AUCTION HOUSES AND THE ANTIQUITIES TRADE

From their prestigious premises in London and New York the large auction houses Sotheby’s and Christie’s and to a lesser extent Bonhams dominate the antiquities market. Straddling the wholesale-retail divide, selling to collectors and dealers alike, their auctions are highlights of the annual antiquities sales calendar. Not surprisingly, given their central place in the market, they frequently become embroiled in disputes over the possession of stolen and illegally-exported (illicit) antiquities. One reason for this seeming vulnerability to third-party fencing operations is their dismissive attitude towards published provenance, considered here to comprise the published ownership history of a piece. In auction catalogues provenance is often not supplied or offered only in barest anonymized outline – “property of a European gentleman” or “bought on the London market” have become cliché’s. Even when more informative and reliable information is made available, it is usually limited to one or two public events in the otherwise private life of the object – the date and place of a previous sale, for example, or the object’s mention in a scholarly publication. Only on rare occasions is a full provenance detailing an unbroken chain of ownership provided. With nothing that might help to reveal their true nature, there is nothing to hinder the entry onto the market of stolen, illegally-traded or counterfeit antiquities. For this reason alone, auction houses facilitate illegal trade by providing an environment that is conducive to the marketing of illicit material. But their involvement is sometimes thought to go beyond simple facilitation, and extend to more active support. This paper describes cases of auction houses having been caught selling stolen or otherwise illegally-traded material, and examines what they reveal about the policies and practices of auction houses as regards the illicit trade in antiquities, and what evidence there is of the more intimate involvement of auction houses.

THE INVESTIGATION OF SOTHEBY’S LONDON DURING THE 1990s AND ITS FOLLOW-UP

For a long time, the propriety of the auction business was considered beyond reproach. 20 years ago, a paper such as this one would not have been written. But times and opinions have changed. Perhaps the first sign that auction houses might be selling stolen antiquities came in June 1995 when Italian authorities recognized at Sotheby’s New York a marble torso of Artemis that had been stolen in 1988 from a convent in Naples and secured its return¹. The appearance of a stolen antiquity in a Sotheby’s catalogue was surprising to many people at the time, but not to everyone. Throughout the 1980s and into the 1990s, Sotheby’s London

¹ Mason 1997.
had been selling unprecedented quantities of unprovenanced artifacts from Italy, attracting the critical attention of archaeologists who suspected illegal excavation, though the evidence needed to confirm that suspicion was initially hard to come by. The evidence did arrive in 1991, however, when a disgruntled former employee of Sotheby’s London came to journalist and author Peter Watson with three suitcases full of internal documents recording what he alleged to be malpractice at the auction house. The documents prompted Watson to investigate the activities of Italian antiquities dealer Giacomo Medici and Indian antiquities dealer Vaman Ghiya, who both appeared to have been consigning large quantities of illicit material to Sotheby’s through the offices of front companies based in Switzerland. The documents also suggested that some Sotheby’s staff were aware of the situation. In 1995, for example, Dietrich von Bothmer of the Metropolitan Museum of Art had written to warn Sotheby’s that an antiquity offered for sale at a forthcoming auction had been illegally excavated in Italy6. Sotheby’s withdrew the piece without alerting Italian authorities, but even though it could be traced back to Medici, continued accepting consignments that could be sourced to him. So profitable was the relationship with Ghiya for Sotheby’s that in 1986 the company proposed that it continued accepting consignments that could be sourced to him. Thus providing it with an aura of legitimacy. In only four auction catalogues, the two heads of the respective departments also left a record relating to his business practices. Included among the photographs was a dossier of Polaroid photographs taken by Medici of recently looted objects in his possession, and that could be used to identify illicit objects that had subsequently been acquired by collectors and museums or offered for sale at auction. The Carabinieri also discovered during the raid that while Medici had been selling illegally-obtained artifacts through Sotheby’s, he had been laundering them too. He would consign a looted antiquity through one front company and buy it back through another company. He would then be able to sell the same artifact at a future date with a Sotheby’s provenance, thus providing it with an aura of legitimacy. In only four auction catalogues, the Carabinieri investigators were able to identify 29 examples of this type of object laundering7. Medici was convicted in 2005 of trafficking in stolen artifacts. In May 2002 the Carabinieri in collaboration with Swiss police went on to raid the Swiss premises of another Italian antiquities dealer, Gianfranco Becchina, recovering another haul of documents and photographs of looted objects8. To begin with, the Italian authorities used the evidence seized from Medici and Becchina to launch successful claims for repatriation of illicit material acquired by major US museums. Increasingly though, they started to make their presence felt in the market by reclaiming identifiable illicit objects when they appeared for auction. In 2009, for example, a Corinthian column krater was retrieved from Christie’s New York, where it had been scheduled for sale in the June Antiquities sale, on grounds that it had been introduced illegally to the market by Medici9. Also in 2009, two ceramic vessels that had been sold at the same Christie’s June sale were seized, and together with a Roman marble Janiform Herm sold at Christie’s New York in December 2009, returned to Italy. All three pieces had been illegally-exported from Iran to Sweden and had passed through the hands of Becchina before arriving in the United States10. Christie’s was not the only auction house to fall under Italian scrutiny. In October 2008, Bonhams in London announced the forthcoming sale of material from the collection of Graham Geddes11. The sale included 145 lots, but the day before it was due to go on offer an alert was received from the Italian authorities informing Bonhams that ten pieces probably derived from illegal digs. Bonhams ultimately withdrew 15 pieces from auction, in the expectation that Italy would make a formal claim for their return12. Seven of the pieces had been acquired at Sotheby’s London between 1984 and 1989. Bonhams was also forced to withdraw four pieces from its London April 2010 sale13. By October 2010, however, Bonhams seems to have developed a more robust attitude toward claims for recovery, refusing to withdraw two objects said to feature in the Medici Polodari dossier, objecting that they did not appear in any stolen artifact database such as those maintained by Interpol and the ALR and complaining about lack of access to the Medici and Becchina photographs14. After the Geddes sale, Bonhams’ chairman Robert Brooks had similarly expressed his frustration when he was quoted in the Telegraph as saying “We would welcome a greater openness on the part of the Italian government, which would allow us far more advance warnings and information about concerns they have”15. The Italian authorities have refused calls to share or make public the Medici and Becchina photographs because they constitute evidence in ongoing investigations. Nevertheless, the auction houses feel aggrieved that despite their official status as evidence the photographs still seem to find their way into the acquisatory hands of journalists and scholars16, who are not slow to call attention to allegedly illegally-traded antiquities appearing in catalogues17.

OTHER CASE STUDIES AND WHAT THEY REVEAL

Although it is now been established that the major auction houses were centrally implicated in the illegal trade of Italian antiquities, even if only unwittingly, other investigations have shown that their involvement in illicit trade did not stop there. In April 1990, for example, thieves stole more than 270 artifacts from the Museum of the Corinth Excavations in Greece18. By 1993, some of the stolen material was in Miami in the hands of one of the thieves. In December 1997 and March 1998, Sabala sold five pieces by auction at Christie’s New York19. In September 1999, FBI agents in collaboration with Greek police recovered another 263 of the stolen objects in twelve plastic boxes hidden in crates of fish in a Miami warehouse20. 14 pieces were still missing, however, including three marble heads – of Julius Caesar, Serapis and Eros. The heads were subsequently recovered from sales at Christie’s New York in 199921. Christie’s did not divulge the name of the consignor22. Sabala was arrested in Miami in June 2000 and subsequently pleaded guilty to interstate transport of stolen property23. In Miami, in the hands of one of the thieves, the stolen objects, offering a physical space and the professional services necessary to create a context of trust within which buyers and sellers can transact indirectly and if they so desire...
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Neither Bonhams nor Christie’s revealed the identity of the consignor, though it was soon discovered. By 2004, a large number of stolen Ma’adi ceramic vessels had appeared for sale on various websites, usually advertised with photographs, and sometimes with an excavation number, in which cases they were easy to check against the 1987 publication of the official excavation. Working together with the ALR, US Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) launched an investigation into the trade of the Ma’adi material, and in February 2008 it announced the arrest of US Army helicopter pilot Edward George Johnson. Johnson had been on active service in Cairo from February to October 2002. On his return to the US in January 2003 he had contacted Sands of Time Antiques, a retail gallery, claiming that the Ma’adi artifacts which were then in his possession had belonged to his grandfather who had acquired them in Egypt during the 1930s and 1940s. Johnson’s arrest warrant states that although he devised the false provenance, he failed to provide Sands of Time with any documentary or other verification. Nevertheless, Sands of Time paid in the region of $20,000 to Johnson for something like 80 pieces, and was subsequently able to sell them to other dealers and collectors around the world, including Bonhams and Christie’s as already described. Thus if Sands of Time did not receive any material proof of provenance, the implication must be that Christie’s and Bonhams then took Johnson’s false account of provenance as repeated by the consignor Sands of Time at face value, again without any substantive verification. In July 2008, Johnson pleaded guilty to possession and selling of stolen antiquities, and in December 2008 ICE returned 79 artifacts to Egypt.

Johnson pleaded guilty to possession and handling, but falsifying provenance in itself can be a criminal offence, even when the exact nature of illegal provenance is not known. In August 2013, for example, Neil Kingsbury pleaded guilty to charges relating to the fraudulent misrepresentation of provenance of Egyptian artifacts he had sold through auction at Christie’s and Bonhams in London. He denied knowing the material was stolen. The case hinged on six pieces he had consigned to Christie’s for their May 2013 Antiquities sale. He told Christie’s that he had inherited the pieces from his uncle who had lived in Egypt in the 1940s, and their provenance was described in the Christie’s catalogue as “Private collection, UK, acquired Egypt 1940s.ence by descent”. One of the pieces, a granite fragment of a Nubian captive, was recognized by a curator in the British Museum as having been discovered in 2000 in the Temple of Amenhoptep III. A colleague in Egypt confirmed it had been stolen from a storage depot. Christie’s withdrew the all six pieces from sale and alerted the police and the Egyptian embassy. Kingsbury claimed to have bought the material in a tourist shop in Egypt, and added to having previously sold another five pieces at Bonhams and eight pieces at Christie’s.

Limited space precludes in-depth discussion of many other stolen and illegally-exported objects that have been recovered from auction houses, but they include:

- A fragment of wall relief from an ancient Egyptian temple at Behbeit el-Hagar recovered from Christie’s New York in June 2002 and returned to Egypt in August 2004.

- Seven ancient Egyptian artifacts stolen from the Amsterdam Bijbels Museum in July 2007 recovered from Christie’s New York in May 2009 and returned to the Museum.

- Six figures stolen from the tomb of the Chinese Western Han Empress Dou recovered from Sotheby’s New York and returned to China in July 2003.

---

66 Most illicit pieces appearing in auction catalogues that are subsequently returned to their legitimate owners are identified by outside agencies such as scholars or police. If an auction house’s own internal investigation of provenance uncovers evidence of illegal trade it is not publicized, presumably because it is bad for business, so it is not known for certain how often this happens and what procedures are followed when it does happen. One example of auction house policy as regards the in-house discovery of possible stolen pieces is provided by a South Arabian stele consigned in 2002 by Phoenix Ancient Art of New York for sale at Sotheby’s New York. Sotheby’s staff discovered that the piece had been stolen from the Aden Museum during the 1987 publication of the official excavation. Working together with the museum’s claim to title on behalf of Phoenix27. Phoenix decided instead to relinquish ownership and the stele was returned to Yemen in 2004. Sotheby’s did not alert INTERPOL or any other law-enforcement agency about the presence of a possibly stolen object on their premises. Their offer to intervene privately with Aden police on behalf of Phoenix shows instead that their first obligation was to the consignor, or perhaps more realistically to their own sales commission.

67 The illegally-traded and recovered pieces so far discussed have been offered for auction with either no provenance or with a meaningless anonymized provenance. Sometimes, however, fuller provenances are simply fabricated. In 2002, 70 artifacts excavated officially from the Egyptian site of Ma’adi were reported stolen from a storage facility at Cairo University28. Five stone and two ceramic vessels turned up for sale, in 2006 Christie’s New York had brought the vessel to the attention of a French Egyptologist, who was ironically its excavator and a sale, in 2006 Christie’s New York had brought the vessel to the attention of a French Egyptologist, who was ironically its excavator and knowing the material was stolen. The case hinged on six pieces he had consigned to Christie’s for their May 2013 Antiquities sale. He told Christie’s that he had inherited the pieces from his uncle who had lived in Egypt in the 1940s, and their provenance was described in the Christie’s catalogue as “Private collection, UK, acquired Egypt 1940s.ence by descent”. One of the pieces, a granite fragment of a Nubian captive, was recognized by a curator in the British Museum as having been discovered in 2000 in the Temple of Amenhoptep III. A colleague in Egypt confirmed it had been stolen from a storage depot. Christie’s withdrew the all six pieces from sale and alerted the police and the Egyptian embassy. Kingsbury claimed to have bought the material in a tourist shop in Egypt, and added to having previously sold another five pieces at Bonhams and eight pieces at Christie’s.

Limited space precludes in-depth discussion of many other stolen and illegally-exported objects that have been recovered from auction houses, but they include:

- A fragment of wall relief from an ancient Egyptian temple at Behbeit el-Hagar recovered from Christie’s New York in June 2002 and returned to Egypt in August 2004.

- Seven ancient Egyptian artifacts stolen from the Amsterdam Bijbels Museum in July 2007 recovered from Christie’s New York in May 2009 and returned to the Museum.

- Six figures stolen from the tomb of the Chinese Western Han Empress Dou recovered from Sotheby’s New York and returned to China in July 2003.

---

66 Most illicit pieces appearing in auction catalogues that are subsequently returned to their legitimate owners are identified by outside agencies such as scholars or police. If an auction house’s own internal investigation of provenance uncovers evidence of illegal trade it is not publicized, presumably because it is bad for business, so it is not known for certain how often this happens and what procedures are followed when it does happen. One example of auction house policy as regards the in-house discovery of possible stolen pieces is provided by a South Arabian stele consigned in 2002 by Phoenix Ancient Art of New York for sale at Sotheby’s New York. Sotheby’s staff discovered that the piece had been stolen from the Aden Museum during the 1987 publication of the official excavation. Working together with the museum’s claim to title on behalf of Phoenix27. Phoenix decided instead to relinquish ownership and the stele was returned to Yemen in 2004. Sotheby’s did not alert INTERPOL or any other law-enforcement agency about the presence of a possibly stolen object on their premises. Their offer to intervene privately with Aden police on behalf of Phoenix shows instead that their first obligation was to the consignor, or perhaps more realistically to their own sales commission.

67 The illegally-traded and recovered pieces so far discussed have been offered for auction with either no provenance or with a meaningless anonymized provenance. Sometimes, however, fuller provenances are simply fabricated. In 2002, 70 artifacts excavated officially from the Egyptian site of Ma’adi were reported stolen from a storage facility at Cairo University28. Five stone and two ceramic vessels turned up for sale, in 2006 Christie’s New York had brought the vessel to the attention of a French Egyptologist, who was ironically its excavator and knowing the material was stolen. The case hinged on six pieces he had consigned to Christie’s for their May 2013 Antiquities sale. He told Christie’s that he had inherited the pieces from his uncle who had lived in Egypt in the 1940s, and their provenance was described in the Christie’s catalogue as “Private collection, UK, acquired Egypt 1940s.ence by descent”. One of the pieces, a granite fragment of a Nubian captive, was recognized by a curator in the British Museum as having been discovered in 2000 in the Temple of Amenhoptep III. A colleague in Egypt confirmed it had been stolen from a storage depot. Christie’s withdrew the all six pieces from sale and alerted the police and the Egyptian embassy. Kingsbury claimed to have bought the material in a tourist shop in Egypt, and added to having previously sold another five pieces at Bonhams and eight pieces at Christie’s.

Limited space precludes in-depth discussion of many other stolen and illegally-exported objects that have been recovered from auction houses, but they include:

- A fragment of wall relief from an ancient Egyptian temple at Behbeit el-Hagar recovered from Christie’s New York in June 2002 and returned to Egypt in August 2004.

- Seven ancient Egyptian artifacts stolen from the Amsterdam Bijbels Museum in July 2007 recovered from Christie’s New York in May 2009 and returned to the Museum.

- Six figures stolen from the tomb of the Chinese Western Han Empress Dou recovered from Sotheby’s New York and returned to China in July 2003.
— A limestone relief fragment from the Egyptian Late period Tomb of Meritkare recovered from Benhams in May 2008 and returned to Egypt.
— A head of the Roman emperor Vespasian's daughter Flavia Domitilla stolen from Libya's Sabratha Museum in 1990 and sold in April 2011 at Christie's London before being returned to Libya later the same year.
— A small bronze statue of Zeus stolen from the National Museum of Italy in 1980 and sold at Sotheby's New York in December 2004 before being returned to Italy in November 2010.
— A 10th-century AD Khmer sandstone statue of the Hindu hero Durvadvhana stolen from the Prasat Chen temple site at Koh Ker in the early 1970s, recovered from Sotheby's New York and returned to Cambodia in December 2015.
— Three (of more than a hundred) Cambodian stone sculptures stolen from storage at Angkor Wat sometime during the 1970s, one sold at Sotheby's New York in 1992, one at Sotheby's London in 1985 and one at Sotheby's London in 1993; all later returned to Cambodia.
— A 2nd-century AD mosaic stolen from ancient Edessa in Turkey and sold by Christie's New York in December 1999 to the Dallas Museum of Art from whence it was returned to Turkey in 2012.

IRAQI ARTIFACTS INSIDE AND OUTSIDE THE AUCTION HOUSES

The archaeological sites and museums of Iraq were very badly looted during the wars of the 1990s and early 2000s, and it wasn’t hard at the time to find suspicious-looking Iraqi artifacts coming up for auction. An Old Babylonian cuneiform-inscribed clay barrel, for example, appeared for sale at Sotheby’s New York in May 1992 without provenance, though with the comment that “only three other examples of this inscription are known”, which was true enough. Over the next five years a further seven previously unknown examples of the very same inscription on similar barrels were offered for sale at Sotheby’s and Christie’s.

The sudden and suspicious appearance of so many previously unknown barrels at a time of such severe looting in Iraq does not seem to have raised any questions for the auction houses where the sales went ahead as planned. The failure to subject the provenance of the barrels to a rigorous and critical examination is all the more surprising given the trade embargo imposed on Iraq in 1990 by United Nations Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) 661 in response to the Iraqi occupation of Kuwait. The auction houses included notices of this embargo in their catalogues, so were clearly aware of its existence. Christie’s London, for example, in its 12 December 1990 Fine Antiquities catalogue, had this to say: “A recently imposed United Nations trade embargo prohibits us from accepting bids … from any other person where we have reasonable cause to believe … that the lot(s) will be used for the purposes of any business carried on in, or operated from, Iraq or Kuwait”.

In the context of the barrels, however, it is clear that “reasonable cause to believe” was being interpreted in very limited terms. For Sotheby's and Christie's, the argument that the barrels might have been recently moved out of Iraq and traded for the ultimate benefit of an Iraqi business, even an illegal one, was clearly not a compelling one.

In fact, throughout the 1990s and early 2000s, and in apparent disregard of the UN trade embargo, there was a healthy auction market in other unprovenanced though clearly Iraqi-sourced artifacts such as cuneiform tablets and cylinder seals. The trade came to a shuddering halt in the summer of 2003, however, after the widely condemned plunder of the Iraq National Museum in April that year, and the restatement of a trade embargo on cultural objects by UNSCR 1483 in May.

Exactly why the auction houses stopped selling material so precipitously is not clear. Perhaps they were frightened of the negative publicity that the ongoing sale of Iraqi material might attract, dismayed by the falling profitability of Iraqi material as customers lost their taste for it, or in light of the reaffirming UNSCR 1483 had developed a broader idea of what might constitute “reasonable cause to believe”.

By 2008, it looked as though auction sales of unprovenanced material from Iraq had all but ceased. In December 2008, however, at the request of the FBI, Christie’s New York withdrew a pair of gold earrings that had been advertised for sale at the December auction. The earrings were part of the “Nimrud treasure”, a collection of Neo-Assyrian gold and jewelry discovered in 1989 during the excavation of two royal tombs underneath the palace of Ashurnasirpal II. They were returned to Iraq in 2010.

By then, the auction market in Iraqi material was starting to pick up again.
since 2009 increasing quantities of material with a 1989 or earlier provenance, but
nothing with a provenance stretching back to the period 1990 to 2015. In other
words, if the provenances provided are to be believed, there is nothing on the
face of it that would give "reasonable cause to believe" of illegal export from Iraq
after the date of UNSCR 661. The example of the Nimrud earrings, however, and
indeed of other case studies presented here, shows that the provenances supplied
to auction houses and reproduced in their catalogues cannot be relied upon, and
must raise questions about the real origin of some of the material now being sold.

Auction house sales of cuneiform tablets raise another question. Given the scale
of archaeological theft and destruction in Iraq, the number of tablets appearing at
auction was not really so high. Between 1991 and 2003, for example, Christie’s
London and Sotheby’s New York between them offered approximately 491 cu-
neiform tablets for sale. Over the same period, one private collector in the USA
accumulated 10,000 tablets\(^\text{[6]}\), and another one since 2011 claims to have assembled
"one of the largest collections of cuneiform tablets in the Western Hemisphere"\(^{[51]}\).

It is clear from these figures that the auction houses were offering only a small
proportion of all cuneiform tablets coming out of Iraq. The remainder were be-
ing traded privately, no doubt with false provenances, from dealers to private
collectors. This observation is not really new. High-quality objects of suspicious
provenance have always been acquired for high prices from private dealers on
the so-called invisible market\(^{[52]}\). Auction houses might be offering a window onto
the flow of illicit antiquities rather than providing a major conduit. Private sales
are also coming to constitute an important part of Sotheby’s business\(^{[53]}\), so it is
important to bear in mind that public auctions do not constitute the entirety of
the auction houses business.

CONCLUSION

The preceding case studies prompt several observations about auction house poli-
cies and practices as regards the trade in stolen or illegally-exported antiquities.
First, it is obvious that the standard and transparency of internal due diligence as
regards the investigation of provenance are weak. False provenances supplied by
consignors are readily accepted, an indication that that consignors are not supply-
ing material validation, or that any such materials that are supplied are not subject
to rigorous examination. Auction houses do appear to search stolen art databases
such as INTERPOL or the ALR, but for antiquities these databases are of limited
utility. Illegally-excavated and thus undocumented material will not appear on
a stolen art database, as the ALR is careful to point out on its search certificates.
The reluctance of auction houses to enquire too closely about provenance talks of
a more general policy of confidentiality as regards consignors\(^{[54]}\). Time and again,
when illicit material is identified at auction, the auction houses do not reveal the
identity of the consignor, thus stymieing further police action or due diligence on
the part of buyers of the type recommended by Article 4(4) of the UNIDROITT
Convention on Stolen or Illegally Exported Cultural Objects that takes account of
the character of vendors. Thus auction houses seem ready to protect the interests
of their consignors than those of their customers or dispossessed owners. There
are also hints of a culture of impunity. It remains the case that despite the ongoing
recoveries of illicit material, and notwithstanding what appear to be the damning
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Στην παρούσα ανακοίνωση εξετάζεται ο τρόπος με τον οποίο οι οίκοι δημοπρασιών διευκολύνουν τη διακίνηση αρχαιοτήτων. Από τη δεκαετία του 1990 έχει καταστεί σαφές ότι οι υπηρεσίες μεγάλων οίκων δημοπρασιών, όπως ο Σοθεβις και ο Χριστιες, γίνονται αντικείμενο εκμετάλλευσης από ασυνείδητους εμπόρους αρχαιοτήτων για την πώληση ή τη νομιμοποίηση παρανόμως διακινούμενου υλικού. Έρευνες της αστυνομίας και των μέσων επικοινωνίας έχουν αποκαλύψει στοιχεία για αρχαιότητες που έχουν κλαπεί από την Ιταλία, την Ινδία, το Ιράκ, την Αίγυπτο και την Καμπότζη και προσφέρονται προς πώληση από οίκους δημοπρασιών, ενώ πολλές αρχαιότητες από μουσεία και ιδιωτικές συλλογές, οι οποίες φαίνεται ότι έχουν κλαπεί, έχουν κατα καρός αγοραστεί ή πωληθεί σε δημοπρασίες. Η εγκληματική εκμετάλλευση των οίκων δημοπρασιών από εμπόρους διευκολύνεται από την πρακτική των ίδιων να μην παρέχουν πληροφορίες για τους πωλητές και το προγενέστερο ιστορικό ιδιοκτησίας των αντικειμένων (την προέλευση, όπως ονομάζεται συνολικά) δήθεν για λόγους απορρήτου των πελατών, καθώς οι πωλητές δεν θέλουν να δημοσιεύσουν λεπτομέρειες σχετικά με την περιουσιακή τους κατάσταση. Ωστόσο, όποιοι και αν είναι η αιτία, αυτή η πρακτική της μη δημοσίευσης της προέλευσης προσφέρει ένα ευνοϊκό περιβάλλον για την πώληση παρανόμως κατεχόμενου υλικού. Μέσω μιας σειράς ποστικών αναλύσεων της αγοράς δημοπρασιών και της παρουσίασης ορισμένων υποθέσεων, θα διερευνηθεί σε ποιο βαθμό οι οίκοι δημοπρασιών εμπλέκονται στη διακίνηση αρχαιοτήτων.

Τα ζητήματα και οι υποθέσεις που θα εξεταστούν περιλαμβάνουν, χωρίς να περιορίζονται σε αυτά:

1. Τη μελέτη στοιχείων επαναλαμβανόμενων πωλήσεων για να γίνει φανερό ότι η αποδοτικότητα των πωλήσεων αρχαιοτήτων συνεχίζει να αυξάνεται, παρά την αρνητική δημοσιότητα.
2. Τη διακίνηση αρχαιοτήτων, που έχουν κλαπεί από την Ιταλία και την Ινδία, μέσω των οίκων δημοπρασιών, όπως αποκαλύπτεται από τις έρευνες των Peter Watson, Patrick Keefe και της Ιταλικής Αστυνομίας.
3. Την πώληση πολιτιστικών αγαθών τραγικής προέλευσης και την επιστροφή από τον Οίκο Christie’s της Νέας Υόρκης το Δεκέμβριο του 2008, τα οποία έχουν κέρδη από ένα θησαυρό χρυσών κοσμημάτων, που είχε ανακαλυφθεί στη Νιμρούντ το 1988.
4. Την επιστροφή από τον Οίκο Bonhams το 2005 επτά αρχαιότητων από τον αρχαιολογικό χώρο του Ma’adi της Αιγύπτου, που εκλάπησαν από αποθηκευτικό χώρο του Πανεπιστημίου του Καΐρου.
5. Τη συνεχόμενη διενέξη μεταξύ της Καμπότζης και του Οίκου Sotheby’s για την πρόθεση του οίκου να πωλήσει ένα αγάλμα από τον αρχαιολογικό χώρο του Κο Κερ.
6. Τη σύλληψη, το Μάιο του 2013, ενός άνδρα ύποπτου για την παράδοση επί παρακαταθήκη κλεμμένων αρχαιοτήτων στον Οίκο Christie’s του Λονδίνου.
7. Μια μελέτη στοιχείων πρόσφατων πωλήσεων που εξετάζει τη θέση ότι οι οίκοι δημοπρασιών καθιερώνουν διαδικασίες για να εμποδίσουν την πώληση παρανόμως διακινούμενου υλικού.

Τέλος, εξετάζεται ο ρόλος που εξακολουθούν να διαδραματίζουν οι οίκοι δημοπρασιών στη διακίνηση αρχαιοτήτων, ιδιαίτερα όσον αφορά στην πρόσφατη μετατόπιση του επιχειρησιακού μοντέλου από δημόσιες δημοπρασίες σε πωλήσεις με ιδιωτικά συμφωνητικά, η ευρέτερη ανάμειξη πανεπιστημιακών και επιστημονικών που εργάζονται σε μουσεία με τους οίκους δημοπρασιών και τα περιθώρια που υπάρχουν για μελλοντικές ρυθμίσεις.