural heritage value
  ☐ Easy to steal
  ☐ Easy to sell
  ☐ Collector’s item
  ☐ Other, please state

7) Under what circumstances have cultural objects disappeared? (Please mark all that apply)

☐ Burglary
☐ Robbery
☐ Theft
☐ Looting (from ancient site/archaeological study)
☐ Circumstances unclear
☐ Other, please state

☐ Do not know

8) Where did the cultural objects disappear from? (Please mark all that apply)

☐ Exhibition / Viewing area / Research room
☐ Store room / Storage / Warehouse
☐ Ancient monument
☐ Shop
☐ Transport
☐ Church/ Vestry
☐ Other, please state

☐ Do not know

9) Please state when the cultural objects disappeared.

A. What time? (Please mark all that apply)

☐ During the day
☐ At night
☐ Do not know
B. What time of the week? (Please mark all that apply)
- Weekday
- Weekend
- Do not know

C. When in relation to opening hours/staff on duty? (Please mark all that apply)
- Staffed hours
- Unattended
- Do not know

10) How were the disappearances of cultural objects discovered? (Please mark all that apply)
- By an employee
- By a visitor
- By a security guard
- When stocktaking
- When making a sale
- Other, please state

11) Has the disappearance been reported?
A. To the police?
- Yes
- No → Why not?

B. To your insurance company?
- Yes
- No → Why not?

12) Have you any idea where any/some of the disappeared/stolen cultural objects went?
- No
- Yes → State country and context:

13) Who was responsible for the theft/disappearance of cultural objects from your business? (Please mark all that apply)
- Employee
- Visitor
- Burglar
- Organised gang
- Other, please state
- Do not know
14) What motive was behind the theft/disappearance of cultural objects?

☐ Financial gain  
☐ Completing a collection  
☐ Souvenir  
☐ Blackmail  
☐ Other, please state

........................................................................................................

☐ Do not know

Security

This section features questions about security routines at your organisation.

15) Does your organisation have some form of night security system?

☐ No  
☐ Yes → What? (Please mark all that apply)
  ☐ Locks  
  ☐ Alarm  
  ☐ Security guard  
  ☐ CCTV  
  ☐ Other, please state

........................................................................................................

16) Does your organisation have some form of daytime security system?

☐ No  
☐ Yes → What? (Please mark all that apply)
  ☐ Locks  
  ☐ Alarm  
  ☐ Security guard  
  ☐ CCTV  
  ☐ Other, please state

........................................................................................................

17) Do you keep an up-to-date register of the cultural objects kept by your organisation?

☐ Yes, for all objects  
☐ Yes, for some objects  
☐ No

18) Do you have pictures of the cultural objects kept by your organisation?

☐ Yes, of all items  
☐ Yes, of some objects  
☐ No
19) Are any of the cultural objects kept by your organisation protected by additional security, for example some form of immobilising or lock arrangement?

☐ Yes
☐ No

20) Are any of the cultural objects insured?

☐ Yes
☐ No

21) Are any checks or inventories made of cultural objects?

☐ No
☐ Yes → How often?

☐ Each month
☐ Each year
☐ Every 2 years
☐ Every 5 years
☐ Less frequently

22) Do you have procedures in the event that cultural objects are discovered missing?

☐ No
☐ Yes → What? Please state all that apply

☐ Contact the police
☐ Contact the media
☐ Contact the responsible authority
☐ Update objects register/inventory list
☐ Other, please state……………………………

23) Does your organisation work with archaeological assignments?

☐ No → go to question 26.
☐ Yes

24) Is a security system used to prevent the illicit removal of archaeological materials from the excavation site?

☐ No
☐ Yes → What? Please state all that apply

☐ Information signs
☐ Area closed-off
☐ Security guards
☐ Other, please state

…………………………………………………
25) When are newly discovered archaeological finds registered?

- Same day
- At the end of the excavation
- Other, please state

………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

Legal trade

This section features questions about legal trade in cultural objects.

26) Did your organisation purchase/acquire cultural objects during 2004?

- Yes
- No → go to question 33.

27) Approximately how many objects were purchased/acquired during 2004?

Number…………………

28) From whom were the cultural objects acquired? (Please mark all that apply)

- Private individual
- Foundations, institutions
- Estate of deceased
- Dealer (antique / art / antiquarian)
- Runner
- Other, please state………………………………………………
- Do not know

29) Where were the cultural objects acquired? (Please mark all that apply)

- Shops
- Fairs
- Auction houses
- Internet auctions
- Newspaper ad
- Internet ad
- Direct contact with private individual / estate of deceased
- Contact with runner
- Other, please state………………………………………………
- Do not know
30) Why were the cultural objects acquired? (Please mark all that apply)

- To sell
- To add to a collection
- To be part of the business
- To preserve/restore
- Other, please state………………………………………………
- Do not know

31) Does your organisation impose any conditions on the seller/donor when buying/acquiring cultural objects? (Please mark all that apply)

- Yes → What?
  - Proof of identity
  - Other, please state……………………………
- No
- Do not know

32) Is the background of cultural objects checked before they are purchased/acquired?

- Yes → How? (Please mark all that apply)
  - Check police register of stolen goods
  - Check against Interpol image database
  - Check provenance of object
  - Other, please state……………………………
- No
- Do not know

33) Has your organisation sold any cultural objects during the past year?

- Yes
- No → go to question 37.

34) How many cultural objects has your organisation sold in 2004?

Number……………

35) To whom have the cultural objects been sold? (Please mark all that apply)

- Museums
- Institutions
- Private individuals
- Antique/Art dealers
- Other company
- Other, please state………………………………………………
36) Where have cultural objects been sold? (Please mark all that apply)

☐ Shops / Fairs
☐ Auction houses
☐ Internet auctions
☐ Newspaper ads
☐ Internet ads
☐ Direct contact with private individual
☐ Contact with runner
☐ Other, please state………………………………………………
☐ Do not know

**Trade in stolen cultural objects**

The section features questions on trade in stolen cultural objects.

37) Has your organisation been offered cultural objects that you know are stolen?

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Do not know

38) Are you aware of one or more cases where a stolen cultural object has been purchased or sold in your operational/business sector?

☐ No → go to question 41.
☐ Yes → What type of cultural objects? (Please mark all that apply)

☐ Art
☐ Archaeological finds
☐ Sculptures
☐ Books / Archive documents / Documents
☐ Furniture
☐ Textiles / Mats
☐ Silver / Precious metals
☐ Church objects
☐ Other, please state……………………………

39) Where did these stolen goods come from?

A. From which region? (Please mark all that apply)

☐ Sweden
☐ Europe
☐ Rest of the world
☐ Do not know
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B. From which area? (Please mark all that apply)
- Museum
- Church
- Antique dealer / Art dealer
- Library / Archive
- Company
- Private individual
- Other, please state……………………………
- Do not know

40) Where are these stolen cultural objects sold?

A. In which region? (Please mark all that apply)
- Sweden
- Europe
- Rest of the world
- Do not know

B. In which business sector? (Please mark all that apply)
- Auction house
- Antique dealer / Art dealer
- Antiquarian
- Pawnbroker
- Fair
- Other, please state……………………………
- Do not know

41) Do you know anyone who buys or sells stolen cultural objects?
- No → Go to question 43.
- Yes → What group category does this person(s) belong to? (Please mark all that apply)
  - Auction house
    - Antique dealer / Art dealer
    - Antiquarian
    - Pawnbroker
    - Museum / Library / Archive
    - Private individual
    - Other, please state……………………………
    - Do not know
42) How is contact made between the buyers and sellers of these cultural objects?

☐ Via runner
☐ Person to person
☐ Internet
☐ Adverts
☐ Other, please state ..........................................................
☐ Do not know

### Removal and export

This section features questions on cultural objects that are removed from the country.

43) Do you know that in some cases, it is illegal to remove cultural objects from the country?

☐ Yes
☐ No

44) Do you know how to apply for a permit for removing or exporting cultural objects?

☐ Yes
☐ No

45) Does your organisation do anything to prevent the illegal removal of cultural objects from the country?

☐ No
☐ Yes → What? (Please mark all that apply)
  ☐ Information on removal and export permits
  ☐ Other, please state ..................................................

46) Has your organisation exported cultural objects to an EU country during 2004?

☐ No
☐ Yes → What types of object do you export most? ..............

.................................................................
47) Has your organisation exported cultural objects to a country outside the EU during 2004?

☐ No
☐ Yes → What types of object do you export most? ………………
…………………………………………………………………………

48) Has your organisation applied for a permit to remove/export cultural objects during 2004?

☐ No
☐ Yes → How many objects have you applied for a permit for? ………

49) Do you know of one or more cultural objects that have been illicitly removed from the country?

☐ No → go to question 51.
☐ Yes → In what way was the removal illicit?
(Please mark all that apply)
☐ Permit never applied for
☐ Object was subject to a removal prohibition
☐ Other…………………………………………

50) Please tell us more about the cultural objects you know that people/organisations in your sector have removed from the country illicitly. (Please mark all that apply)

A. ☐ Archaeological find →
   Number …………

B. ☐ Pictorial art (Pictures / Paintings / Drawings / Graphics) →
   Were any of these objects more than 100 years old?
   ☐ No
   ☐ Yes → Was any object valued at more than SEK 50,000?
   ☐ No
   ☐ Yes → Number …………
C. Sculptures / Statues / Objects →
   Were any of these objects more than 100 years old?
   □ No
   □ Yes → Was any object valued at over SEK 50,000?
       □ No
       □ Yes → Number............
   
E. Books / Archive documents / Documents →
   Were any of these objects more than 100 years old?
   □ No
   □ Yes → Was any object valued at over SEK 10,000?
       □ No
       □ Yes → Number............
   
G. Furniture / Mirrors / Boxes →
   Were any of these objects produced before 1860?
   □ No
   □ Yes → Number ............
   
I. Firearms / Edged weapons / Armour
   Were any of these objects more than 100 years old?
   □ No
   □ Yes → Number ............
   
J. Other antiquities / cultural objects, please state → ...........
   Number ........

Import

This section features questions on cultural objects that have been brought into the country

51) Do you know of one or more cultural objects more than 100 years old in your sector that have been brought into the country?
   □ No → go to question 53.
   □ Yes → Have any of the objects been illicitly removed from their country of origin?
       □ Yes → What type of object......................
       ..........................................................
       □ No
       □ Do not know

214
52) Where did the object that was illicitly removed from its country of origin come from? (Please mark all that apply)

A. Which part of the world?
- Europe
- Africa
- Asia
- North America
- South America
- Do not know

B. Which country? ........................................
- Do not know

Any other comments

53) If you have any other comments on the subject area, or views on this study or the questions, please write them below or on a separate sheet.

_____________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________

Thank you for your cooperation.

The project will also include interviews with people who work with cultural objects. The results of the interviews will be presented anonymously. If you are interested in taking part, please contact BRA, tel 08-5191 8268 or 08-5191 8310 or by email: sofia.elwer@bra.se