Illicit Trade in Cultural Objects
It has been 28 years since the adoption by Unesco of a convention designed to prohibit and prevent the illicit trade in cultural property. Fifteen years have passed since the United States became the 55th nation to join the convention—then the only major art-importing country to do so. How much progress has there been in the international effort to stem the pillage and illicit trade in cultural objects? The executive director of the U.S. president’s Cultural Property Advisory Committee considers this question.

The Recovery of Antiquities A Conversation with Engin Özgen
The former director general of monuments and museums in Turkey talks about what is being done—and what more needs to be done—to combat the illicit traffic in antiquities and to preserve the vast archaeological record found within his country’s borders.

Fighting the Theft of Art
The rise in art theft over the last 10 years has mirrored the tremendous rise in art market prices. Today art theft is the third-most-lucrative international crime, after drugs and arms running. Is there a way to fight this latest threat to cultural heritage? An art historian with the London-based Art Loss Register describes how an internationally recognized computer database of stolen works of art can lead to the recovery of objects.

Partners in St. Petersburg The Government of the Netherlands and the GCI
Responding to the need to protect cultural heritage in places undergoing radical change, the government of the Netherlands has joined the Getty Conservation Institute to initiate programs in conservation in St. Petersburg, Russia. One project is the creation of an information facility within the St. Petersburg International Center for Preservation which includes a specialized library, electronic links to information worldwide, and participation in an international computer database of stolen and missing works of art.

Projects, Events, and Publications
Updates on Getty Conservation Institute projects, events, publications, and staff.
It has been 28 years since the adoption by UNESCO of the Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export or Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property. Fifteen years have passed since the United States became the 55th nation to join the convention, then the only major art-importing country to do so.

Ratification of the convention was the strongest U.S. response to an international problem—the pillage of cultural objects from their context and the illicit trade of such objects. It is still the strongest national response, even though the problem has not diminished over time. Rather, according to Interpol, it now ranks with drugs and arms as one of the three most serious illicit international trading activities, valued at approximately $4.5 billion annually. At the time of the convention’s ratification, the United States was the world’s largest art market. With recent figures from the Art Sales Index showing that over 45 percent of the dollar value of the world’s auction sales is conducted in the United States, it still holds that distinction.

Has there been any improvement in the international effort to ameliorate pillage and illicit trade in cultural objects? Given the evidence, one could argue that there has not.

Filmed documentation shows Malian peasants shoveling the earth for Djenné terracottas to supply the pipeline out of Africa to Europe and the United States. In an interview several years ago in Vanity Fair magazine, the former owner of a major U.S. hockey team and a founder of ancient coin trading partnerships admitted that the ancient hoards were “fresh”—that is, fresh out of the ground—stolen or illegally excavated and smuggled out of Mediter-
ranean countries such as Turkey and Italy.” Not long ago, a tourist was arrested in Athens for taking a chisel to the Parthenon to remove a keepsake. Recently, too, several Roman-Byzantine mosaics, each weighing a ton, were sawed and pried out of their original context in Syria; intended for the U.S. market, they were shipped to Canada, where they were seized by authorities. Particularly troubling was the ransacking of the Kabul Museum in Afghanistan and the selling off of its treasures, many of which had been scientifically excavated. The stakes seem so high and the gain so great that homicide, theft, bribery, fraud, and money laundering have become crimes associated with the unauthorized movement of cultural property.

International Change

While one might wonder whether much has changed over the years, there are significant developments worth noting. The Unesco Convention itself remains viable and continues to attract new parties. Thirty-three countries have joined since the U.S. became a party, bringing the total to 88. With France’s ratification in 1997, the United States is no longer the only major art-importing country to implement this international treaty. The Swiss government, in public statements and as a result of domestic review of its constitution, now signals its intention to ratify the convention. As U.S. ratification gave art source countries new recourse, so will French and, prospectively, Swiss participation create more opportunities for international cooperation. In filing its ratification, France announced its commitment to encourage other European nations to become party to the treaty.

The hardline resistance of art-importing countries to confront illicit trade seems to be losing its edge. Continued international outrage at the growing pace of trade in stolen and illicitly exported cultural objects led to the creation in 1995 of another convention on stolen or illegally exported cultural objects, this one put forth by the International Institute for the Unification of Private Law in Rome. Of the art-importing countries, France, Switzerland, and the Netherlands have signed this treaty. In the United States, the Customs Service, increasingly vigilant, recovers cultural objects illicitly transported in personal luggage, in large shipping containers, in Federal Express packages, and even in news wrap, a technique previously used to conceal illicit drugs.

Today, numerous countries—Turkey, Greece, Cyprus, Mexico, Bolivia, Peru, Guatemala, Burma, and Thailand among them—are increasingly emboldened to file legal actions in U.S. courts to recover pillaged objects representing their national patrimony. Many of these countries have been successful with these efforts.

While there has not been a sea change in the acquisitions policies of American museums, there is incremental change. More individual institutions are adopting higher standards for acquiring unprovenanced objects—the most recent being the Getty Museum. Under this policy, which establishes November 10, 1995, as a threshold date, recently looted material may not find a home at the Getty Museum. Since museums are on the receiving end of benefactors, such policies would encourage more collectors to document their purchases and publish their collections, enhancing the opportunity for drawing the net around objects already out of context and making it easier to control present-day looting. The Smithsonian Institution in Washington, D.C., also adheres to a threshold date, as do the Museum of the University of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia and other research-oriented museums, such as the Field Museum of Natural History in Chicago and the American Museum of Natural History in New York City.

The U.S. Role

The enabling legislation ratifying U.S. participation in the 1970 Unesco convention was based on the following statement of national policy: “There has been an expanding trade in archaeological and [ethological] artifacts deriving from clandestine activities and excavations that result in the mutilation of ancient centers of civilization.... The appearance in the United States of important art objects of suspicious origin has often given rise to outrages and urgent requests for return. The United States considers that, on grounds of good foreign relations and motivated by ethical and moral principles, it should render assistance.”

How does the U.S. enabling legislation work? It is intended to be a deterrent, not the solution to illicit trade. It is a framework for providing import restrictions and is intended to reduce the incentive for pillage, thereby enhancing opportunities for scientific research at undisturbed sites and enabling countries to discourage pillage while they pursue long-term strategies for protecting their cultural heritage.

U.S. implementation is applied only on a country-by-country basis. A country that is party to the 1970 convention may make a case for U.S. import restrictions by
preparing and submitting to the United States a request that seeks restrictions on certain categories of archaeological or ethnological material. To the extent information is known to the requesting country, such a request should offer background regarding the national cultural patrimony and how it is in jeopardy from pillage; it should provide information about what internal protective measures have been put in place; it should indicate the significance of the U.S. market for the material in question; and it should say why U.S. import restrictions would be in the best interest of the international community for educational, cultural, and scientific purposes.

Each request is evaluated through an advisory and decision-making process. If granted, the protection of import restrictions is prospective only, being an instrument for preventing future losses to the archaeological record rather than an instrument for interdiction. If a request is approved, a list of restricted objects is published in the Federal Register by the Customs Service. Such objects may come into the United States if accompanied by an export certificate issued by the country of origin. The restriction is not intended to apply to objects already out of the country of origin at the time the list is published.

The United States Information Agency (USIA) is the agency largely responsible for implementing U.S. participation in the Unesco convention. It administers the Cultural Property Advisory Committee and carries out most of the president’s executive responsibilities under the enabling legislation. Requests for U.S. protection have been received from Canada, El Salvador, Bolivia, Peru, Guatemala, Nicaragua, and Mali. All requests are reviewed by the committee, whose 11 members (among them GCI director Miguel Angel Corzo) are appointed by the president (they include archaeologists, experts in the international sale of art, and representatives of museums and the general public). The committee’s recommendations are submitted to the head of the USIA, who, on behalf of the president, renders decisions.

Reducing Pillage

Depending on how one defines success, one could say that U.S. implementation of the convention has been very successful—although not necessarily from the perspective of interdiction. If illicit trade is inherently clandestine, how can we possibly know whether no interdiction means that restricted material is not coming in or that it is successfully being smuggled in, only to surface in later years? How, then, can we speak of success?

Sipán, the remarkable Moche archaeological site on the coast of Peru, is an example. U.S. emergency action with respect to Sipán has stabilized the situation of pillage. Systematic archaeology is taking place there, uncovering more tombs and adding to our knowledge of the Moche culture; modern museum exhibition space is being created for the excavated objects; access to the material by the general public has been made possible by an international traveling exhibition; and the resident archaeologist has provided the local population (including the original looters) the opportunity to develop an appreciation for the ancestral importance of the site. They have come to understand the long-term economic benefit to their communities of a protected archaeological park that attracts visitors from around the world. Peru’s National Congress passed legislation declaring the conservation, protection, and promotion of the archaeological patrimony of Sipán to be of national importance. Added to this success is the recovery by U.S.
Customs of Sipán objects advertised for auction in New York. The objects ultimately were repatriated to Peru.

Another example can be found in Mali, which, in the opinion of some, represents the most egregious case of cultural depredation. Mali, the third-poorest country in the world, has the second-greatest concentration of archaeological sites in Africa. U.S. emergency action under the convention may not have achieved an end to pillage and illicit trade, but important internal changes can be noted. Mali reports that it has initiated a policy of photodocumentation as part of its export authorization program and has taken legal steps to tighten control over the antiquarians. Most important, Mali’s National Museum has undertaken public education initiatives that include dispatching cultural missions to teach local populations to understand and manage their own cultural heritage. Archaeologists working in Djenné report a dramatic drop in pillage and note changes in the local attitude toward this activity. Radio and television broadcasts about U.S. efforts to help Mali have raised international awareness about the problem, particularly in Europe.

Regional Cooperation

Under the Unesco convention and the U.S. Cultural Property Implementation Act that ratified it, bilateral cooperation between the United States and several countries in the Western Hemisphere has stimulated interest in regional collaboration in Central America that recognizes that cultural boundaries are not aligned with modern national boundaries. At the 1994 Summit of the Americas, the protection of cultural heritage was adopted as a major action item. All nations of the Americas agreed to “work with hemispheric governments to enhance appreciation of indigenous cultures and cultural artifacts through the implementation of cultural property protection agreements.”

For the United States, the first of these agreements was with El Salvador. Signed in 1995, it applies import restrictions on pre-Hispanic archaeological objects originating in El Salvador. Beyond that, the agreement addresses long-term initiatives that both countries agree must be pursued. These initiatives include technical assistance in cultural resource management and security to El Salvador; the encouragement of academic and nongovernmental institutions and other organizations to cooperate in the interchange of knowledge and information about the cultural patrimony of El Salvador; a pledge by El Salvador to expedite the registration of cultural property in public and private collections and to initiate programs to educate the public about its laws and the importance of protecting archaeological sites; a pledge to rebuild El Salvador’s national museum, destroyed by earthquake; and, finally, a pledge to strengthen cooperation within Central America for the protection of the cultural patrimony of the region. There is no question that in only a few years, this agreement has been exceedingly successful in all its aspects.

The agreement with El Salvador demonstrates that a cultural property agreement is not solely a means for restricting the flow of cultural objects across international borders. It is also a gateway to strategic planning and to initiatives that protect cultural resources.

Toward that end, the U.S. Cultural Property Advisory Committee has developed guidelines for long-term strategic planning for use by prospective requesting countries. These guidelines provide an opportunity for a requesting country to initiate a self-assessment of what it has or has not done to establish sustainable cultural resource management. The guidelines emphasize public education, conservation, research, and the development of a national museum system, as well as of regional and local museums. They are meant to encourage planning and initiatives to inform the committee about the level of commitment of the requesting country to protect its cultural patrimony. This document will stimulate the search for enlightened approaches to the protection of cultural property—and will also, no doubt, focus attention on accountability.

In 1996 the Getty Conservation Institute hosted a historic meeting in Los Angeles of the Cultural Property Advisory Committee and ministers of culture from Central American countries to learn of regional initiatives under way and to stress the importance of full participation by Central America within the Unesco convention framework. Among the Central American countries, consensus emerged that they should work with the United States to restrict the unauthorized flow of cultural objects across boundaries; that public education is essential to foster a change in the national attitude toward protection of cultural patrimony; that linkage with environmental protection is vital; that cultural resources are a sustainable economic asset; and that, as in the case of Sipán, Peru, the past represents the future.

We are increasingly confronted with the reality that laws are not the ultimate solution to the problem of pillage and illicit trade. They are, however, a vital tool that supports a change in the way we perceive the importance of our cultural heritage and in how we, the living stewards of our nonrenewable past, care for it.

Maria Papageorge Kouropoubas is executive director of the Cultural Property Advisory Committee, administered by the United States Information Agency. This article is based on a presentation she gave at the Getty Conservation Institute in observance of International Museum Day in 1997.
**Marta de la Torre:** As an archaeologist of great experience and a former director general of antiquities of Turkey, you have seen the impact of the international market in antiquities on the archaeological record. Can you speak about the impact of this demand in countries such as Turkey?

**Engin Özgen:** The increased demand by the international art market for Turkish antiquities ignited the organized looting and destruction of the archaeological record of our country, just as is the case in all art-rich countries, especially in the Mediterranean region. Turkey’s vast archaeological heritage is threatened by local people who act as agents of art dealers. According to the Turkish Financial Police and gendarmerie, there are over one thousand archaeology and art-related crimes yearly. You can easily guess the possible number of unrecorded cases.

*In the fight against the illicit traffic of antiquities, is the main concern the loss of valuable objects to the nation, or is it the protection of the integrity of the archaeological record?*

I would say both. A nation’s archaeological property is essential to gaining a correct understanding of its historical past and culture, and is the foundation upon which its culture can grow and advance. It is crucial, therefore, to properly preserve it and to make it accessible to the public. The archaeological record, on the other hand, is also very important. We have to maintain its integrity if we are to study it and understand it.

*Realistically, what can countries do to protect their archaeological heritage in the face of the great demand for objects and the high prices they fetch in the art market?*

Our country has always been a cultural bridge between East and West, and our land holds the remains of over 30 civilizations. The demand for ancient objects began to affect Turkey in the early 19th century. Many travelers, attracted by their love for Greek and Roman antiquities, located ancient sites, discovered hitherto-unknown cultures, and took away the objects they found—carrying off even architectural monuments. This was the beginning of the irreparable destruction of ancient sites in Turkey.

During the five years I was the director general of Monuments and Museums, I tried to complete the archaeological map of Turkey by pinpointing ancient sites in order to protect them. This proved an impossible task because of the size of the country, inadequate financial resources, and a lack of sufficiently trained people and appropriate equipment.

The approach that Turkey has taken, in light of the difficulties of patrolling all our sites, has been to fight the battle in the legal arena outside of Turkey, as a way of dissuading those who would acquire objects. We have been successful in the United States, mainly because we have been dealing in and out of the courts with private entities such as collectors and museums. In other countries, the recovery of Turkish antiquities found in state museums has been more difficult; government bureaucracies can create insurmountable obstacles. Our longtime friend and neighbor Greece and other Mediterranean countries also suffer immensely from the constant looting of their cultural heritage. It is a relief to see that our Greek colleagues, too, have started to benefit from the Turkish experience and have successfully retrieved the Mycenaean artifacts taken from Mycenae.

*What have these legal initiatives contributed to the fight against illicit traffic?*

The coverage that U.S. trials and negotiations have received in the international media has been very helpful. We have sent a very important message to would-be buyers...
of Turkish antiquities—the government of Turkey is willing to spend time and money to get its cultural heritage back. I believe collectors and museums now think twice before acquiring an object that could have been exported illegally from Turkey. You see, even private collectors will bring the objects out into the open sooner or later, and the Turkish government will go to court for them. The media attention has also brought good results inside our country. When the Lydian treasure was returned to Turkey in 1993, the local press and TV covered the news extensively. Our own citizens now realize the importance of these objects because the government was ready to go to great trouble to bring them back. Since then, the number of objects found by chance by villagers and turned over to museums has more than doubled.

Do you see a time when illicit traffic will cease to exist?

I do not believe that any country will ever be able to end all the smuggling of antiquities, but we must try to slow it down and minimize the destruction of our heritage at the hands of the looters. International conventions—such as the 1970 Unesco Convention on the Means of Prohibiting the Illicit Import, Export, and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property—may create disincentives to the illegal export of cultural heritage and, in some instances, the means to get objects back. However, until today, none of them has proved very effective in curbing the illicit traffic of antiquities.

What measures can be taken by a country like Turkey, with long borders and great archaeological richness?

Based on my experience, I believe that the main solutions will have to be found inside our country. We have to start by having all relevant Turkish organizations collaborate inside our borders and, more importantly, by intensifying the education of our people.

It is not realistic to expect that we can recover, or even attempt to recover, every archaeological object that has left Turkey illegally, but we must do our best to keep such objects from leaving the country. We have to protect what we have within our borders. To do this, we need to strengthen our own institutions and networks. In Turkey, we have over 180 museums, and we have archaeology and art history departments in 16 universities, but we still need more people, especially politicians, dedicated to protection of the cultural heritage. Unfortunately, the majority of archaeologists who have graduated from our universities have no opportunity for employment in their field of study. Since 1988 there have been no new positions for archaeologists; our own national institutions must create new jobs. In addition, as our efforts to protect cultural properties have increased, the budget of the Ministry of Culture has declined—a situation that has created the main obstacle to our projects.

You mentioned the 1970 Unesco Convention. This convention is now almost 30 years old. In your view, how effective has this agreement been?

The Unesco Convention certainly has been a positive factor and has helped create an awareness of the magnitude of the problem worldwide. It was an important step forward, insofar as it laid the foundations for an international law on cultural property and set out certain values and principles. But actual implementation is more difficult. Unfortunately, only 86 countries have ratified the convention, and of these, few are among the main importing countries. The United States signed it years ago, but France, for example, did so only last year. Other countries in which the market of antiquities is very active—such as Germany, Austria, and Belgium—still have not adopted it.

There is a new initiative, the UNIDROIT Convention adopted in Rome in June 1995. What impact do you think the UNIDROIT agreement will have on illicit traffic?

The International Institute for the Unification of Private Law (UNIDROIT) worked for six years to develop a new convention that aimed to complement the 1970 Unesco Convention. The UNIDROIT Convention, however, has not received support from all countries. The Turkish point of view—which is shared by many of the so-called “exporting” countries, including Greece—is that it presents some disadvantages for us, since, for example, for the first time it spells out that the country of origin of the objects should provide compensation to the buyers—even if the objects were taken out of the country illegally.

There are very strong arguments to support the presence of archaeological objects in museums around the world. How do you think we can address this in the future in a manner that doesn’t encourage looting of sites and illicit traffic?

There are many legitimate ways that ancient cultures can be represented and enjoyed around the world through their objects. Besides traveling exhibitions, there are exchanges of collections between museums or nations or long-term loans. All major art-rich countries have duplicate collections that are kept in reserve. These objects could be loaned or exchanged between institutions.

At this time, there are practical barriers to these solutions. In Turkey, for example, there is legislation that states that no object from our antiquities collections can be on loan outside the country for more than a year in the same country. During my years as director general, we tried hard to change that legislation, but bureaucratic structures are difficult to modify, let alone change. I am convinced that we are moving toward finding these solutions, but everyone concerned with ancient objects has to be part of the solutions. No one country or institution can do it alone.

If we do prove to be unsuccessful in our battle to stop illicit trade and the destruction of our cultural heritage, then we should ask ourselves the inevitable question—is there a future for the past in Turkey?
THE STEALING OF ART IN BULK IS A CRIME for which history provides numerous examples, the most notorious being Napoleon’s collection of loot during his campaigns or Hitler’s systematic acquisition of “Aryan” artworks for his showpiece museum at Linz. But the motivation for these confirmations of the old adage “to the victor go the spoils” differs markedly from the impetus behind today’s eruption of art theft—namely, filthy lucre.

It is commonly accepted by all concerned with stemming the trade in stolen art that the rise in art theft over the last 10 years mirrors the tremendous rise in art-market prices, particularly in the area of Impressionist paintings. While banking authorities are ever more vigilant in tracing the movement of funds and cash, the art thief can move art and antiques with relative ease across international borders. Those involved in terrorism and drug-related crimes now use art as a currency, replacing diamonds and bullion. It came as no surprise to learn that one of the underworld characters behind the great 1986 theft of paintings from the Irish home of Sir Alfred Beit wanted to set himself up as a major cocaine importer into the British Isles, and that one of the subsequent handlers of the paintings was a member of an outlawed paramilitary group in Northern Ireland. Art theft is regarded as the third-most-lucrative international crime, after drugs and arms running.

An International Database

Until the formation of an international database of stolen works of art, statistics on art theft were hard to come by. This was due in part to the lack of priority given to art theft by law enforcement agencies, whose budgets are necessarily directed first toward other higher-priority crimes such as terrorism, murder, and fraud, and also due to the dearth of insurance company records on art and antique losses. Unlike a stolen car, for which the chassis number acts as a unique identifying code, art and antiques are much harder to describe. In the past, many insurers did not single out losses of art and antiques on insurance schedules or specifically identify claims they paid as the result of theft; this practice rendered available figures on art theft unreliable.

Losses have often not been reported because descriptions of the objects were inadequate, and photographs were not available. In the absence of a photograph, how does one describe a stolen piece of art? The Getty Information Institute spent five years answering this question and in 1997 launched Object ID in Amsterdam (see sidebar). Object ID has transformed the protection and detection of cultural objects by providing an internationally accepted minimum standard for the identification of art and antiques.

Prior to the formation of the Art Loss Register, there was no internationally recognized computerized database of stolen works of art accessible to the general public, although police agencies in certain countries (in particular, the United States, Canada, France, and Italy) had compiled, as had Interpol, databases of cultural thefts, mainly from within their own borders. Art theft, however, is an international crime, demanding an international response based on an information network that transcends national boundaries. With this fact in mind, the Register was established in 1990 by organizations in the art trade, Sotheby’s and Christie’s among them, and by insurance companies, including Lloyds of London and Nord stern.

The aims of the company are threefold: deter theft, recover stolen art, and reduce the trade in stolen art. Since its formation, 100,000 items have been recorded on the database, most logged with digital images; 30,000 of these listings were acquired from the International Foundation for Art Research (IFAR) in New York,
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which also became a shareholder. Approximately one thousand new items are added monthly. Reports are received from insurance companies; loss adjusters and appraisers; police agencies, including Interpol; and museums, galleries, and private individuals. The Art Loss Register records only stolen items, items missing as a result of armed conflict, and items thought to have been destroyed but for which there remains some question regarding their status. No criminal data are held on the database; instead, it includes only descriptions of the objects, information about the owners; insurance details; and police crime reference numbers assigned by investigating officers. The Register maintains offices in London, New York, Düsseldorf, and Perth, Australia. An office will open in St. Petersburg, Russia, in 1998 under the auspices of the St. Petersburg International Center for Preservation, of which the Getty Conservation Institute is a founding partner (see p. 14).

Types of Art Theft

Theft involving artworks can be divided into five main categories. It is the headline-grabbing category of ransom that fuels the curiosity of the public and the pens of newspaper editors and crime writers. Edvard Munch's The Scream, stolen during the 1994 Lillehammer Winter Olympics, falls into this category. Valued at between $40 and $50 million, The Scream was stolen by a gang of drug dealers and other criminals. While the robbery is well known, what is less well known is that the ransom demand made to the Norwegian government was just $22,000.

A second category involves stolen art sold very quickly for a fraction of its value. In this instance, the police often apprehend the thief or handler when an attempt is made to sell the item on the market.

Another category involves stolen art that is warehoused. This practice applies in particular to spectacular pieces of art that are impossible to sell on the open market and are stored away until the statute of limitations has expired; such statutes vary from country to country and, in the United States, from state to state. For example, in the case of the Old Master paintings, including Rembrandt's only known seascape, stolen in the notorious 1990 heist at Boston's Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum, the federal statute of limitations has run out, and the state statute of limitations on the theft itself will end soon.

Less common is the category of theft for personal enjoyment. This, for instance, was the reason used by the defendant charged with stealing Caspar David Friedrich's 1815 painting Harbour, stolen in Potsdam in 1996.

Last, there is theft for the purpose of making a personal or ideological statement. Examples here are legion—from the disgruntled Englishman who stole Goya's Portrait of Wellington from the Dulwich picture gallery in the early 1960s, in protest against having to pay his television license fee, to the stealing of symbols of cultural identity by both sides in the Balkan conflict, to the theft (and in some cases destruction or forced sale) of “degenerate” art during the Second World War.

Checking with an internationally recognized database such as the Art Loss Register is now considered due diligence by a prospective purchaser or lender. Some major museums in the United States routinely check acquisitions against the Register to determine title. Forty-six percent of recoveries stem from this checking process, while 40 percent occur through the systematic screening of auction house catalogues worldwide. Both routine and catalogue screening recoveries highlight the international character of art theft. In December 1993, a small painting by

By Sarah Jackson
Flemish artist Petrus Christus of *Christ as the Man of Sorrows* was stolen from Birmingham City Art Gallery. Because it was snatched off the wall during daylight hours, most presumed that the theft was the work of an opportunist thief. The painting was recovered four months later in Switzerland by police officers alerted by the Art Loss Register; the Register had checked the artwork's origins for an inquiring dealer. Later it became clear that money from the sale of the painting (worth about $440,000) had been intended to finance drug deals in South America.

In another example, a fine view of Constantinople by Russian artist Constantin Aivazovsky was identified in 1996 at a London salesroom, where it had been entered for sale by a dealer. The painting had been bought at auction in Helsinki after having been stolen in 1992 from the Sochi Museum in the Russian city of Sochi on the Black Sea. Similarly, a Renoir floral study of anemones, stolen in London in 1993, was spotted in a catalogue for a small auction house in Belgium. Recently, a valuable silver coffeepot made by renowned Huguenot silversmith Paul de Lamerie turned up in New York six years after its theft in Yorkshire, England. Time is proving no barrier to recovery. In September 1997, for instance, a Florida-based dealer prudently checked a still life of peaches by Edouard Manet against the database to discover that it had been stolen in New York City 20 years earlier.

The banking community is a recent convert to the use of art databases in the fight against art crime. Great care may be taken by a bank before it issues a mortgage on a property, but until now, banks and other financial institutions have paid scant attention to the numerous artworks used as collateral for loans. Before a loan is issued, a quick check against the Art Loss Register's database can significantly reduce the chance of money being lent against an object for which the borrower may not be the true owner. Once the loan is made, the lender may report the artwork—now collateral—to the Art Loss Register's Collateral File. If the borrower has meanwhile kept possession of the artwork and tries to dispose of it on the art market, registration on the Collateral File will alert the lender to any unauthorized attempt at sale. The Art Loss Register has a list of one thousand paintings, with a total value of $1.4 billion, held as collateral against bad debts; current jitters in the Far East financial markets are likely to lead additional financial institutions to request provenance clearance as they begin to sell some of their art holdings.

There would seem to be no limit to human ingenuity when it comes to the theft of cultural objects. Joe Keenan, the former New York City detective who became well known for his investigations into art theft, has said “art galleries often have more money hanging on their walls than a bank has in its cash drawers. Even department stores frequently have better security measures for controlling people trying on new clothes than galleries do [for their artworks].”

Whatever the motivation behind the theft of art—be it for ransom or for the purchase of arms or simply for instant cash—all art thefts have one thing in common: greed. But greed can be fought. By pooling information, tightening up and unifying legislation, insisting on due diligence, and improving awareness about item identification, all those concerned with protecting cultural heritage have a greater chance of success than has the thief.

*Sarah Jackson is senior art historian with the Art Loss Register in London.*
The Getty Information Institute and its project partners—Unesco, the United States Information Agency, the International Council of Museums, the Council of Europe, and the Getty Conservation Institute—have developed a new standard for the identification of works of art and artifacts. Called Object ID, the standard is intended to allow essential data about stolen art to be transmitted quickly among collectors, cultural institutions, law enforcement and insurance agencies, customs bureaus, and art dealers. Previously, no standardized agreement on documenting cultural objects for the purpose of identification existed.

Based on consultations and worldwide surveys of more than one thousand organizations in 84 countries, Object ID specifies 10 categories of information, including documentation of the artwork by photograph or drawing. Other categories include type of object, materials and techniques, measurements, and distinguishing features.

To help curators and collectors put the new standard into practice, the Getty Information Institute has released an eight-minute video and a page guide (“Object ID Checklist”). The checklist provides step-by-step documentation instructions. The Information Institute has also published Protecting Cultural Objects in the Global Information Society, a report that describes Object ID as well as other efforts to halt the illicit trade in cultural artifacts. Along with the GCI, it is copublishing an additional resource, a guide to photographing cultural objects.

For free copies of the video, checklist, or report, write:

The Getty Information Institute
1200 Getty Center Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90049 USA
or e-mail: objectid@getty.edu

OBJECT ID CHECKLIST

☐ **Take Photographs**

Photographs are of vital importance in identifying and recovering stolen objects. In addition to overall views, take close-ups of inscriptions, markings, and any damage or repairs. If possible, include a scale or object of known size in the image.

☐ **Answer these questions:**

**Type of Object**

What kind of object is it (e.g., painting, sculpture, clock, mask)?

**Materials & Techniques**

What materials is the object made of (e.g., brass, wood, oil on canvas)?

How was it made (e.g., carved, cast, etched)?

**Measurements**

What is the size and/or weight of the object? Specify which unit of measurement is being used (e.g., cm., in.) and to which dimension the measurement refers (e.g., height, width, depth).

**Inscriptions & Markings**

Are there any identifying markings, numbers, or inscriptions on the object (e.g., a signature, dedication, title, maker’s marks, purity marks, property marks)?

**Distinguishing Features**

Does the object have any physical characteristics that could help to identify it (e.g., damage, repairs, or manufacturing defects)?

**Title**

Does the object have a title by which it is known and might be identified (e.g., *The Scream*)?

**Subject**

What is pictured or represented (e.g., landscape, battle, woman holding child)?

**Date or Period**

When was the object made (e.g., 1893, early 17th century, Late Bronze Age)?

**Maker**

Do you know who made the object? This may be the name of a known individual (e.g., Thomas Tompion), a company (e.g., Tiffany), or a cultural group (e.g., Hopi).

☐ **Write a short description**

This can also include any additional information which helps to identify the object (e.g., color and shape of the object, where it was made).

☐ **Keep it secure**

Having documented the object, keep this information in a secure place.
RESPONDING TO THE URGENT NEED for sustainable solutions to protect cultural heritage in places undergoing radical change, the government of the Netherlands has joined the Getty Conservation Institute in partnerships in St. Petersburg, Russia, to initiate programs in cultural heritage conservation.

The latest partnership was announced by the Dutch state secretary for culture, Aad Nuis, on December 4, 1997, at the St. Petersburg International Center for Preservation in the historic Lavalle Palace, also home to the Russian State Historical Archives. Secretary Nuis explained that the Netherlands will establish new communications programs at the Center to promote international exchanges and open access to information. This unique and unprecedented information resource is named the Nicolaas Witsen Information Facility in honor of the distinguished 17th-century Dutch scholar and Amsterdam mayor who forged strong and lasting ties between Russia and the Netherlands.

The partnership funds several new cultural initiatives: the first and exclusive office in Russia of the London-based Art Loss Register; a specialized preservation library of foreign and Russian reference sources; and an electronic communications system linking the Center and its constituent organizations to other international databases and libraries worldwide. The Dutch ambassador to Russia, de Vos van Steenwijk, noted that the partnership is supported by both the Ministry of Education, Culture, and Science and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, as part of an overall initiative to commemorate over three centuries of collaboration between the Netherlands and Russia.

The governor of St. Petersburg, Vladimir A. Yakovlev, participated in the signing ceremony to commemorate the announcement. He stated that "the St. Petersburg International Center for Preservation is the project for the 21st century—it will help us develop this city in a way that is respectful of its historic and cultural legacy. We are extremely proud to receive support for this program from Secretary Nuis, Ambassador de Vos van Steenwijk, and our many friends in the Netherlands."

Governor Yakovlev was joined by his deputy governor for culture, Professor Vladimir P. Yakovlev, who underscored the significance of the choice of St. Petersburg, the
cultural capital of Russia, as the location of the International Center for Preservation. He explained that the Center grew out of a partnership between the city, the Getty Conservation Institute, and the Russian Academy of Sciences. The new partnership with the Dutch strengthens the Center by providing funds to establish its Internet Web site and international databases.

The Center has been designated by the governor as a coordinating institution for St. Petersburg 2003—a celebration of the city's 300th birthday year.

A unique feature of the Nicolaas Witsen Information Facility is the Art Loss Register, an international computerized database of stolen and missing works of art, manuscripts, books, antiques, and other cultural treasures (see p. 10). Richard Crewdson, a board member of the Art Loss Register, observed that “the Register helps law enforcement agencies, insurance companies, cultural institutions, and private individuals identify and recover stolen works. . . . We expect to have a strong impact on the recovery of missing art from institutions and collections in Russia and throughout the Commonwealth of Independent States.”

The St. Petersburg International Center will work closely with cultural institutions throughout Russia and with the Register’s offices in London, New York, Perth, and Düsseldorf, to assist Interpol-Moscow and other international law enforcement agencies to document and recover missing works of art. The placement of the Art Loss Register at the St. Petersburg International Center has been the result of collaboration between experts involved in the Center’s security programs and James Emson, managing director of the Art Loss Register. The Center’s security programs are carried out under the guidance of Wilbur Faulk, Getty Trust security director, and Oleg Boev, Hermitage Museum security director.

The Getty Conservation Institute has been the principal foreign partner in the Center’s development. According to GCI Director Miguel Angel Corzo, “It is our objective at the Getty to build strong and sustainable alliances for the cultural heritage. As our Russian and Dutch partners understand so well, we must pool our resources if we are to have any hope of making serious progress in protecting our world heritage.”

This is the second commitment made to the Center by the Dutch. In June 1997, the Dutch government established the Peter the Great Trust Fund to support educational programs in conservation, also in partnership with the GCI. The Center’s November 1997 “Art in Transit” seminar was organized with support from the Trust Fund, the GCI, and the Hermitage/Unesco/Dutch Fund in Trust. The seminar was cochaired by M. Kirby Talley, executive counselor to the Ministry of Education, Science, and Culture, the Netherlands; and by Ross Merrill, chief of conservation, and Mervin Richard, deputy chief of conservation, both of the National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C. The seminar covered state-of-the-art methods of packing and shipping works of art which are designed to ensure conservation and protection of objects. Participating were staff from the Hermitage Museum, the Russian State Museum, Peterhof, Tsarkoe Selo, Pavlovsk, Gatchina, the Russian Academy of Fine Arts, the Peter and Paul Fortress, the Central Naval Museum, the Museum of Artillery, the Museum of the History of Religion, the Zoological Museum, the State Tretyakov Gallery, the Pushkin State Museum, the State Historical Museum, the Russian National Library, the Library of the Russian Academy of Sciences, the Russian State Historical Archives, and the Hepry Packing Company. Didactic materials in English and Russian were provided by Mr. Merrill and Mr. Richard.

The Nicolaas Witsen Information Facility is expected to become operational in the coming months, after cables are laid and communications capabilities are assured. The Art Loss Register is slated for use during 1998. The Center’s educational activities will continue in existing program areas, such as security, theft, collections management, and preventive conservation, and in new program areas, such as porcelain conservation, textile conservation, cultural heritage tourism management, and conservation science. A public lecture series begins in May 1998.

*Jane Siena Talley is head of institutional relations for the GCI and president of the St. Petersburg International Center for Preservation.*
International Conference in Benin

The Getty Conservation Institute co-organized “Past, Present, and Future of the Royal Palaces and Sites of Abomey,” an international conference in Abomey, Benin. The purpose of the conference, held September 22 through 26, 1997, was to discuss recent conservation work at the Royal Palaces of Abomey and to propose measures that can be taken locally and nationally to ensure the continued preservation of such sites for future generations. Attending were specialists from 11 countries—Benin, Cameroon, Mali, Niger, Senegal, Togo, France, Belgium, Italy, the United Kingdom, and the United States—experienced in dealing with the complex issues involved in the management of Africa’s cultural heritage sites.

The GCI and the West African Republic of Benin’s Department of Cultural Patrimony began working together in 1993 to conserve 50 seriously damaged bas-relief panels that once adorned the Salle des Bijoux (Hall of Jewels), now part of the Historic Museum at the Royal Palaces of Abomey. The reliefs are thought to be the oldest surviving elements of the Royal Palaces, a group of earthen structures built by the Fon people between the mid-17th and late 19th century. The project systematically documented and preserved the polychrome earthen panels, which depict battle scenes and allegorical symbols of the power of the kings of Dahomey. The project also provided local Benin staff with training in conservation, photographic documentation, and long-term care of the bas-reliefs.

The Benin conference marked the completion not only of the bas-relief conservation project but also of an architectural and museological project in Abomey of the Rome-based International Center for the Preservation of Cultural Property/Prevention in Museums in Africa (known as ICCROM-PREMA) working with the International Center for Research of Earthen Architecture in the School of Architecture, Grenoble. A collaboration of the GCI, ICCROM, and the Ministry of Culture and Communication of Benin, Department of Cultural Patrimony, the conference addressed issues of site management useful to managers of sites similar to the Royal Palaces of Abomey in neighboring West African countries. Providing support to the conference were the Italian Ministry for Foreign Affairs and Unesco’s World Heritage Center.

In October 1997, Federico Mayor, director general of Unesco, honored Miguel Angel Corzo, director of the Getty Conservation Institute, with a Unesco Medal in recognition of Mr. Corzo’s distinguished career devoted to the arts and culture.

Previous recipients of this award include Nelson Mandela, King Juan Carlos of Spain, musician Lord Yehudi Menuhin, and Vaclav Havel, president of the Czech Republic. Mr. Corzo received the medal at Unesco headquarters in Paris during the opening of Unesco’s General Assembly, which brings together ministers of culture and distinguished personalities in the arts and humanities from member states.

“The Medal for Patrons of the Arts is awarded in recognition of Miguel Angel Corzo’s lifelong international activities on behalf of the arts,” commented Mr. Mayor, “and the success he has met in the diffusion, preservation, and conservation of the world’s cultural heritage.”

“There is a long tradition of giving awards for heroism and for athletic and scientific achievement,” observed Mr. Corzo. “This is an award for the arts and for preserving cultural heritage. I am honored to receive this medal and pleased that it will help raise awareness of the urgent global need for cultural heritage conservation.”
Latin American Consortium for Preventive Conservation Training

Over the course of its 15-year history, the Getty Conservation Institute has undertaken a number of collaborative projects with national and regional conservation organizations in Latin America. One of these projects, a training course entitled “Conservación preventiva: Colecciones del museo y su medio ambiente,” was offered in November 1995 in cooperation with Mexico’s Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia (INAH).

Seeking effective and sustainable means to contribute to the development of preventive conservation training and practice in the region, the GCI last year invited representatives of seven Latin American training institutions to discuss the possibility of collaborating on the development of preventive conservation training in the region. When they met in Los Angeles from October 13 to 17, 1997, the training institutions and the GCI agreed to formalize the partnership as the Latin American Consortium for Preventive Conservation Training.

During the meeting, the goals, interests, and working strategies were defined by representatives of each institution. The following areas, which were identified as needing additional training support, were selected for the work of the consortium:

- The museum building and its effect on the collection environment
- Emergency planning and preparedness
- Pollution and its effect on museum collections
- Pest management
- Exhibition, storage, and transport
- Technician training

Development of training in these areas will be carried out by working groups composed of several institutions with particular interest or experience in the topic. Each working group will be overseen by one member institution, which will coordinate the work of the group. Each group will collaborate on the development of training curricula and/or didactic materials. In the coming year, the working groups will further refine their work plans and begin pooling existing information and materials. As a result of this exchange and the development of regional teaching resources, the consortium will function as an important network of preventive conservation training specialists.

Members of the consortium will use the Internet as the primary communications link, creating an electronic community of educators. A central Web site designed to support and advance the goals of this project will facilitate exchange among the participating institutions.

Through its experience in preventive conservation—which includes research on controlling the museum environment, as well as training—the GCI will contribute to a number of consortium projects. The curricula and teaching materials of the GCI courses in preventive conservation will serve as a resource for the working groups; it is also expected that consortium members will create teaching materials, develop new educational strategies, and use new media. The GCI will take an active role in exploring new teaching strategies and technologies with the consortium and will provide opportunities for consortium members to meet on a regular basis.

All the consortium members believe that a network of teaching institutions with pooled resources is an important model for conservation education. This type of collaborative network, formed with specific goals in mind, will bring about significant advancements for the training of the conservator of the 21st century.

The Latin American Consortium for Preventive Conservation Training includes the following institutions:

- Centro de Conservação e Restauração Bens Culturais Móveis (CECOR), Brazil
- Centro Nacional de Conservación y Restauración, Chile
- Escuela de Arte, Pontificia Universidad Católica, Chile
- Instituto Colombiano de Cultura (COLCULTURA), Colombia
- Fundación Universidad Externado, Colombia
- Centro Nacional de Conservación, Restauración y Museografía (INAH), Mexico
- The Getty Conservation Institute, United States
Increasingly over the past 20 years, important cultural information has been recorded in digital form. However, the media used to store data can deteriorate within a decade, and computers and programs that read the data are likely to be obsolete in half that time.

This potential crisis poses two questions for the programs of the Getty: what are the best practices for capturing and storing cultural information, and what can we recommend as recording methods and media for use around the world?

The Getty Conservation Institute, the Getty Information Institute, and the Long Now Foundation of San Francisco are collaborating on a multiyear project to highlight the problems of preserving information in digital form and to consider possible solutions. After a year of background research, position papers, and online discussions, the project held its first major meeting February 8-10, 1998, at the Getty Center.

The meeting was designed to articulate the central problem and to clarify its current reach. The group, which included prominent individuals in the world of new media, began with the assumption that the problem can and must be solved. In the words of Stewart Brand of the Long Now Foundation, “Culture should be able to count on the continuity of digit-arrays as much as on stone arrays.” The group agreed that instead of one problem, there are many, and that any solution is likely to have several components.

During two days of discussion, participants considered market forces that might contribute to the persistence or diminution of the problems, societal forces and trends, the unreasonably high expectations for the technology, the dearth of standards, and the speed of change in technology and culture. They set an agenda for research and discussed criteria to which solutions would need to conform. They also explored the ways in which this collaborative effort should proceed to effect the changes needed.

On the afternoon of February 10, the organizers invited press, local experts and interested professionals, Getty staff, and the general public for a briefing with the panel, moderated by Stewart Brand. Margaret Mac Lean of the Conservation Institute gave an example that demonstrated the importance of this issue: “The bright sides of the new technologies are many, and very exciting. On the darker side, a Buddhist monk in Korea is transcribing unique religious texts from wooden tablets into electronic form. He is thinking that this is the safe way to keep this ancient library safe. He assumes that someone is handling the problems of survival of the digital records. That isn’t happening.” Ben Davis of the Information Institute noted that “the new Getty Center has hosted this meeting for a very good reason. Digital technology has become so pervasive in the creation and preservation of human expression that long-term responsibility for its use is inherent in any new endeavor in the arts and humanities.” A lively discussion ensued with the audience, and plans began to take shape for the follow-up from this meeting and for the next meeting in the series.

The public is invited to follow the progress of this important effort by visiting its Web site [www.geti.getty.edu/timeandbits] and by joining in the discussion online.

**Meeting Participants**

**Stewart Brand**

**Margaret Mac Lean**
Co-organizer; anthropologist/archaeologist, Special Initiatives, the Getty Conservation Institute

**Ben Davis**
Co-organizer; electronic communications expert, artist, writer, Program Manager, Communications, the Getty Information Institute

**Howard Besser**
Adjunct associate professor in the School of Information Management and Systems at the University of California, Berkeley; coauthor of the meeting background paper

**Doug Carlston**
Cofounder and CEO of Broderbund Software

**Brian Eno**
Musician, artist, producer, philosopher

**Danny Hillis**
Developer of parallel processing; VP, Research and Development, the Walt Disney Company

**Brewster Kahle**
Inventor of the Wide Area Information Servers system (WAIS); now heads the Internet Archive

**Kevin Kelly**
Executive editor, Wired magazine; author of Out of Control (1994)

**Jaron Lanier**
Pioneered virtual reality; computer scientist, musician

**Peter Lyman**
University librarian and professor in the School of Information Management and Systems at the University of California, Berkeley; coauthor of the meeting background paper
Arising out of the GCI’s long-term involvement in China, the first in a series of workshops to develop a set of principles for conservation and management of cultural sites was held in Australia February 1–16, 1998. The project is a collaboration between the GCI, the Australian Heritage Commission, and the National Administration for Cultural Heritage (NACH) in China. The aim of the workshop, which was preceded by extensive discussions in Australia and China in October 1997, was to further clarify the principles of heritage conservation promulgated in the Burra Charter of ICOMOS Australia and to witness its practice by Australian professionals.

Participating in the workshop were 12 Chinese professionals representing the NACH, the China National Institute for Cultural Property, and the directors of provincial cultural heritage bureaus and of the nationally important cultural sites of the Mogao grottoes and the Chengde Imperial Summer Resort. The team, which will guide the development and dissemination of the conservation principles, was led by Zhang Bai, deputy director of NACH. “The workshop was a great success,” he said. “Through the process, senior Chinese heritage officials became familiar with conservation policies and the operation of the Burra Charter in Australia. We also learned that it is important for conservation specialists to exchange ideas and experiences in considering their own country’s situation. I believe that we have strengthened the foundation of our collaboration and that our project will be fruitful.”

The workshop was structured around visits to historic sites and buildings in the Sydney and Canberra area that reflect a wide range of heritage values and approaches to conservation, interpretation, and use of heritage sites. Discussions centered on how the conservation principles and planning process advocated in the Burra Charter have been applied to these heritage places. A draft outline of conservation principles produced by the Chinese team was reviewed and revised in light of their experiences and discussions in Australia. The draft will serve as the basis for further development of the principles by the Chinese team in the coming months. A second workshop in China in late summer will review and finalize a draft document. The draft principles will be validated in a third workshop through the development of a conservation plan for a major cultural site in China.

Based on some one hundred selected sites across China, the outcome of the project will be a document and an illustrated book, in Chinese and English versions, that will disseminate the principles of good conservation practice to a wide audience of professionals and site managers throughout China.
The World Bank and the J. Paul Getty Trust have agreed to an operational partnership to sustain cultural heritage in developing countries—to support access to, conservation of, and education about cultural heritage.

The agreement—signed at the Getty Center in Los Angeles in October 1997 by James D. Wolfensohn, president of the World Bank, and Harold M. Williams, then-president and CEO of the Getty Trust—reflects the World Bank’s growing interest in the cultural field and its increasing efforts with a number of institutions to integrate cultural heritage as a force in promoting sustainable development. For the Getty, the partnership continues a long-standing commitment to forging broad alliances on a global scale—in conservation, education, scholarship, information technology, and museology.

"In every country I have visited," said Mr. Wolfensohn, "I have seen the importance of a sense of history and a link to the past. For real development to occur, it should be grounded in the culture of the people—drawing strength from their history. I am proud that the Bank and the Getty can help people preserve and pass on their heritage."

"We have always worked in close collaboration with other organizations around the world," said Mr. Williams. "Now, by combining the experience and resources of our two organizations, the Getty–World Bank partnership will generate needed attention and support for some of the most important cultural heritage sites that are at risk."

The World Bank and the Getty Trust will strengthen their activities related to cultural heritage by working together to:

- identify specific operations and projects on which they can collaborate to protect and sustain cultural heritage—the Getty, for example, providing expertise to World Bank–assisted projects;
- jointly undertake pilot projects in cultural heritage and develop a research and evaluation agenda to assess the performance of these projects;
- develop the World Bank’s knowledge of current international standards of conservation and documentation practices and identify potential applications of Getty expertise;
- mobilize financial and institutional resources for these objectives.

The GCI Landmarks initiative began in late 1993 when the Institute asked eight young people from around Los Angeles to photograph designated heritage sites and their personal neighborhood landmarks and to comment on their significance. The result was a powerful collection of photographs and commentary that broadened the traditional definition of what constitutes a landmark. The success of the project’s exhibition and book, *Picture L.A.*, led the GCI to organize similar projects in other cities around the world, including Cape Town, Mumbai (Bombay), and Mexico City.


The GCI Landmarks projects have inspired other places to undertake their own picture projects. *Picture Salzburg* was initiated by the ACHI (Art Restoration for Cultural Heritage) Foundation, a nonprofit organization founded in 1991 by Francesca von Habsburg. The ACHI Foundation received support for the project from the Salzburg mayor’s office, Salzburger Sparkasse-Kulturfonds, and several local businesses. The project’s nine photographers, ages 9 through 18, were: Simon Gassner, Benjamin Gauss, Ruth Hezer, Laura Hochhäusl, Philippa Lovrek, Judith Rohrmoser, Goswin Rothenhal, Stefanie Wacht, and Marijes Winkelmeier. The exhibition was held at the Galerie der Stadt Salzburg, Muscns-pavillon, Mirabell Gardens, August 28 through September 14, 1997. The opening was hosted by the mayor of Salzburg and attended by over five hundred people. ACHI published a bilingual catalogue in conjunction with the exhibition.

*Picture Delaware*, currently under way, is a collaborative effort of the Winterthur/University of Delaware Program in Art Conservation, the Christina Cultural Arts Center, the Delaware Art Museum, the Delaware College of Art and Design, the Delaware Department of Public Instruction, Preservation Delaware, and the Rehoboth Art League. *Picture Delaware* will be exhibited at the Delaware Art Museum in October 1998.

An exhibition of images and videos from the Institute’s Landmarks projects was on display at Unesco headquarters in Paris in October 1997 on the occasion of the general assembly’s biennial meeting, the theme of which was youth. For the first time, photographs from all five GCI projects and *Picture Salzburg* were presented in a single exhibition. The *Picture Paris* youth, as well as Osofu Washington of *Picture L.A.*
and Jolene Martin of Picture Cape Town, were on hand. During the exhibition, Unesco passed a motion to adopt Landmarks into their global agenda for cultural heritage, expanding the reach of the GCI’s initiative.

Additional information on the projects can be found at the following Web sites:

- Picture Cape Town
  [http://www.picturecapetown.com](http://www.picturecapetown.com)
- Picture Mumbai
  [http://www.picturemumbai.com](http://www.picturemumbai.com)
- Picture L.A.
  [http://www.picturela.org](http://www.picturela.org)
- Picture Salzburg
  [http://www.picture.salzburg.or.at/picture/](http://www.picture.salzburg.or.at/picture/)

---

Monitoring at the J. Paul Getty Museum at the Getty Center has demonstrated that it is among the cleanest museums in the world with respect to gaseous and particulate pollutants. Extensive material testing by the GCI’s Museum Research Laboratory of materials proposed for use within the Museum ensured that no harmful gaseous pollutants would be emitted. Approximately eight hundred materials were tested, of which 12 percent (or about one hundred) failed. The materials that failed were rejected for use in galleries, storage areas, and display cases.

A major factor in the minimal infiltration of outdoor pollutants into the Museum is the heating, ventilation, and air-conditioning (HVAC) system selected for the Getty Center. The Center’s location—not only in a major metropolitan area but also above one of the main freeway corridors in the region—presents a challenge with respect to the infiltration of outdoor pollutants. The HVAC system filters air at least twice through particle and gaseous filters. The air is exchanged six times per hour and refiltered with each exchange.

In a collaborative project among the GCI, Getty Trust Facilities, and the Museum’s Decorative Art and Sculpture Conservation department, the indoor air quality of the Museum was monitored for 16 months prior to the Center’s public opening to confirm low levels of gaseous and particle pollution. Outdoor pollutants were measured at two HVAC air intakes and at two receiving galleries. In these galleries, the concentrations of indoor-generated pollutants were monitored. Once construction was completed, the indoor particulate concentrations measured were exceptionally low, comparable to some “clean room” environments used in sensitive manufacturing. The levels of gaseous pollutants were also low.

This important research project includes the evaluation of passive samplers commercially available in the United States and sampling devices developed by colleagues from the California Institute of Technology in Pasadena, the Netherlands Institute for Cultural Heritage in Amsterdam, Brookes University in Oxford, England, and the University of Strathclyde in Glasgow, Scotland. This is also the first thorough study of a new museum’s environment from construction and installation to opening and operation.

The Museum’s environment continues to be monitored. Even with the addition of the public presence in the galleries, it is anticipated that the levels of pollutants will remain low.
Rock Art Exhibit at Kennedy Center

The John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts in Washington, D.C., and the Getty Conservation Institute are co-organizing a photographic exhibition of African rock art at the Kennedy Center as part of the four-year African Odyssey festival. The exhibition, entitled The Painted Rocks of Africa—Other-World Visions of the Sun, will open on April 29, 1998. It is being curated by a leading authority on the rock art of southern Africa, Professor David Lewis-Williams of the Rock Art Heritage Centre, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa. The focus of the exhibition will be the rock art of the San people of southern Africa; however, the final module of the exhibition will broaden the scope to include rock art elsewhere in Africa and the world. An important message of the exhibition is the geographical ubiquity of rock art, as well as its continuity from ancient times to the present. The exhibition coincides with a conference in Washington, D.C., entitled African Renaissance, which will be attended by a number of prominent African leaders.

Picture Paris
Landmarks of a New Generation

Paris—one of the most photographed cities in the world—is viewed anew through the eyes of nine local youths who photographed what they consider to be their city’s distinctive landmarks. Classic sites such as the Eiffel Tower and the Pyramid at the Louvre are interspersed with personal images, such as a photographer’s mother over a traditional French breakfast.

The images, in combination with quotes from the young photographers, evoke ideas that challenge our conventional notions of landmarks and, at the same time, invite us to consider how we are marked by the communities in which we live.

The book contains a selection of provocative black-and-white prints culled from hundreds taken during the course of the project, along with short biographies and color images of each of the young photographers.

In 1993 the Getty Conservation Institute launched an international landmarks campaign with an exhibit of images by Los Angeles youths and an accompanying book on their hometown. The success of that undertaking prompted the GCI’s Landmarks initiative, which has included projects in Cape Town, Mumbai (Bombay), and Mexico City.

128 pages, 10¼ x 8¾ inches
9 color and 77 b/w illustrations

“I grew up in Paris. People who destroy, who don’t take care of Paris, destroy my memories and also my identity. To see the neighborhood where I grew up change would be like seeing a piece of my own history and of my childhood disappear.”
—Jérémie Garnier, age 18
From Picture Paris

La conservation des sites archéologiques dans la région méditerranéenne

Marta de la Torre, Editor

This is the French-language edition of The Conservation of Archaeological Sites in the Mediterranean Region, which reports on the proceedings of an international conference on the conservation of classical sites in the Mediterranean region organized by the GCI and the Getty Museum in May 1995. The book includes chapters presenting management issues at three sites—Piazza Armerina in Sicily, Knossos on Crete, and Ephesus in Turkey—which conference participants visited in order to examine how issues raised at these locales can illuminate the challenges of management and conservation faced by complex heritage sites the world over. Additional chapters discuss such topics as the management of cultural sites, the reconstruction of ancient buildings, and ways of presenting and interpreting sites for today’s visitors.

176 pages, 8½ x 11¾ inches
10 color and 100 b/w illustrations
ISBN 0-89236-487-4, paper, $50.00

To order these publications, or for further information, contact Getty Trust Publications at P.O. Box 49659, Los Angeles, California 90049-0659, USA, or call 800-223-3431 (U.S. or Canada) or 310-440-7333 (outside the U.S. or Canada).
Neville Agnew spent his early years in South Africa and studied at the University of Natal. There he earned degrees in chemistry and geology, followed by two years in London working on his Ph.D. He taught chemistry for 10 years at Rhodes University, but in the mid-1970s, dismayed by the strife engendered by South Africa’s apartheid system, he moved his family to Australia, taking a research position at the University of Queensland.

Since childhood, he’d been fascinated with nature and conservation, the result of safaris taken with his father to some of the last unspoiled areas in southern Africa. This, combined with his background in the sciences and his interest in museums, prompted him to apply for a job heading up the newly formed conservation department of the state’s Queensland Museum. Starting in 1980, he initiated conservation of the museum’s natural history, archaeological, and industrial collections. His work included the preservation of rock art, dinosaur fossil footprints, the wreck of an 18th-century British warship sent to capture the Bounty mutineers, and the ruins of a 19th-century penal colony.

In late 1986 he spent three months at the GCI researching adobe conservation. Over a year later he accepted the deputy directorship of the Institute’s scientific program, welcoming the opportunity to develop further his interests in conservation. He became scientific director in 1990 and then special projects director in 1991. In 1994 he was appointed associate director for programs.

Dr. Agnew has led many Institute conservation projects—the Mogao and Yungang Buddhist grottoes in China, the historic city center of Quito, Ecuador, and the Laetoli hominid trackway in Tanzania—and participates in research on adobe preservation and on-site preservation, working with the National Park Service (NPS) at Chaco Canyon, New Mexico, and on the GCI’s site reburial project. He heads the Institute’s publications department, writes for the GCI newsletter and other journals, and serves on the board of the National Center for Preservation Technology and Training of the NPS, the editorial board of the journal Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites, and the advisory board of Cornerstones, a preservation organization in New Mexico. During his 10 years with the GCI, he’s enjoyed being part of its evolution as an intellectual institution, exploring the philosophy and practice of conservation, particularly the relationship between cultural and environmental heritage.

Born and raised in Los Angeles, Jeffrey Levin attended college at UCLA, majoring in history while taking courses in literature, film, and playwriting as well. Before graduating, he took a break—first to travel in Europe and then to work in a congressional office in Washington, D.C. Following graduation, he was hired to help handle constituent and community relations in the office of Tom Bradley, the newly elected mayor of Los Angeles. After a two-year stint at L.A. City Hall, he moved to Boston to devote himself to writing. This pursuit continued when he returned to Los Angeles, and he worked in television for several years, part of the time writing for the ABC comedy Benson.

In 1984 he moved east again, this time to New York City, where he worked for a research center preparing a study on police policy commissioned by the U.S. Justice Department. This was followed by a job as a policy analyst with a New York State commission on trade and competitiveness in the office of Governor Mario Cuomo. There he drafted position papers and wrote portions of the Cuomo Commission Report, published in 1988. The following year he returned to Los Angeles, where he worked as a freelance writer for the “Opinion” section of the Los Angeles Times and for the Friends of the Arts of Mexico Foundation, among others. His projects at the foundation included a documentary on the rock art of Baja California and a public radio program on short stories from modern Mexico.

His association with the GCI began in 1991, when he was hired to write and edit the Institute’s newsletter on a regular basis. Other assignments included writing a documentary on the Nefertari project and editing the GCI book Picture L.A., which went on to win several awards. In 1995 he joined the Institute’s staff. While continuing as editor of the newsletter, he also serves as the GCI’s liaison with the Getty Trust’s Public Affairs department and is part of the team supervising the GCI’s Web site. In addition, he undertakes special assignments from the Institute’s director, such as writing the GCI’s new brochure. He enjoys being at the Institute, for it appeals to his omnivorous curiosity—and because the diversity of what he does now echoes the diversity of his working life prior to the GCI.
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