

The "Antiquities" Problem

Received 21 December 1973

WILHELM G. SOLHEIM II

THE problem of illegal excavation for and illegal export of antiquities has been receiving international attention during the last few years. The UNESCO declaration on the illegal international traffic in antiquities was an important statement directing attention to this major problem. This is a worldwide problem which has perhaps received more attention, at least, in the United States, where it concerns the Mediterranean and Middle East areas of Europe and Asia, and Mexico and Central America in the New World. The problem is of equal importance, however, in eastern Asia and the Pacific, where only a few countries appear to have it under control.

In the spring of 1971 a senior Indian archaeologist and an Indian art historian approached me about this problem in India and asked me whether something couldn't be done about the illegal importing into the United States of Indian antiquities. The case in point was the public announcement and display at a well-known West Coast museum of a famous Indian sculpture which had been illegally purchased in India and smuggled out of India to the United States. I wrote to several people about this matter, including Richard I. Ford, of the Museum of Anthropology of the University of Michigan. Partially as a result of this letter Ford organized a symposium on the subject which was held at the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science in Philadelphia on 29 December 1971. The symposium was titled "Looting the Past: An International Scandal." Ford asked if I would prepare a paper on "... the extent of looting, methods of disposal, attitudes of authorities, and consequences for legitimate scientists ..." in Southeast Asia (Ford 1971, personal communication).

I prepared such a paper and it was presented at the symposium, although I could not be in attendance. A revised version of this paper (Solheim 1972a), published in an Asian magazine, did not reach an archaeologically oriented audience, so I feel it would be relevant to present it here. A small number of minor editorial changes have been made.

A portion of this article previously appeared in the July 1972 issue of *Orientalism*. I wish to thank the editors of that publication for permission to reprint this material.

SECURITY PROBLEMS FOR ANTIQUITIES IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

The *New York Times* in its "Resorts and Travel" section for Sunday, 20th April, 1969, ran an article recommending that tourists buy Chinese porcelains in Southeast Asian countries. This began, "One of the most rewarding purchases that visitors to Southeast Asia can make today, and one that they generally overlook, is Chinese trade porcelain." The article, by Peggy Durdin, was accurate and well written. It suggested that purchases could be made in Indonesia, the Philippines, Thailand, Burma, and even Vietnam, and further that not only could this be the beginning of an interesting and unusual hobby but that considerable profit could be made in the resale of these ceramics if the buyer tired of his new hobby.

Alfredo Evangelista, of the University of the Philippines and the Philippines National Museum, and I sent a rather long letter to the editor of the *New York Times* trying to explain the harm that was being done to Southeast Asian prehistory by this traffic in ceramics, and it was printed. The common, and understandable, attitude to such protest against the sale of illegally excavated antiquities was expressed by Paul J. C. Friedlander, Travel Editor of the *Times*, in a letter to me. After telling me that our letter had been published, he said, "I do think, however, that you should direct yourself and your terrible anxiety and excitement not so much to Peggy Durdin or the Travel Section of the *New York Times* but to the Government of the Philippines because they are responsible to keep their own 'professional gravediggers' from plundering their archaeological treasures."

I agree that governments are responsible for saving their own antiquities, but I feel strongly that theirs is not the only responsibility. It is also the responsibility of the potential buyers of these antiquities, individuals, buyers for shops, and museums, not to buy unless they make the effort to see that they are obeying the local laws on the export of antiquities. The buyer is equally at fault with the seller if he accepts the dealer's explanation that the laws against export are not enforced or that the dealer can take care of any problems connected with the export, even though illegal. Naturally, the conversation between the dealer and the buyer is not this simple and straightforward, but in most cases this is what is meant.

WHAT ANTIQUITIES

There are three general kinds of antiquities that are being purchased in Southeast Asia for export: ceramics and other small prehistoric to historic artifacts, architectural and sculptured objects, and objects which we might call folk art. The mixture of these different types of artifacts varies from country to country.

Ceramics make up the most common antiquity exported, and because of their quantity probably constitute the most valuable group. Most of these ceramics are glazed porcelains and stonewares which were manufactured in China, Annam, Cambodia, or Thailand. Gradually, earlier prehistoric, locally made pottery is finding its way into this trade. A very small percentage of these ceramics are heirloom pieces, but most of them are being illegally dug up and removed from burial sites by a growing number of professional grave robbers. Other artifacts are sometimes found associated with the ceramics and are also marketed; these include jewelry and stone and bronze tools.

Architectural and sculptured objects are in considerably smaller quantity but are ordinarily of more individual value than the ceramic pieces. These objects are made of stone or plaster, bronze or wood. In many cases an original object, such as a stone lintel, is much too large for movement without heavy machinery, so portions of the sculptural elements, such as heads, are broken off the lintel, ruining it as an art object and reducing the historical information which it contains. This group of antiquities (heads) is particularly prone to faking, and there is a considerable industry in making stone and bronze "antiquities," and less so of wood.

Most of the governments of Southeast Asia are concerned about the loss of antiquities in these first two groups but a number of them have indicated no particular concern in their loss of items of folk art. In most cases these objects were heirloom or culturally treasured items of mountain tribal groups which, following disruption of their traditional culture, the young people no longer hold in esteem. These include such objects as religious woodcarvings, hand-woven textiles, weapons where both the handle and scabbard may be ornately carved and/or otherwise decorated or the blade may be of special ornate form and decoration, and some bronzes which were probably being cast up to one or two hundred years ago, and possibly more recently.

COUNTRY PROBLEMS

The problem, or lack of problem, is different in each Southeast Asian country, so I shall review what I know of these countries, one at a time.

Formosa

Theft and clandestine excavation appear to be nonexistent on Taiwan, so this is one of the few countries in Southeast Asia that has no archaeological problem. They are losing folk art, however. Ancestral woodcarving and other varieties, particularly from the Paiwan, a tribal group in the mountains, are often available in some small shops in Taipei, as were a considerable variety of heirlooms (ceramics and textiles) which had been brought over from the mainland.

Hong Kong

Hong Kong is one of the big selling centers for Chinese ceramics and other kinds of Chinese antiquities. These do not come from Hong Kong sources but from the Chinese mainland. There are relatively few archaeological sites in Hong Kong itself, and there is little problem of vandalism on these sites.

Philippines

Here we have probably the most unpleasant situation in Southeast Asia. The ceramics trade, mentioned in the *New York Times* article, received its major beginning in the late 1950s with widely publicized excavations of 13th to 15th century cemeteries south of Manila in Batangas Province. The excavations were properly done by the National Museum of the Philippines. Unfortunately, the burials excavated had many associated, whole Chinese, Annamese, and Siamese

bowls and plates which the public started to covet. Local collecting of these kinds of ceramics developed into a status matter within the Philippines, and to supply this market professional "diggers" started finding new burial sites and mining them for their whole ceramics, completely destroying them as far as any careful excavation was concerned! In the 1960s a series of burial sites was located near Laguna de Bay, just to the southeast of Manila. Here developed a do-it-yourself ceramics mining pastime. A number of antiquities shops developed in Manila in areas where tourists would see them, and into these went the surplus of relatively common items, while the more unusual and better items went into a number of remarkable collections, the owners of which had first choice from the shipments brought in from the field.

The loss to the Philippines is not so much the individual ceramic pieces as the complete destruction of site after site in the mining for this asset. Collecting has now extended to the locally made earthenware from the earlier burial sites in which these are found. In 1966 a good antiquities law was passed but this is difficult to enforce, particularly in the more remote areas where the "diggers" are now operating. For the Philippines the combination of an internal as well as an export market for these artifacts makes the problem of control very complex. Folk art export is also considerable, but most of the good, old pieces are gone.

Indonesia

All the varieties of antiquities are found in and exported from Indonesia, but not to the extent found in some other countries. With the Hindu-Indonesian monuments of Central and East Java and Bali there is local looting of architectural and stone and bronze sculptural remains. There is also local digging of cemeteries for ceramics and the associated objects, such as bronze bells and other small bronze items. There is little local market for these materials, so most of them are exported in one way or another.

Malaysia and Brunei

The problems in this area are similar to but less than those of Indonesia, as there is much less in the way of Hindu-Malayan architectural monuments for looting, and because these areas were generally less wealthy and much smaller than Indonesia. Fewer ceramics were brought into these countries to end up in burials. The national museums in Malaya, Sarawak, Brunei, and Sabah have relatively good government cooperation, and in all areas there is reasonably good control. The greatest problem is in the folk art area, where much of the available material has already been exported.

Thailand, Laos, Cambodia, Vietnam

The countries of Mainland Southeast Asia have similar problems, except for Burma. All have potentially the same sorts of antiquities of all three groups. Without question, the looting of temples and other large monuments, with the resulting export of stone and bronze statuary and architectural elements, is the major problem. Ceramics are found and exported as well, but not on the scale as that of the Philippines and Indonesia.

There is little problem in a local market except for Buddhist reliquaries, and for these the problem is extreme, particularly in Thailand. The great majority of the local people of all classes believe that there is great supernatural power in the objects found in the reliquaries, which were incorporated in the foundations of Buddhist monuments. Excavation in Buddhist monuments requires police or army protection. In one case in Thailand during the 1960s the newspapers reported that the National Museum party excavating the foundation of an old Chedi felt that their army guard was not needed and sent them away. The next day they were forced out of the site by a group of men armed with machine guns and other weapons. These men plundered for more than a day before the army guard was brought back and drove them off. Having excavated in different Southeast Asian countries over the last twenty-two years, I always worry about finding gold in a site because of the local excitement it arouses with attendant danger of banditry, but in Thailand I worry much more about the possibility of coming across a reliquary deposit. Happily, the sites I seek out are much earlier than Buddhist sites, and I have had no trouble of this sort.

Cambodia has small organized bands working in the north which usually steal local finds from small temples and occasionally do some digging in the sites. Through much of the Buddhist area of the mainland the people in the remote areas are devout Buddhists, and when they find an unusual antiquity while hunting in remote jungle or mountain areas, or in their farming activities, they deposit these in their local Buddhist temples. It is these finds which are often stolen for export sales, and not only in Cambodia.

Folk arts of these countries are also being exported in considerable quantity, the best known of these being the bronze drums of the "Dongson" type. The great majority of these have been coming from tribal groups in northern Laos. Most of these were probably heirloom pieces which had been locally cast as recently as one or two hundred years ago. They are brought into Vientiane, where I have seen two workmen in a small local shop laboriously "cleaning" them with a weak acid to thin the bronze in some areas until they break through, thus adding hundreds of years to their apparent age. Over the last ten years these have been exported in such considerable numbers that I wonder if new ones are being cast and then aged. Unfortunately, the National Museum of Laos has only a very small budget, and I know of no collection or study being made of these drums.

Burma

Burma is different from the other countries of Southeast Asia only in that it has been much more isolated from world commerce and tourists during the last nine years. Without a ready market, the desecration of monuments for architectural elements has been kept under control by the small but efficient Archaeological Survey of Burma. The government is now opening up to tourists and we can only hope that they can keep control of the situation. An example of one type of architectural element much of which was destroyed in the 1930s is the Jataka plaques found on a number of otherwise remarkably preserved monuments in Pagan. Hundreds of these individually cast and then glazed clay plaques, illustrating stories in the Jatakas, were incorporated in the outer walls of several large terraced

monuments. Most of these were more or less destroyed by thieves who tried to remove them from their plaster setting and usually broke them in the process.

METHODS OF DISPOSAL

All countries and capital cities of Southeast Asia have legitimate antiquity shops which usually sell all the varieties of antiquities mentioned here that are to be found in their own or neighboring countries. Some antiquities, and more of the folk art antiquity, are to be found in local markets often only on particular days of the week. Except for the Philippines, there are relatively few local native collectors in these countries, though there are some in all of them.

A much greater market is found among the Europeans and Americans who live in a country for several years with a business or governmental job. They become educated to the sources and supplies of local antiquities, and many of them accumulate a considerable collection, primarily for home decoration but sometimes for sale. Probably the worst offenders are those people with diplomatic or military privileges, of all countries, who are able to send packages out of the country through diplomatic pouch or APO mail. In several countries permits are required for export of any antiquity, and all mail and freight (but only some or none of the baggage of those traveling by air) are examined. There is no way of finding out what is being exported through the privileged mail, but every indication is that it is considerable. This market is the one which removes the few exceptional and unique pieces which are of themselves of historical as well as artistic value. The bulk market is the tourist and probably some buyers for foreign antiquity businesses. The really good pieces seldom find their way out in this way, but this is the major channel of money to support the illegal mining of archaeological sites and other sources, in all countries of Southeast Asia.

There is a certain amount of smuggling of antiquities from one country to the more or less legitimate shops of other countries. Much of the loot stolen by the organized bands in northern Cambodia is said to be taken into Thailand and sold in the markets of the larger market towns of nearby northeastern Thailand. Some of the brass cannon and ceramics found in Sarawak are smuggled into Brunei or to Singapore. A major market for Indonesian antiquities is Singapore and towns and cities in west Malaysia. This is a smugglers' business as well.

ATTITUDE OF THE AUTHORITIES

The majority of the countries of Southeast Asia have antiquities laws which are more or less enforced. The portion of these laws which is enforced is that which has to do with the export of antiquities, while there is virtually no enforcement in the field to prevent the original mining of these antiquities. Specific monuments, or areas of concentrated monuments, which are visited regularly by local and/or international tourists are usually well protected, but those that are remote from central cities are virtually unprotected. The authorities responsible for protection are either national museums or the archaeological services of the countries in which this is not a part of the museum. The budgets of these agencies are always small compared to the duties they are assigned, of which protection is only one of many.

None of these agencies have the facilities to protect more than the most important and readily accessible of their archaeological sites. For this they are very sorry but, as far as they can see, there is nothing they can do about it. In all parts of the world there are problems of communication between different governmental agencies. For the most part there is little cooperation on the part of personnel in departments not concerned with the safety of antiquities with those in the department to which this job falls. Postal and customs services are varyingly effective in the different countries, but in some countries are not much better than a sieve.

Thailand probably has one of the best organizations for controlling exports of antiquities. Every object over 50 years old must have an export permit, with a stamp on the object, if it is to be exported. This can only be gotten from the National Museum. The cost of the stamp is directly related to the age and not to the value of the object; unique pieces cannot be exported. Objects less than 50 years old can also receive an export permit (everything on the permit is written in Thai) for about twenty-five cents U.S. About 80%, or more, of the objects in antiquity shops in Bangkok are new copies of antiquities. The small fee brings a permit stamp which looks just the same as the ones for the older objects, if the buyer is unable to read Thai. The seller can then point out that the antiquity permit for export has been obtained from the National Museum. The dealer does not tell the buyer that he is buying a copy but tells him that the object is Ayuthia or Khmer style, etc., in which he is telling the truth. The buyer thinks the National Museum export permit is authenticating the item, which it is, as new. Everyone is happy.

Virtually the only people who comply with legal requirements on excavations are foreign archaeologists. In most of these countries the only local archaeologists are those employed by the antiquity-responsible agencies. This naturally makes it much more difficult for a legitimate archaeologist to excavate than for a private person to go out and pillage. This is certainly no hardship, however, as in those countries where it is today possible for a foreigner to legally excavate, the requirements to be complied with for permission to excavate are eminently reasonable and equitable.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The trade in antiquities in Southeast Asia is fed primarily by illegal mining of archaeological sites beyond the control of the authorities responsible for control. It is paid for primarily by tourist and export-import business money and secondarily by local collectors and foreign collectors temporarily living in the country.

The only feasible control is international agreement. Chea Thay Seng, the Director of the National Museum of Cambodia, asks, "Votre pays pourra-t-il en particulier interdire l'importation des objets d'art non munis de pièces justificatives en bonne et due forme?" This must be the way, but through international organization such as that suggested by UNESCO or in those resolutions approved by the Executive Committee of the Society for American Archaeology and published in *American Antiquity*, Volume 36, number 3 (July 1971).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank the following people for information on the antiquities problems in their countries: P. M. Shariffuddin, Curator, Muzium Brunei; Chea

Thay Seng, Director of the National Museum of Cambodia; Chiang Fu-tsung, Director of the National Palace Museum in Formosa; J. C. Y. Watt, Director of the Art Gallery of the Institute of Chinese Studies, The Chinese University of Hong Kong; R. P. Soejono, Director of the Department of Prehistory, National Archaeological Institute of Indonesia; Godofredo L. Alcasid, Director of the National Museum of the Philippines; and Mrs. Rosario B. Tantoco, also of the National Museum. I alone am responsible for interpretation and data retrieved out of my memory for those countries from which I did not receive up-to-date information.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

Since the foregoing paper was written there have been major new developments in Thailand and the Philippines. In Thailand, Ban Chiang and related sites in northeastern Thailand have produced a considerable quantity of striking painted pottery and associated bronze artifacts. The painted pottery, related to the few painted vessels we recovered from Non Nok Tha (Solheim 1971:338; 1972b:29), has become extremely popular on the antiquities market, some vessels selling for several thousand U.S. dollars in London or New York. The King of Thailand became interested in these sites, and because of his interest, enforcement of antiquity laws, at least at the Ban Chiang sites, has become much stronger. While it had not been against the law to have a collection of the painted pottery in Thailand, such collections were required by law to be registered with the National Museum. In June 1973 the manager of one of the large European airlines was arrested for having an unregistered collection, and this arrest received considerable publicity in the Bangkok papers. Some Thai officials are said to have very large collections from these sites, and one or more of these collections is said to be better than the collection of the National Museum. I do not know what may have happened in this field since the recent "student revolution."

Martial law in the Philippines has led to much stronger enforcement of their antiquities law. As this law has been proclaimed under martial law, breaking the antiquities law is theoretically punishable by death. I doubt that any other antiquities law has such a strong penalty as a possibility. A recent communication from Avelino Legaspi of the National Museum in Manila reported that he had been traveling with the legal officer of the National Museum "... to stop illegal excavations and so far we have about 100 cases filed in court all over the Philippines."

There is movement in the right direction. If we can only keep these areas of prevention of illegal excavation going and expand them to other countries in Asia and the Pacific, we may be able to stop some of these irreparable losses to archaeology and to world and Asian prehistory at their source, which is the best and most important place to stop them. Of somewhat less but still major importance would be drying up the market for illegal antiquities.

MUSEUMS, ONE OF THE MARKETS

There are two ultimate markets for antiquities outside of the country of their origin. These are museums and individual collections. It would be virtually impossible to stop most individual collectors from collecting if antiquities continue

to be available in antiquity shops. There is more possibility of developing cooperation among museums.

In April 1973 seven organizations in the United States drafted a resolution to guide museums in their acquisition of cultural properties. Of the seven organizations, the American Association of Museums, US-ICOM, and the Society for American Archaeology have endorsed the resolution at their respective annual meetings. Hopefully, the others will follow. This resolution states in part:

Be it resolved that the organizations listed below cooperate fully with foreign countries in the endeavors to preserve cultural property and its documentation and to prevent illicit traffic in such cultural property.

These organizations believe that museums can henceforth best implement such cooperation by refusing to acquire through purchase, gift, or bequest cultural property exported in violation of the laws obtaining in the countries of origin.

They further believe that the governing bodies, directors and curators of museums should, in determining the propriety of acquiring cultural property, support and be guided by the policies of the UNESCO Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Export, Import and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property and the implementing provisions adopted by the signatory states.

It is recommended that all nations establish effective export laws and develop proper controls over export so that illicit traffic may be stopped at its sources. However, wherever possible, within the limits of national law, consideration should be given to legitimate and honorable means for the acquisition of cultural property. It is hoped that nations will release for acquisition, long term loan, or exchange, cultural property of significance for the advancement of knowledge and for the benefit of all peoples.

In order to augment and clarify further the intent of this resolution and determine methods of accomplishing its aims, the governing body of a museum should promulgate an appropriate acquisition policy statement commensurate with its by-laws and operational procedures, taking into consideration the International Council of Museums' recommendations on "Ethics of Acquisition" (American Anthropological Association 1973).

Several major museums in the United States have published statements concerning their acquisition of antiquities. I present here all or portions of two of these.

The Field Museum of Natural History in Chicago has made the following policy statement:

- 1 (a) The Museum will not acquire any archaeological or ethnographic object that cannot be shown to the satisfaction of the Museum official or committee responsible for its acquisition to have been exported legally from its country of origin.
- (b) Further, the Museum will refuse to acquire objects in any case where the responsible Museum official or committee has reasonable cause to believe that the circumstances of their recovery involved the recent unscientific or intentional destruction of sites or monuments. These restrictions shall also apply to archaeological objects excavated in the United States.

- (c) "Acquire" shall include acquisitions through purchase, gift or bequest. "Country of origin" means both "country of ultimate origin," when the objects in question have been recently transported across several international boundaries, and also "country of intermediate origin," when applied to objects anciently transported and then deposited in an archaeological or historical context.
 - (d) This Museum policy shall be taken into account in determining whether to accept loans for exhibition or other purposes.
- 2 This Museum policy shall apply especially to objects of appreciable market value. The pedigrees of such items will be subjected to particular scrutiny. Regardless of value, however, no archaeological or cultural object of any kind will be acquired unless the responsible Museum official or committee is satisfied as to the legality of its exportation and the circumstances of its recovery.
 - 3 The Museum will hereafter acquire no questionable objects except those that can be demonstrated to have left their country of origin before the approved date of this document. The same date shall apply as to the acquisition of objects reasonably believed to have been illegally or unscientifically excavated within the United States. The responsible Museum official or committee shall be entitled, however, to utilize the principles contained in this Policy Statement in determining whether to acquire any object reasonably believed to have been improperly exported or recovered before that date.
 - 4 The Museum has for many years refused to appraise archaeological objects. Extending this policy, the Museum shall hereafter refuse to authenticate any antiquity the acquisition of which by the vendor or owner does not meet the criteria listed in paragraphs 1 and 3. In this manner the Museum hopes to avoid encouraging, even indirectly, the trade in illicit or irresponsibly recovered antiquities.
 - 5 In the future, if the Museum should inadvertently acquire an object that is thereafter determined by the responsible Museum official or committee to have been exported or recovered in violation of this policy, the Museum shall promptly return the object to the transferor or, wherever appropriate, to the government of the country of origin or other proper owner thereof, as the case may be. (Bronson 1972:6)

The Smithsonian Institution in Washington, D.C., has published the following rules for the acquisition of artifacts, as a part of their statement of policy:

1. Each Director of a museum or collection, before authorizing the acquisition of an object, whether by purchase, transfer, gift or bequest, has the responsibility, in good faith, to ascertain, from the circumstances surrounding the transaction, or his knowledge of the object's provenance, that the object in question was not stolen or wrongfully converted, and is not illegally present in the United States.

2. Each Director also has the responsibility to ascertain that any proposed new acquisition was not unethically acquired from its source, unscientifically excavated or illegally removed from its country of origin after the date of adoption of this policy.

3. (a) In cases of doubt, the Director should consult widely within the Institution, particularly with those scientists or curators whose interests would be affected by acquisition of the object, and with the General Counsel. Where helpful, a special panel should be created to help pass on the questions raised.

(b) In the case of a substantial proposed acquisition of foreign provenance whose acceptability is in question, the Institution will contact the competent authorities or corresponding national museums of the probable countries of origin, or the countries whose laws may be affected by the transaction, in order to determine whether the latter can advise the Institution as to the status of the object. If any such object can be demonstrated to form part of the national patrimony of another country, the Institution will take reasonable steps within its power to aid that country in its efforts to effect the object's return.

4. In case the Institution should hereafter come into possession of an object which can be shown to have been acquired, excavated or exported in violation of Rule 2 above, the Institution should proceed as appropriate in each case, to seek to return the object to the donor or vendor or to contact the competent authorities or corresponding national museum in the probable country of origin, to determine what steps might be taken best to preserve the interests of all parties.

5. The policy set forth here should be applied in determining whether to accept loans for display or other purposes.

6. The provenance of acquired objects shall be a matter of public record. (Smithsonian Institution 1973)

POSITIVE ACTION IN EAST ASIA AND THE PACIFIC

The most effective action to stop illegal excavation and export of antiquities in Asia and the Pacific is the official government support and enforcement of fair but strong antiquities laws. The laws themselves would probably be most efficient if they were approximately the same for all the countries of our area. It would be well to have an international conference held somewhere in Asia, with all Asian and Pacific countries represented, to develop model legislation for the area. Local authorities could then push for national legislation in the respective countries patterned on the suggested model. If a country already has stronger antiquities laws, they could either be kept as they are or modified to follow the model legislation while continuing those portions where the existing law is stronger, if so desired.

Enforcement of law costs money. In many cases, a major reason for nonenforcement of what may well be a good and a strong antiquities law is the lack of funds for enforcement personnel and the equipment that they need. National museums could well assist in providing needed funds.

I would suggest that all national museums, or a similar related agency, should have at their public museums a shop where good copies of antiquities, well marked

as such, be available for sale. They should also maintain a shop at each international airport where tourist traffic warrants it. In these shops they should also sell real artifacts which are not unique and are in surplus quantity in the museum. These should be sold at approximately current market value with a certificate of origin and release from the museum. The funds from these sales, after paying the costs of running the shops, could be used to help enforce the antiquity laws. A major source of real artifacts for sale would be those antiquities confiscated from illegal possessors. These would ordinarily be without provenience data and so of little archaeological interest. If they are unique or rare art objects, then of course they could be retained.

It may be that the laws in some countries are such that all antiquities recovered from the ground are property of the government as the patrimony of the people of that country. Observance of such a law would provide the government with a legal monopoly on a scarce and desired commodity. Doing away with antiquities shops would be neither necessary nor desirable. It would just be necessary that they buy all of their antiquities originating in their own country from the national museum. Discount rates could be worked out whereby the shops could still make a good living. This would make this portion of the national museum a profit-making business. Profits not needed to support the enforcement of the antiquities laws would go into a fund to support further archaeological research and publication. I see no reason why the antiquities trade should not be carefully and fairly regulated so that the sale of a portion of the surplus antiquities and/or good copies of these artifacts could produce the funds to enforce the antiquity laws and to help support archaeological research.

REFERENCES

AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

- 1973 *Question V. Resolution on Acquisition of Cultural Properties*. Circulated to members of the AAA for vote.

BRONSON, BENNET

- 1972 The campaign against the antiquity trade. *Field Museum of Natural History Bulletin* 43(8): 2-6.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

- 1973 Smithsonian Institution adopts policy on museum acquisitions. *News from the Office of Public Affairs Smithsonian Institution*. Washington, D.C.

SOLHEIM II, WILHELM G.

- 1971 New light on a forgotten past. *National Geographic Magazine* 139(3): 330-339.
1972a Following the grave robbers. *Orientalism* July: 82-84.
1972b Early man in Southeast Asia. *Expedition* 14(3): 25-31.