

Art Crime in Australia: A Market Analysis

by

Lisette Aarons

Duncan Chappell

Kenneth Polk

A paper presented at the Annual Australian and New Zealand Society of Criminology Conference, Gold Coast, Queensland, 10 July 1998

Art Crime in Australia: A Market Analysis

This paper is a report of research, in its initial phases, which examines the nature of the illegal art market in Australia. It follows the lead of Sutton (1998) in the UK, and Freiberg (1997) in Australia in making use of a market approach to the study of property crime. As it proceeds, the research, and this specific report, will address such questions as: What is the size and volume of the illegal art market in Australia? What is the shape of the market for illegal art, especially in contrast to other stolen property markets? What are the specific processes where illegal art is passed into the legitimate market for legal art? What is the place of Aboriginal art in the illegal art market of Australia? To what extent does the illegal art market in Australia function as part of an international market for illegal art? Finally, what does the analysis of the illegal art market suggest for general market models as a way of studying the movement of stolen property?

While the research being pursued calls for using a "market" approach in the study of art crime, there are a number of issues that have to be addressed if this is to be possible. The focus here requires that we identify the meaning of terms such as "art" and "art crime". Regarding the first of these, we will follow the lead of Conklin (1994: 2)) and define art as referring to "...the kinds of objects typically displayed in museums of fine arts," although he went on to point out that sources such as the International Foundation for Art Research use such sub-categories as fine arts (including paintings, photographs, prints, drawings, and sculptures), decorative arts, antiquities, ethnographic objects, oriental and Islamic art, and miscellaneous category which includes armour, books, coins and medals.

Conklin (1994:3) then goes on to define art crimes as "criminally punishable acts that involve works of art." There are three major forms of such crime that can be identified: various forms of fraud, including forgery; theft, and vandalism. For the purposes of the present discussion which takes a market approach, major attention will be given to the first two of these (fraud and theft), although some attention will be paid within the project to the problems of prevention posed by vandalism, especially in the major public galleries.

What follows represents what amounts to an early progress report of a research investigation in its earliest stages. To date roughly 20 interviews have been held with key informants in Adelaide, Canberra, Darwin and Melbourne. Most of these are individuals connected with small commercial galleries but information has also been obtained from police, from informants in large public galleries, and from informants with particular knowledge about the Aboriginal art market. These interviews have been conducted by Lisette Aarons, Duncan Chappell and Kenneth Polk. It is anticipated that the next phase of the research will be completed in between 12 to 18 months, although its size and scope will depend upon the availability of funds to support the research.

What is the Total Volume and Cost of Art Crime in Australia?

A first substantive issue to be addressed in this research is to obtain at least an estimate of the amount of illegal activity that is found in the art market in Australia. Certainly there are a number of problems which will be encountered in such an endeavour. Conklin (1994: 4) points out that many art crimes are never reported for such diverse reasons as public museums being reluctant to call attention either to the value or the vulnerability of their holdings, private collectors not wanting to alert professional thieves to the fact that their houses hold works of great worth, or in some cases the persons involved may have obtained these and other works through questionable or illegal practices which they want to conceal. As Blum puts the matter:

We face the 'dark number' again writ large. No surprise then that at this stage there exists little by way of sophisticated research, as for example on corruption networks, the movement of covert funds, or best means for evaluation and networking crime deterring or loss recover technology. (Blum, 1995: 151)

Nonetheless, Conklin asserts that the annual losses due to theft of art and antiquities are at least \$1 billion (U.S.), and he suggests that the losses to art theft have increased in recent years due to the rapid rise in the costs of art. A more recent claim was made at a conference in England in 1995 that an estimated 3 billion pounds worth of art and antiques was stolen world-wide in the previous year (Clutten, 1996: 11), while Allwood (1992) had argued three years earlier that works of art estimated at 2 billion pounds were stolen annually from Great Britain and Ireland alone. No systematic estimates of costs of art crime, or its size, exist in Australia at the current time. One possible exception is a report a decade ago which suggests that at least the problem of forgery might be widespread, observing that:

There are a number of persons who now make their living from the creation of fakes and forgeries. The favourites for forgers and fakers include Streeton, McCubbin, Gill, Heysen, Withers, Gruner, Lindsay, Rees, Drysdale, Nolan and Hart. The problems of attribution and authenticity have created a great need for caution in those who buy and sell art and also in those who act as art consultants. (Simpson, 1988: 796)

Unfortunately, there has been little systematic subsequent investigation of this issue in Australia, and at this point the information gathered to date does not provide much in the way of definitive answers. Therefore, one task of the research as it proceeds through the next phases will be to assess the volume and costs of such crime as they exist in Australia.

What is the Shape of the Market for Illegal Art in Australia?

There has been a recent surge of interest in examining property crime generally as a part of the wider commercial market. Freiberg, for one, has argued that for an approach which would view:

...property crime not as a series of discrete individual and unrelated events, but as a market for goods and services, which, like any other market, is subject to the influences of supply and demand and government regulation. (Freiberg, 1997: 237)

A similar approach has been taken to a recent study of the nature of the market for stolen goods, which opened with an observation that by and large little is known about such markets:

...very little has been written about the factors which influence demand for stolen goods...There has been little research to determine how and where goods are disposed of, or how often and in what circumstances people are offered stolen goods. Further, there has been little research to date on the roles played by thieves, fences and consumers in the overall redistribution of stolen goods. (Sutton: 1998: 1)

In a commentary made over two decades ago, Walsh and Chappell (1974) argued for such an approach, noting the much could be gained from shifting criminological attention from characteristics of criminals and crimes to the organisational arrangements among criminals (see also Chappell and Walsh, 1974). One potential benefit noted by such writers is the possibility that such information might lead to what Sutton (1998) refers to as a "market reduction approach" to the task of crime prevention.

A major feature of such analyses is their attempt to trace out the workings of the property crime market. Sutton (1998) with reference to such specific stolen goods as VCRs, suggests a way (Figure 1) of tracing out the complex possible pathways that lead from the action of a thief through such middle-men sources as what are referred to as "commercial" or "residential" fences onward to ultimate consumers. Freiberg (1997) takes a somewhat more complex approach (Figure 2) which traces the pathways from theft through suppliers through a complex web of distributors or retailers, and then onward to the purchasers.

Preliminary data collection permits some rough guesses as to the basic outline of the art market generally in Australia, and then the particular mechanisms involved in the markets for illegal art. A task to be addressed as the research proceeds into its next phases will be to trace the diverse patterns whereby legitimate works of art move from the hands of either an artist or an initial holder of a work of art, through in some cases middlemen such as agents, then outward in terms of the places of sale such as an art dealer's gallery or an art auction (such as currently are held by such large firms as Sotheby's, Christie's or Leonard Joel's in Melbourne) and then into the hand of purchasers.

In developing a model of the illegal art market, it is presumed that there is a close convergence of legal and illegal components of this market, since ultimately much illegal art is "passed" on to consumers who believe they are purchasing legitimate works of art. There are a number of specific sub-questions that would be part of such an analysis. For example, with respect to stolen art, one issue consists of identifying the major targets of stolen art. Conklin (1994: 121), drawing upon data reported by the IFAR finds that the largest proportions of stolen art in the United States consist of thefts from galleries (37%), private collections (32%) or museums (11%), while outside of that country another major source for stolen works of art consists of churches. Preliminary evidence suggests that in Australia the large public museums to date have not been major targets for theft, with the major examples as indicated in newspaper and police reports being connected with either commercial galleries or private collectors, although a task of the proposed research would be to obtain a clearer picture of this issue of the targets of art crime in Australia.

What are the Particular Locations and Processes Involved in the "Passing" of Illegal Art into the Legitimate Art Market?

One of the important objectives of this research suggested by a market analysis will consist of the task of identifying the specific locations within the legitimate art market where illegal works are passed on as apparently legal works of art, and the specific processes involved as this occurs. In the analyses of the market for stolen property posed by Freiberg (1997) and Sutton (1998), many of the consumers either know they are buying stolen goods, or have good reason to believe that they are stolen by virtue of such features as the price, being approached by the seller in a context outside of ordinary legitimate business, or that the goods are being bartered at a value far under their market value.

It seems highly likely, however, based on limited preliminary interviews, that in the Australian art market, a major feature of much (but not all) of the ultimate purchasing behaviour involving what are illegal art items is that the buyer is operating in the context of a legitimate enterprise (an auction house or through what appears to be a legitimate art dealer) and the goods are being purchased as legitimate commercial objects of art, that is, the purchaser does not know that the goods are either stolen or forged. In fact, it is highly likely that knowledgeable buyers will insist on some assurance of the provenance of the object being considered for purchase. Put another way, one of the important acts that has to be accomplished within the art market is that such items as forged or stolen paintings at some point have to be transformed from

illegal to apparently legal goods so that they can "pass" as legitimate art goods being purchased in what appears to be a legitimate commercial transaction.

The criminal art market, therefore, may operate in ways somewhat different than the more general market for stolen goods as described by Freiberg (1997), since such sources as second hand dealers, pawnshops, garage sales, or direct hawking are not likely to be major players in the sale of art. Instead, most potential art purchasers are likely to encounter a particular work of art as one among hundreds of items in an auction, or as one of a large number in the possession of a person known as a legitimate dealer in art. What a market approach to the study of illegal art does is to call attention specifically to the process whereby art which is known to some persons as either forged or stolen is passed on in a way so that it becomes transformed into what appears to be a legitimate piece of art.

The process of transformation appears to take different forms depending upon the nature of the illegal behaviour. When the issue is the theft of art, a starting point for the analysis is the nature of the theft and the motivations of the thief involved. It can be observed that there have been in recent years some notable examples of the theft of art works in both Australia and overseas. Australian examples in recent years include the theft of paintings by such artists as William Dobell, Rupert Bunny, Arthur Boyd and Frederick Williams from the Saville Galleries in Sydney; the theft of paintings by Arthur Boyd, Marc Chagall, Samuel Gill and John Perceval from the Smorgon household in Toorak, the theft of several works of Hans Heysen in Adelaide, and the theft of over 250 graphic works by contemporary European artists from Tony Reichardt who was living at the time in the Daintree Forest in Queensland, or many years ago the famous theft of an entire exhibition of the works of Grace Cossington Smith in Sydney in 1977, among many others. Overseas there have been numerous examples of the theft of major works from the public galleries, including Van Goghs from Amsterdam, the famous "Scream" by the Norwegian Edvard Munch from the public gallery in Oslo, and in 1997 alone according to a year-end accounting in the *IFAR Reports* (December, 1977) there were thefts of such well known artists as Brueghel, Chagall, Dali, Klimt, and Rodin, among many others.

Tracing the movement of art from the point of theft can be complicated depending upon how well known the paintings are and the motivations which prompted the theft. In some instances the intention is to ransom the works based on negotiations with insurers, with the result that the work will be returned to the point of the theft, and therefore these works can not be considered to have entered into the general art market. When the works stolen are of exceptional value and are widely known, it is also unlikely that they will, at least within any reasonable period of time, enter into the legal art market. It is not unusual for some simply to disappear from view, with one presumption being that the works have been stolen "on order" from a private collector, which was one of the hypotheses advanced when \$300 million dollars of art was stolen from the Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum in Boston and which has still not been recovered (see, for example, Conklin, 1994, and Gorvy, 1991: 69).

Preliminary field work indicates that the probability of detection of the art as stolen when it goes on sale will dictate the steps that will be taken so that the art can enter the legitimate art world. One possible route suggested by research to date is for the original thief to sell to a "middleman" who has some knowledge about how the art market works, and therefore the possible avenues for the sale of the art. The middleman in turn may attempt to dispose of the stolen work in a city at some distance from the point of the theft, selling either through an auction house a dealer in the distant city (there are other cases, according to our sources, where the thief and the middleman are one and the same person). Since the larger auction houses publish a colour catalogue of the works for sale, placing a stolen work of any visibility or reputation in such auctions represents a risk. It therefore seems that one avenue that may serve as a conduit for the transforming of lesser known stolen art works may be the smaller auction houses, who often do not print colour catalogues of art works that are being auctioned, and where these catalogues have only a brief description of the work (for example: "oil painting, late 19th century, Australian landscape"). One of our informants has suggested a case of a painting by one of Australia's best known artists which after being stolen first passed through a small auction house in a distant city, then subsequently through at least five

other legitimate commercial venues so that when the painting was ultimately found by the initial victim on the walls of a commercial gallery, the gallery owner who has a solid reputation for honesty was quite confident of the provenance of the painting.

A large percentage of the smaller and middle-sized art dealers prefer not to buy directly from sources such as the hypothetical middleman, with many restricting their activities either to sales on consignment or to sources they know to be reputable. In most of the larger cities, however, there are dealers who will buy "off the street" and these pose a possible source of disposal if the middleman is able to provide a convincing story regarding the provenance of the painting.

Initial interviews suggest that fraud, especially in terms of forgery, may be a larger problem than theft in the Australian art market, at least in the view of some dealers. As with stolen art, the challenge for those engaged in the sale of paintings allegedly by an established artist is to arrange for the safe "passing" of the work into the commercial art market. The method of arranging this transformation apparently will depend upon the reputation of the artist in question and the connections of those who know of the circumstances of the forged art, with the key point for the "passing" of the works being either the auction houses or dealers who will purchase directly from middlemen. For fraudulent as well as stolen art, this process of transformation has to be accomplished if the works are to pass into the hands of unsuspecting consumers. It must be pointed out that these transformation processes can involve unanticipated kinks. For example, in the All Saints Gallery case in 1988 (Simpson, 1988: 796) a gallery was given works to sell by a barrister who had received the works in lieu of fees, and when some were found to be fakes, the gallery owner was sued as a consequence.

Initial field work suggests that, in fact, there are a narrow range of locations and conditions where such transformation of art is possible. For example, it is obviously close to impossible to dispose of a well known painting of an international famous artist which has been stolen in the larger auction houses or commercial galleries in Melbourne or Sydney. The works that can pass will be of lesser well known artists, and somehow their illegal origins have to be concealed (which will require that the process bypass middlemen who both know the work of the particular artist and who will insist on proper details of provenance). A third task as it proceeds into its next phases is to document where such works are transformed (the location within the market) and the particular methods employed (the market processes) so that works known by some to be illegal are able to pass into the hands of unsuspecting consumers who buy the art thinking that it is a legitimate and legal work of art.

How Extensive are Processes Where Art is Sold Where Consumers Know (or Could Reasonably Presume) that the Art has been Illegally Obtained?

In most of the above an assumption is made that forms of illegal art ultimately are purchased through what are apparently legal transactions. It is recognised that there will be some amount of art, at this time an unknown volume, which may pass directly to consumers who know, or who should reasonably believe because the art is offered outside of legitimate commercial channels, that they are in possession of illegal art. Conklin (1994: 135) comments that there are known examples of persons who commission thefts of art from major collections such as Idi Amin, the former ruler of Uganda, and one of the Australian informants in the preliminary field work has asserted that this happens in Australia as well. It should be noted that there is some scepticism among those in the art world about the degree to which this happens, and Pearson (1986: 3) has asserted in one of the IFAR Reports that there are "very few, if any, examples of this type of theft". At this point there is little information on the degree to which stolen art finds its way into the hands of people who know or presume that it is stolen, and a fourth task of this research, in providing a full model of the market for illegal art, is to obtain information on the dimensions of this aspect of the problem.

What are the Particular Problems Raised by Aboriginal Art?

While at first glance it may seem that Aboriginal art might be viewed as posing problems similar to art from other traditions, there are some interesting and rather unique questions that arise in this segment of the art market of Australia. To be sure, when a painting by an Aboriginal artist is stolen and later sold on the market, or when the work of an Aboriginal artist is forged and sold, these will present problems similar if not identical to other works of art. Preliminary interviews and observations, however, suggest that there are some particular vexing problems posed by Aboriginal art that will have to be covered as part of a study of the workings of the art market in Australia.

One issue concerns the unauthorised copying of material of Aboriginal artists, of which there have been a number of notable cases, including the early "one dollar note" and the more recent "ten dollar note" cases (for general discussion, see Johnson, 1996; Golvan, 1992). In one case involving John Bulun Bulun, an artist from central Arnhemland, a painting of the artist was copied without permission by a large T-shirt manufacturer (Golvan, 1989), that case being resolved in favour of the artist. A similar successful result was obtained in the so-called Carpets Case where a number of artists brought action for a breach of copyright of their patterns which had been copied onto carpets which had been manufactured in Vietnam and then imported into Australia (Martin, 1995; Miller, 1995; Janke, 1997).

For the Aboriginal community, a number of important issues are presented by what amounts to the theft of sacred material. Derived in complex ways from their beliefs about the Dreaming time, particular thematic materials are vested in specific kinship groups who become the custodians of the various designs, and they, and only they, in their view have control over specific designs. For the Aboriginal, the unauthorised reproduction is a most serious matter:

A person's association with a particular Ancestral Being is threatened by another person, without authority, reproducing a pre-existing design and thereby claiming the right or authority to speak for the Ancestral Being represented by that pre-existing design. If such unauthorised reproduction is permitted to occur, without any action being taken, this is considered to be an abdication by the traditionally oriented Aborigines of their responsibility to maintain the Dreaming, and calls into question the very essence and purpose of their existence. (Ellinson, 1994: 331)

A major question here involves whether existing civil process, as reflected in copyright litigation, represents an adequate avenue for consideration of the issues. In one poignant early episode, one Aboriginal artist who found out that his sacred art has been copied without his approval claimed that as a result of the act that those involved had "stolen" his spirit and he was unable to paint for some years after the discovery (Johnson, 1996: 12). In fact, the ruling in the Yumbulul case (which was unsuccessful from the point of view of the Aboriginal claimant) observed that:

...it may also be that Australia's copyright law does not provide adequate recognition of Aboriginal community claims to regulate the reproduction and use of works which are essentially communal in origin. (Attorney General's Department, 1994:5)

One of the problems here consists of the differential view of the problem when cast within Aboriginal and Australian law. From the Aboriginal point of view, such copying comes close to Western ideas of theft, although they will not be treated as such within the traditions of the common law. This does not mean that these practices are legal. In fact, while legal action to date has been primarily in the civil courts, under section 132 of the Copyright Act it is a criminal offence for a person to sell or to have in their possession for the purpose of sale an article that she or he knows to be an infringement of copyright. As such, the practices of unauthorised copying of Aboriginal art can be seen as falling within legitimate concerns for illegal practices within the art marketplace, despite the fact that the fit between Aboriginal understandings of what has transpired and the legal process is not as exact as one might desire.

Another area of contention concerns European centred notions of "authorship" of works of art. This can be seen in recent controversy over the works of the artist Kathleen Petyarre, recent winner of the Telstra Award by the Museum and Gallery of the Northern Territory (McCulloch, 1998). The former partner of the artist, a Welsh-born white, claimed that he had been painting much of the works sold under her name. This has caused considerable debate within the artistic community, and one observer recently commented that:

No Aboriginal gallery, museum, academic or dealer can allow painting produced by a non-Aboriginal artists to be exhibited, sold or awarded as Aboriginal art... As a gallery owner I guarantee unconditionally every painting sold with an exchange clause in writing regardless of time. (Ebes, 1998: 51)

Lurking within this debate is the likelihood that within many Aboriginal communities the actual painting of a particular work may involve the active collaboration of persons other than the artist who is the custodian of the story and the principal in the design and execution of the painting. For members of the Aboriginal community the "ownership" derives from the relationship of the individual and family to the Dreaming, and the participation of others in the actual creation of the work may be for communal, social, socialisation or recreation purposes. When the painting enters into the world of white art, however, some interpret this collaboration as possible evidence of fraud, as in the words of one dealer:

For years our experience with Aboriginal art was virtually free from fraud. Occasionally we were caught buying pictures from known artists only to discover that they were painted by their wives, brothers or other family members. (Ebes, 1998: 15)

The question then becomes, to what extent is there fraud in the world of art, and to what extent is the problem one of a collision of understanding between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal communities about custodianship, ownership and authorship? It should be noted that in the Kathleen Petyarre case, a recent commission of inquiry established by the Museum of the Northern Territory has cleared the artist of any impropriety.

What still remains, however, is the question of how to define fraud in the context of Aboriginal art, and once defined, determining how much of it exists. Certainly, it appears rare for Aboriginal artists to paint stories that are not part of their custodianship, or in a style made famous by another (Ebes, 1998:15). Preliminary interviews suggest that there are rumours within the Australian art world of non-Aboriginal artists copying the styles of known Aboriginal artists. There is as well the known case of Sakshi Anmatyerre who has claimed he is part Aboriginal (despite allegations that his parents are Indian and that is where he was born), and has established a wide reputation for his art which appears in many respects to be Aboriginal in character. In another damaging case, Elizabeth Durack has confessed to inventing the purported Aboriginal artist Eddie Burrup.

The importance of these general problems should not be underestimated. McCulloch (1998), for one, has argued that Aboriginal art constitutes Australia's "largest visual arts industry," and has grown in recent years to the point where it is estimated that it accounts for sales in excess of \$100 million annually. Some indication of the gravity of this situation, especially in light of the soon to be held Sydney Olympics, is indicated by the fact that the Australian Government announced in May, 1998 that it intends to introduce legislation to support an authentication system for Aboriginal art. The Arts Minister, Senator Richard Alston, was quoted as saying:

There is a degree of urgency about this, especially with the Olympics coming up and the number of visitors that they will bring in...I do think there needs to be a transparent regime so that people will know what they are buying. (as quoted in Greene, 1998: 10)

Whatever action is taken, it would seem urgent that the deliberations be informed by data regarding the nature and level of such problems in the Aboriginal art market. Without question

one of the major and particularly pressing objectives of the research as it continues will be to document the place of Aboriginal art within the legal and illegal art markets of Australia, and to assess the volume of such problems as fraud within this market.

What is the Place of the Art Market of Australia, including Illegal Art, in the International Art Market?

National art markets of any scale inevitably intertwine with wider international markets. When it comes to illegal practices, international threads can reach into Australia in a variety of ways. For one famous example, the National Gallery of Art in Canberra a number of years ago found that a valued example of ethnographic art in its collection, the "Paracas Mantle" from Peru, actually had been stolen from its country of origin, and once that was discovered took the proper diplomatic steps of returning the object (for an account, see the *Melbourne Age*, September 23, 1988). There have been a number of published accounts in leading art magazines in recent months of paintings owned by World War II Holocaust victims which had been confiscated by the Germans, but then after the war have made their way by various means ultimately to such locations as the major public galleries of the world, including in the United States the Museum of Modern Art in New York, and the public galleries in such cities as Chicago, San Francisco, Seattle, Los Angeles, Denver and Minneapolis. Now the families of these victims are attempting to regain ownership of these works (Franklin, 1998). In addition, many countries which have had their antiquities looted by colonial powers in earlier times are now seeking legal means for their recovery (for a discussion, see Blum, 1995; Meyer, 1973). In fact, this issue of the sourcing and provenance of antiquities poses many difficult questions (Greenfeld, 1995). As matters stand at the moment, no systematic analysis of the vulnerability of Australian collections to such claims has been carried out. For comparative purposes, one author recently claimed that ninety-five percent of the ancient art in the United States had been smuggled (Brandt, 1990)

A sixth objective of the research in its next phases would be to document the degree to which there are international dimensions in the interplay of legal and illegal art in the market in Australia. Preliminary data would suggest that while there are some international links in illegal activity, these may not be great. There is anecdotal evidence that on occasion clients of commercial art galleries may be approached from out of the country with offers to buy art of dubious authenticity. There are stories of purported works of Australian artists which have had to be removed from sales of overseas auctions because of questions of their authenticity. As well, there are suggestions that Aboriginal art, as in the form of digderidoos, may be flagrantly copied by non-Aboriginal and sold in overseas markets as original Aboriginal art. A particular issue worthy of exploration is the extent to which the recent attention paid in Australia to questions of fraud in Aboriginal art are having repercussions in terms of responses in overseas markets of this art.

How Useful is the "Market Model" Approach to the Examination and Prevention of Crime?

A final and more general purpose of this research is to examine the question of the usefulness of the "market" model for the study of crime and crime prevention. To date, there has been little empirical research in Australia on the approaches suggested by writers such as Freiberg (1997) or Walsh and Chappell (1974). One notable exception is the recent work of Sutton (1998) in the UK. That investigation examined diverse data including purchasing patterns of consumers (which attempted to approximate those conditions where buyers are willing to obtain goods of at least questionable origin) and direct interviews with persons convicted of stealing property in order to trace out a typology of "stolen goods markets" and the characteristics of such markets (including answering such questions as "what happens to stolen car stereos?"). On the basis of this research, a number of suggestions were made about a "market reduction approach" to the prevention of property crime.

While valuable as a guide for the general idea of a market for illegal goods, there are some differences between the features of markets for stolen goods such as VCRs or car stereos, and the interplay of forces in the legal and illegal art market, and, as well, how these can be

researched. The research strategies proposed here are to be directed at tracing out the general shape of the legal and illegal art market by relying (at least at this stage) on "key informants" who are direct participants in primarily legal art transactions, since on the one hand there are few convictions for art theft or fraud which would provide a pool of subject "thieves" for interview, nor are there (at least as so far uncovered) a large pool of customers who are willing to buy expensive art of dubious provenance in such contexts as pubs or garage sales.

Similarly, there will probably emerge rather different approaches to the task of crime prevention. For one example, some of the specific strategies based in situational crime prevention ideas suggested by Sutton (1998: 88-90) are aimed at discouraging consumers who "might be dissuaded from buying" within illegal trading subcultures. As suggested above, one of the central features of the art market is that many of the ultimate consumers are purchasing what are actually stolen or forged works of art within the legal art market.

Nonetheless, the research proposed here is strongly influenced by such writings as Freiberg (1997) and Sutton (1998) and their emphasis on the study of criminal behaviour as constituting a total market environment, and the specific assumptions in these writings that such an approach will result in the identification of particular targets for crime prevention which is based on a "market reduction" approach. As such, the seventh and final objective of this research on the art market is to provide a general test of the market model both as an approach for research on criminal behaviour, and on resultant crime reduction and prevention strategies. The research phase will attempt to describe, in the words of Walsh and Chappell (1974) the organisational arrangements among criminals, and the networks of interaction between goods and people. While there needs to be considerable more confirmatory data gathered, it also appears that there is a particular and potentially narrow "window" through which illegal art goods can be "transformed" so that they "pass" as legal goods, which tentatively include the smaller auction houses (because of such factors as their lack of expertise in the art market and the kinds of catalogues, if any, they prepare) and specific dealers who are willing to take the risks of "buying off the street". While it needs to be emphasised that these ideas might be considerably sharpened as the proposed research proceeds, if confirmed these outlets can become the focus of a number of specific steps of a "market reduction" nature which might result in much greater difficulty in allowing illegal art to proceed into the legal art market and thus on to unsuspecting consumers.

REFERENCES

- Allwood, R. (1992) "Art Theft on the Increase," *Museum Journal* 92 (June):13-14.
- Attorney General's Department (1994) *Stopping the Rip-Offs: Intellectual Property Protection for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander People*. Canberra: International Trade Law and Intellectual Property Branch, Attorney General's Department.
- Blum, R. H. (1995) "Art and Cultural Heritage Loss: A Worthy Priority for International Prevention and Enforcement," *Journal of Financial Crime*. 3: 149-152.
- Brandt, A. (1990) "Room for Cynicism: The Booming Antiquities Trade: It is Only a Moral Issue, so Who Cares?" *Connoisseur* (January): 92-99.
- Chappell, D. and Walsh, M. (1974) "Receiving Stolen Property: The Need for Systematic Inquiry into the Fencing Process," *Criminology* 11: 484-497.
- Clutten, S. (1996) "Illegal Theft at 3bn Pounds a Year," *Museum Journal*: 96: 11.
- Conklin, J. E. (1994) *Art Crime*. London: Praeger.
- Ebes, H. (1998) "Storm in Teacup Country," *Antique and Arts in Victoria* (April to August): 51.
- Ellinson, D. A. (1994) "Unauthorized Reproduction of Traditional Aboriginal Art," *University of New South Wales Law Journal*. 17: 327-344.
- Franklin, R. (1998) "The Big Steal" *The Age* (June 6): 6.
- Freiberg, A. (1997) "Regulating Markets for Stolen Property," *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*. 30: 237-259.
- Golvan, C. (1989) "Aboriginal Art and Copyright: The Case for Johnny Bulun Bulun," *European Intellectual Property Review* 10: 346-355.
- Golvan, C. (1992) "Aboriginal Art and the Protection of Indigenous Cultural Rights," *Aboriginal Law Bulletin* (1): 5-8.
- Gorvy, B. (1991) "To Catch a Thief," *The Antique Collector*. 62: 68-71.
- Greene, G. (1998) "Bid to Safeguard Aboriginal art," *The Age* (May 28): 10.
- Greenfeld, J. (1955) *The Return of Cultural Treasures*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Janke, T. (1997) *Our Culture, Our Future: Proposals for the Recognition and Protection of Indigenous Cultural and Intellectual Property*. Canberra: Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission.
- Johnson, V. (1996) *Aboriginal Art in the Age of Reproductive Technologies*. Sydney: National Indigenous Arts Advocacy Association.
- Martin, M. (1995) "What's in a Painting? The Cultural Harm of Unauthorised Reproduction: *Milpurruru & Ors v Indofurn Pty Ltd & Ors*," *Sydney Law Review* 17: 592-598.
- McCulloch, S. (1998) "Aboriginal Art Market in Crisis," *Australian Art Collector* (May): 14.

Miller, D. (1995) "Collective Ownership of the Copyright in Spiritually-Sensitive Works: *Milpurruru v Indofurn Pty Ltd*," *Australian Intellectual Property Review* 6: 185-207.

Pearson, L. S. (1986) "Current Trends in Art Theft," *IFAR Reports* 7 (June): 3-4.

Meyer, K. E. (1973) *The Plundered Past*. New York: Athenaeum.

Simpson, S. (1988) "Fakes, Forgeries and Fees: The Authentication of Fine Art," *Australian Law Journal* 62: 796-798.

Sutton, M. (1998) *Handling Stolen Goods and Theft: A Market Reduction Approach* (Home Office Research Study 178). London: Home Office.

Walsh, M and Chappell, D. (1974) "Operational parameters in the stolen property system," *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 2: 113-129.