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The Reviewing Committee on the Export of Works of Art and Objects of Cultural Interest

I am pleased to lay before Parliament the ninth annual report on the operation of the export controls on objects of cultural interest, as required by section 10(1) (a) of the Export Control Act 2002 (the 2002 Act). The report covers the period 1 May 2012 to 30 April 2013.

This is the 59th year that the Government has published the annual report of the Reviewing Committee and once again we are indebted to the Committee, its expert advisers and staff at the Arts Council for their dedication and hard work in ensuring the export licensing system operates effectively and that items of sufficient importance to us as a nation are identified and an opportunity provided for them to stay in the UK. I am sure that the many items that have been saved in this way over the years would easily fill a medium sized museum or gallery and we remain rich as a nation as a result.

Whilst there is much to celebrate, this is unfortunately also the last Report to be made under Lord Inglewood’s chairmanship. Lord Inglewood has chaired the Committee in an exemplary manner throughout his 10 year tenure in the post and I am most grateful to him for his excellent advice on the many cases referred to the Committee and for his shrewd insight on policy issues. Lord Inglewood has presided over meetings which have resulted in some truly iconic works of art being saved for the nation such as the Macclesfield Psalter, a superb example of medieval craftsmanship, acquired by the Fitzwilliam Museum in 2005 or Turner’s Blue Rigi, acquired by Tate in 2007.

I would also like to thank Professor David Ekserdjian and Dr Catherine Johns as they stand down from the Committee, for their long and dedicated service and to welcome Leslie Webster and Richard Calvocoressi.

This has been another busy year for the Committee and the case histories that unfold are no less fascinating than before. In total, six items worth just under £11.2 million have been saved from export and acquired by collections throughout the UK. There are, as always, some outstanding examples of fine art but also items considered important because of their strong association with our history and national identity. Two of my personal favourites from this year’s report are the paintings by George Stubbs of a kangaroo and a dingo which symbolise the discovery of Australia and what the strange new continent meant to people here at the time. Thanks to a very generous donation from the shipping magnate, Eyal Ofer, together with Lottery funding, the National Maritime Museum has managed to acquire the paintings. I agree with the Committee that the saving of items at risk of export should continue to be seen as an integral part of the Government’s commitment to deliver world class arts, heritage and culture to audiences in the UK, including tourists and I hope that works such as the Stubbs paintings will contribute to that.

I was also pleased to see that seven silk works depicting views of the Temple of Solomon have been saved from export and purchased under the ‘Ridley Rules’ by a private purchaser who has agreed to display the works at Waddesdon Manor. As highlighted in last year’s Report, I decided that the overall objective of retaining national treasures in the UK was best served by extending the present five year period for Ridley purchases from five years to 10 years and this is the first offer to be accompanied by an undertaking to retain ownership of the items for 10 years.

Of course, fundraising is always a major challenge for museums and I hope that generous individuals, businesses, and other organisations will continue to support the retention of our national treasures. I agree with the Committee that we now have an excellent set of initiatives to encourage the philanthropic giving of
works of art. The Acceptance in Lieu scheme continues to offer opportunities to bring heritage assets into public ownership and the securing for the nation of £50 million worth of important objects and archives in 2012/13 shows that this scheme is as popular as ever. There has also been much excitement around the new Cultural Gifts Scheme which provides opportunities for people to donate important cultural objects within their own lifetimes and four offers have already been accepted including an early portrait by Van Gogh which has been allocated to the National Gallery.

I am concerned over the Committee’s observation that expert advisers may not always refer objects that might potentially meet the Waverley criteria, possibly because they sense that funds may not be available for the purchase of export deferred items and I would welcome the Committee’s further views on how this problem might be addressed.

I also note the Committee’s concern that in the case of private treaty sales, it is important that information on the amount of tax payable on a particular sale is made available quickly to a museum which is attempting to raise funds to make a compensating offer. We will see what can be done to speed up this process.

Finally, I would like to thank the many organisations and individuals without whose help many of these wonderful objects would not have been saved. It is their support, together with the tireless work of museum experts, volunteers and supporters throughout the UK which makes this area of work such a huge success.

Maria Miller
Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport and Minister for Women and Equalities
## Operation of the Control

The following figures cover the period of this report (1 May 2012 to 30 April 2013).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1 May 2011 – 30 April 2012</th>
<th>1 May 2012 – 30 April 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Number of applications for individual export licences ¹</td>
<td>11,615</td>
<td>12,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Number of above applications which were for manuscripts, documents or archives</td>
<td>1,444</td>
<td>1,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Number of items licensed after reference to expert advisers on the question of national importance</td>
<td>33,236</td>
<td>33,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Total value of items in (c)</td>
<td>£1,970,115,511</td>
<td>£1,665,255,992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Number of Open Individual Export Licences (OIEL) in operation having been issued in previous years to regular exporters for the export of (i) manuscripts, documents, archives and photographic positives and negatives; (ii) objects imported into the UK in the past 50 years; (iii) UK origin coins; (iv) the temporary export of a Rolls Royce; (v) the temporary export of objects in soil samples from archaeological sites in Northern Ireland; (vi) the temporary export of objects owned or under the control of national institutions or institutions holding designated collections.</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Number of items licensed after the Export Licensing Unit was satisfied of import into the UK within the past 50 years</td>
<td>13,002</td>
<td>13,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Total value of items in (f)</td>
<td>£7,870,416,556</td>
<td>£8,851,790,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) Number of items in (f) which were manuscripts, documents or archives</td>
<td>1,256</td>
<td>2,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Total value of items in (h)</td>
<td>£72,137,155</td>
<td>£93,925,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(j) Number of items given an EU licence without reference to the question of national importance because they were either: valued at below the appropriate UK monetary limit ²; owned by a museum or gallery that had an OIEL; manuscripts valued at £1,500 or less or coins valued at £500 or less and the exporter held a valid OIEL; musical instruments exported for less than three months for use in the course of work by a professional musician; a motor vehicle exported for less than three months for social, domestic or pleasure purposes; a foreign registered motor vehicle exported following importation for less than three months for pleasure purposes; imported into the UK in the last 50 years and were being exported on a temporary basis.</td>
<td>4,108</td>
<td>4,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k) Total value of items in (j)</td>
<td>£1,993,935,304</td>
<td>£2,612,658,658</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ One application may cover several items.

² In some cases, an EU export licence may be required to export items that are valued below the relevant UK monetary limit. In such cases, an EU licence will normally be given without referring the licence application to the expert adviser on the question of national importance.
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<tr>
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<tr>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>Seven silk works</td>
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<tr>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>Louis de Gruuthuse’s copy of the Deeds of Sir Gillion de Trazegnies in the Middle East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV</td>
<td>Head of a Young Apostle by Raphael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI</td>
<td>A peridot and gold suite of jewellery by Rundell, Bridge and Rundell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII</td>
<td>An amber games board attributed to Georg Schreiber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII</td>
<td>Four scenes from the Passion of the Christ by Niccolo di Pietro Gerini: Peter Protesting at Christ washing the Feet of the Disciples; The Betrayal of Christ in the Garden of Gethsemane; The Mocking of Christ; and The Flagellation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX</td>
<td>Photographs from Julia Margaret Cameron’s photo album, the ‘Signor 1857’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part I:
Reviewing Committee Report for 2012/13
1 May 2012 to 30 April 2013

Introduction

History and operation of the export control system
A full history of export controls in the UK and their rationale are at Annex A. The terms of reference of the Reviewing Committee are at Annex B.

Cases
During the 2012/13 reporting year (up until the end of April 2013) the Committee considered 24 cases at 11 meetings. 19 cases, including one which was considered in 2011/12 but not resolved until 2012/13, with a total value at deferral of just under £115 million were export-deferred by the Secretary of State following the recommendation of the Committee. A total of 6 works of art and cultural objects with a total value at deferral of £11.2 million were acquired for the nation by public institutions and a Ridley purchaser. The Committee is pleased that these six objects are now in galleries, museums and archives across the country and accessible to the UK public.

Committee members, expert advisers, independent assessors and the administration of the system of export control
There were four changes of membership during 2012/13. Professor David Ekserdjian’s and Dr Catherine Johns’ terms of appointment expired on 13 November 2012 and 18 February 2013 respectively. We should like to record our appreciation for their valuable contribution and service over the ten years of their membership. Leslie Webster, who has specialist knowledge of archaeology and early medieval material culture, and Richard Calvocoressi, who has specialist expertise in 20th century art, were each appointed to a four year term. The Reviewing Committee has UK wide competence for the Export Control System for Works of Art and Cultural Goods and in carrying out that role is conscious of the importance of the distinct traditions of all parts of the UK.

A full list of members can be found at the beginning of this report and brief biographies are included at Appendix C.

The Committee would like once more to thank the Secretary of State’s expert advisers and the independent assessors for their vital expertise, time and commitment. The role they all play is essential to the proper working of the system. We would also like to thank all those in the Export Licensing Unit at the Arts Council and at the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS), who administer the system on the Secretary of State’s behalf, without whose efforts the system of export control could not function in the manner in which it does.

Observations on the working of the system of Export Control
As well as considering individual cases, the Committee also has a wider, and equally important, remit to keep a watching brief over the workings of the export control system and advise the Secretary of State on any issues of concern overall.

Referral of objects by expert advisers which might potentially meet the Waverley criteria
In our view there is a continuing problem that there can, on occasion, be some reluctance on the part of the Secretary of State’s expert advisers to refer objects that might potentially meet the Waverley criteria to the Committee for consideration. In cases of doubt, expert advisers should always bring such objects forward, because it is for the Committee to decide on whether they meet the criteria. It is of the utmost importance that the process should be carried out thoroughly and meticulously, irrespective of whether there is any expectation that funds might be available from any source for the purchase of export deferred objects. This cannot be known in advance. Expert advisers play a crucial role in ensuring that objects potentially of Waverley standard come before the Committee. Our country’s procedures place on Committee members the obligation to form a view as to whether they are national treasures.
Philanthropy – Cultural Gifts Scheme

We are pleased that the Cultural Gifts Scheme (CGS) has been successfully introduced and is now operational. This is a most significant new mechanism to assist in the retention of British heritage. The CGS should encourage lifetime giving of cultural objects. We believe it has the potential to play a role in retaining objects of Waverley significance in the UK and we hope that private collectors who are considering selling works of art might choose to donate them to the nation through the scheme rather than selling them at auction with the ensuing risk that they may go abroad. Conversely, a potential donor might consider purchasing an export deferred object and donating it to the nation through this scheme.

Acquisitions and the funding for export deferred objects by the Heritage Lottery Fund

In October 2011 the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) changed its acquisitions policy to make it simpler for organisations to acquire portable heritage while having to respond to tight deadlines. Applicants for HLF funding are now required to demonstrate how the proposed acquisition fits with their current and planned activity programmes rather than produce a separate activity plan. This allows the HLF to accommodate the particular characteristics of export deferred objects which have specific and necessarily time limited deferral periods, within their application procedure. This should enable interested institutions to be in a position to make a matching offer to purchase.

The Committee strongly welcomes this change in policy which has already begun to bear fruit. During the last reporting period an HLF grant of £5.9 million, in conjunction with an Art Fund grant of £850,000, proved critical in allowing the Ashmolean Museum to purchase the Portrait of Mademoiselle Claus by Edouard Manet which previously came before the Committee. This acquisition was enabled by a combination of factors, including a substantial tax remittance which reduces the cost of the acquisition to the museum or gallery. In such circumstances H M Revenue and Customs (HMRC) waives the tax that would otherwise be payable on the sale of the object. The acquisition of the Manet is an illustration of the increased cooperation and imagination required if UK institutions are to remain serious contenders when faced by an apparently ever rising international art market in an uncertain economic climate. In the current reporting period this policy was crucial in securing the acquisition of the Lorenzetti Christ between Saints Paul and Peter (Case 12) and the two paintings by George Stubbs (Case 13).

Funding

As we have pointed out in previous Annual Reports each year, objects which the Secretary of State has stopped on the recommendation of the Committee, because she has accepted that their export would be a national misfortune, have not been retained in this country. This has almost invariably been because the purchase price has not been forthcoming. It is to be hoped that the recent welcome changes to the tax system and the increased amount of money now available from the Heritage Lottery Fund may help bring to an end this sorry state of affairs, but the Committee is not convinced that this necessarily will be the case.

In a well reported speech on 24 April 2013 the Secretary of State said, ‘40% of tourists to the UK cite culture and heritage as the primary reason for their visit. This generates tens of billions of pounds each year for the UK economy, not only through tickets and entrance fees, but in thousands of pounds spent in shops, hotels and restaurants. All of which is delivering real economic benefits to local business and local communities…But the potential for culture to play a central role in driving growth goes far beyond its direct impact’.

Deloittes in 2010 reported that UK Tourism is worth £115 billion a year. In 2012 there were 31 million visits to the UK (approximately 20.5 million from within Europe). The industry is a key part of our economic growth strategy and hugely important to our economic recovery. Visitors to the UK spend money, and support local jobs and businesses – in many parts of the UK it is the leading economic sector.

This must be right. In addition it is important this real contribution made by the Heritage to the national economy is measured objectively and accurately. In particular it should also be noted, in pure financial terms, that the value of objects in the National Collections has increased far above the rate of inflation in recent years. In these circumstances the Committee is satisfied that the acquisition of export-deferred objects represents a sound and proper use of public money and that since these objects come into the market unpredictably funding streams should take this into account.
Taking advantage of our cultural assets is a key part of securing the tourism sector’s continuing success and with it the nation’s ongoing prosperity. The Government has stated that it is committed to supporting our culture so that we can continue to deliver world class arts, heritage and culture and the acquisition of national treasures under threat of export is an integral part of this commitment.

**Fair matching price and compensating offer**

For many years the UK tax system has helped public museums and galleries to acquire important cultural objects at a reduced price. In cases where the original owner/vendor sells direct to a museum without testing the market, the so-called private treaty sale process means that the tax due is not collected by HMRC but goes instead to reducing the cost to the acquiring public museum. In addition, in these circumstances the system offers an incentive to owners to sell direct. Under an administrative arrangement known as the douceur, the benefit of the tax exemption is shared between the vendor (usually 25%) and the purchasing museum (usually 75%). Hence the vendor typically obtains a sweetener of 25% and the purchase price is reduced by 75% of the tax otherwise payable.

Not only will such a private treaty sale frequently be of greater financial benefit to the owner than an open market sale that entails the payment of capital taxes and does not involve the douceur, but a private treaty sale will also enable the vendor (with the help of the acquiring institution) to ensure that a part of our national heritage is retained in this country.

In cases that come before the Committee where the object has been sold by its original owner and an export application has been submitted it is not appropriate that the douceur be included since its rationale is to encourage direct sales to UK public museums. After an export-deferral any owner, rightly, must receive the market price which has been set in the marketplace and so should not financially be out of pocket. However, where a sale to a UK public museum follows the vendor’s tax liabilities reduce the actual cash paid because the sale is tax free. But, of course, there is no question of the douceur because it is not a sale by direct negotiation to a museum and there is no need to add a ‘sweetener’. In such circumstances a compensating offer, does not include any douceur element. As a result the public museum can make a compensating offer to purchase which is set by the fair matching price and any additional elements (for example buyer’s premium and VAT usually payable to the agent) but reduced by the total amount of tax that would be payable in the UK by the seller on the sale price.

The amount of tax which is payable on any particular sale is confidential information. It is, therefore, important that when cases come before the Committee this information is either to hand or can be obtained quickly. It is critical for a public museum that it be given this information as soon as it begins the process of trying to raise the funds necessary to make a compensating offer. If there are delays it can prejudice the museum’s chances of successfully concluding the purchase and may give grounds for considering whether the deferral period should be extended.

**The practice of withdrawing licence applications, following either a serious expression of interest in purchasing the object or an unconditional offer and of subsequently refusing such offers**

For a second year running there have been no such cases and we hope that applicants and their advisers will continue to honour their commitments such as a formally declared willingness, both at the Committee’s hearing and in subsequent correspondence, to accept a matching offer from a purchaser who will retain the object in the UK.

With the increase in the amount of money now available to the Heritage Lottery Fund and the streamlining of its application procedures specifically for export deferred objects there is now more likelihood that if an institution does make a serious expression of interest the requisite funds to enable it to make an offer will be forthcoming. We hope that applicants will bear this in mind when making their intentions known and will be dissuaded, therefore, from adopting the practice of ‘waiting and seeing’ in the hope that the funds will not materialise to enable institutional purchasers to make matching offers.
Additional means for acquisitions

UK public institutions, regrettably, have very limited acquisition funds. We are extremely grateful, as always, for the external funding provided towards purchasing items placed under deferral as a result of recommendations we have made. The money provided by the main funding bodies for all acquisitions of cultural objects are listed below, and the tables at Appendix G give specific details of the funding received for export-deferred items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>National Heritage Memorial Fund (£ millions)</th>
<th>Heritage Lottery Fund (museums/galleries) (£ millions)</th>
<th>Heritage Lottery Fund (manuscripts/archives) (£ millions)</th>
<th>Total (£ millions)</th>
<th>Total adjusted for inflation as per 2012 (£ millions) approximate*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>7.83</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>16.74</td>
<td>22.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>20.65</td>
<td>23.05</td>
<td>29.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>7.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>9.70</td>
<td>11.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>12.10</td>
<td>14.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>13.79</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>15.23</td>
<td>17.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>12.34</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>13.29</td>
<td>14.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>11.14</td>
<td>11.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>10.48</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>15.87</td>
<td>15.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figures based on the Bank of England Inflation Calculator for illustrative purposes only: www.bankofengland.co.uk/education/inflation/calculator/index1.htm
i) The National Heritage Memorial Fund

The National Heritage Memorial Fund set up under the National Heritage Act 1980 in memory of the people who gave their lives for the UK, acts as a fund of last resort to provide financial assistance towards the acquisition, preservation and maintenance of land, buildings, works of art and other objects which are of outstanding importance to the national heritage and are under threat. The National Heritage Memorial Fund’s grant-in-aid since 2010/11 has been £5 million and where necessary it uses its endowment fund for exceptional cases such as the St Cuthbert Gospel.

The NHMF was asked to support two items which were deferred during the year, the ‘Bristol ewer and basin’ (Case 6) and the ‘Brand Cabinet’ (Case 7). Unfortunately, on these occasions the Trustees were unable to provide awards due to other pressures on its funds.

Outwith export-deferred items, this year the NHMF funded a number of archive collections including that of the Westmoreland family, formerly of Apethorpe Hall, Northamptonshire. The Bodleian Library in Oxford acquired the archive of the 4th Earl of Clarendon, (1800-1870). Both archives were acquired under the terms of hybrid Acceptance in Lieu arrangements. The Fund also supported two archives with artistic connections. Salisbury and South Wiltshire Museum acquired the archive of the inter-war artist and designer Rex Whistler and the personal archive of William Henry Fox Talbot which the Bodleian Library is hoping to secure.
ii) Heritage Lottery Fund
The Heritage Lottery Fund is the largest funder of the UK’s heritage, with around £375 million a year to distribute.

Recent major grants include £3 million to the National Gallery and National Galleries of Scotland for the purchase of Titian’s Diana and Callisto, £107,300 to Kingston University to acquire the Iris Murdoch/Philippa Foot series of correspondence and £225,900 for the purchase of the Wickham Market Hoard which is the most complete Iron Age gold coin hoard in the UK.

In 2012/13 it contributed funding for the acquisition of two items placed under temporary export deferral. These were the painting by Lorenzetti (Case 12) and the pair of paintings by George Stubbs (Case 13).

This is the first full year since HLF has made it simpler for organisations to acquire objects within short timeframes. Applicants are now asked to demonstrate how the acquisition fits within their current and planned programmes rather than having to produce a separate activity plan.

The table and graph on pages 14 and 15 set out the figures for the NHMF’s and HLF’s overall commitment to acquisitions, including grants awarded for the acquisition of manuscripts and archive material. Details of awards for the acquisition of export-deferred items are at Appendix G.

iii) The Art Fund
The Art Fund is the national fundraising charity for art, helping to increase the range and quality of art in public collections across the UK. In 2012/13 the Art Fund contributed towards the acquisition of three cases placed under temporary deferral. These were the Chinese porcelain casket (Case 9), the Lorenzetti (Case 12) and the pair of Stubbs (Case 13). Full details are at Appendix G.

iv) The V&A Purchase Grant Fund
The V&A Purchase Grant Fund assists the collections of non-national museums, galleries, specialist libraries and record offices in England and Wales. In 2012/13, two items which had been placed under deferral were supported. These were the volume of maps for the Hampton Court estate, (Case 5) acquired by Herefordshire Archive Service and the porcelain casket bought by the Bowes Museum (Case 9). Details are at Appendix G.

v) The National Fund for Acquisitions
The National Fund for Acquisitions (NFA), provided by Scottish Government to the Trustees of National Museums Scotland, contributes towards the acquisition of objects for the collections of non-national museums, galleries, libraries and archives in Scotland. It was not asked to support any export deferred items in the reporting year.

vii) The Acceptance in Lieu Scheme and the Cultural Gifts Scheme
The Acceptance in Lieu (AIL) scheme brings important works of art, heritage objects, manuscripts and archives into public ownership. In 2012/13 30 cases were completed resulting in almost £50 million worth of important objects and archives being secured for the nation. Details are in its 2012/13 Report available on the Arts Council website.

The Cultural Gifts Scheme which the Reviewing Committee warmly welcomes opened in early 2013 and enables UK taxpayers to donate important works of art and heritage objects to the nation during their lifetime. In return, donors will receive a tax reduction based on a set percentage of the value of the object they are donating – this is 30% where the donor is an individual and 20% where the donor is a company. The first item to be donated under the Cultural Gifts Scheme consisted of a collection of handwritten lyrics for some of the Beatles best known songs and autograph letters by John Lennon which were in the collection of Beatles’ biographer, Hunter Davies.
viii) Private treaty sales
If a heritage object is sold on the open market, the vendor may be liable to Capital Gains Tax and Inheritance Tax. However, these tax charges are not incurred if an owner sells the object by Private Treaty to a body (e.g., a museum or gallery) listed under Schedule 3 of the Inheritance Tax Act 1984. Qualifying heritage objects include any previously granted conditional exemption or an item which would qualify as of pre-eminent importance. This dispensation was extended in April 2009 to Corporation Tax on companies’ chargeable gains. This is an attractive tax exemption because it offers a sweetener to owners to encourage them to offer such objects direct to museums. This is known colloquially as the ‘douceur’ under which the benefits of the tax exemption are shared. The vendor receives the amount that he or she would have received at the agreed market value, net after tax, but also receives a ‘douceur’ (usually 25 per cent) of the tax that would have been chargeable. The purchaser normally pays what would have been paid under normal arrangements, less a proportion of the tax (usually 75 per cent) that would have been chargeable.

Schedule 3 of the Inheritance Tax Act 1984 lists those museums which are able to benefit from a ‘douceur’ when acquiring works of art that are subject to either Inheritance Tax, Capital Gains Tax or Corporation Tax on sale.

Advisory Council
Many different branches of art and learning have an interest in the export of cultural objects and all the issues associated with it, as do many different UK institutions. They cannot all be represented on the Reviewing Committee but their knowledge and advice is valuable. The original Waverley Committee therefore recommended the creation of a widely representative Advisory Council, which would meet from time to time, as circumstances might require, to discuss matters of common interest and the operation of the system as a whole. It was envisaged that the Council would advise whether the right standards were being applied to the different categories of objects, as well as enabling institutions, not least provincial ones, and the art trade to make their views known.

Membership of the Council includes the expert advisers (who refer objects to the Committee and are normally appointed by the Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport as ‘champions’ for their retention when the decision on the export licence is deferred), as well as representatives of the institutions seeking to acquire deferred items, of grant-making bodies, of the art trade and of interested associations (see Appendix H for full details).

The Advisory Council is normally convened annually and met most recently on 12 June 2013. The main issue discussed was the availability of funding for the acquisition of export deferred items. The Council also considered the draft policy section of the Reviewing Committee’s Annual Report for 2012/13. Its comments have been fully considered and are reflected in this text.

Manuscripts, documents and archives
The Working Party on Manuscripts, Documents and Archives is a sub-committee of the Reviewing Committee. Its terms of reference were revised in 2005 and are as follows:

‘To consider the present arrangements for the export control of manuscripts, documents and archives, and the sources of funds available (to U.K. institutions) for their acquisition and to make recommendations resulting from this consideration.’

For membership of the Working Party on Manuscripts, Documents and Archives, see Appendix K.

The Working Party usually meets annually, although it may meet more frequently if necessary. It met most recently on 7 May 2013 when it considered the dispersal of collections and the implications this may have for the export control system. It was noted with regret that in many cases the significance of collections diminishes as items are removed. The Working Party also discussed the progress of the online export licence application system and the current situation of manuscript OIELS.
The Working Party then looked at sources of financial help for the acquisition of manuscripts, documents, and archives. Written reports had been submitted by the V&A Purchase Grant Fund, the PRISM Fund, the Friends of the National Libraries, the Secretary of the Acceptance in Lieu Panel and TNA Sales Monitoring Service. The HLF and NHMF provided details of funding towards archival and manuscript material.

i) The V&A Purchase Grant Fund
During 2012/13, the V&A Purchase Grant Fund considered 19 cases in respect of manuscript material and offered 14 grants totalling £160,277, enabling purchases of over £924,000 to go ahead. The budget for the fund overall was raised to £750,000, a welcome increase on 2011/12, supplemented by a further £100,000 in November. This meant that no grants were rejected due to lack of funds and only one was reduced from the level requested. Expenditure on manuscript material remained consistent at just under 20% of the overall budget although the actual sum spent rose by £40,000; the application success rate rose to just over 70%.

ii) The PRISM Fund
The PRISM Fund supports the acquisition and conservation of material relating to all fields of the history of science, technology, industry and medicine. During 2012/13, it made only one grant for the acquisition of archival or similar material, totalling £6,520.

iii) The Friends of the National Libraries
The Friends assist various institutions primarily by promoting the acquisition of printed books, manuscripts and records of historical, literary, artistic, architectural and musical interest. The Friends made or committed 31 grants to 27 institutions in 2012, totalling £126,175 from the operating fund and £33,005 from the restricted funds. Over £110,000 was awarded to university libraries, county record offices and smaller institutions.

iv) The Heritage Lottery Fund and National Heritage Memorial Fund
The Funds made awards for the purchase of archival and manuscript material totalling £698,700 in 2012/13.

v) Acceptance in Lieu
The Acceptance in Lieu scheme is also an important means of retaining archival material within the United Kingdom. During 2012/13 the Acceptance in Lieu scheme brought into public ownership seven archives which settled £1,245,030 of tax. The most significant was the archive of the Earls of Westmorland from Apethorpe in the Northamptonshire Record Office which included many documents of national importance as well as providing a wealth of material relating to the county. Information on all works of art and the archives accepted through the scheme in 2012/13 can be found on the Arts Council England’s website at www.artscouncil.org.uk.
vi) National Archives sales catalogue monitoring service
The sales catalogue monitoring service, among its other functions, notifies repositories when manuscripts and archives become available for acquisition through public sales. This service is greatly valued by repositories. In 2012/13, 80 items were purchased by 41 different repositories as a result of notifications. However there were 22 unsuccessful bids, as repositories were outbid or dealers had already disposed of stock.

vii) Cultural Gifts Scheme
The introduction of the Cultural Gifts Scheme is a significant and welcome development. The first item to be acquired by the nation under it consisted of manuscript material, the Hunter Davies Beatles Collection.

The Working Party strongly endorses the work of these funds and this scheme and service and expresses its thanks to the advisers and administrators of all of them, who work hard, often at very short notice, to enable applicants to acquire material. It noted that the national endorsement they provide to local institutions is often as valuable as the financial assistance provided.

Table 1
The statistics below show the figures for the number of cases from July 2003/April 2004 to 2012/13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>(2) Cases considered by the Committee</th>
<th>(3) Cases where a decision on the licence application was deferred</th>
<th>(4) Cases in (3) where items were not licensed for permanent export</th>
<th>(5) Cases where items were not licensed for permanent export as % of (3)</th>
<th>(6) Value (at deferral) of cases in (4) where items were not licensed for permanent export (£m)</th>
<th>(7) Cases in (3) where items were licensed for permanent export</th>
<th>(8) Cases where items were licensed for permanent export as % of (3)</th>
<th>(9) Value of items in (3) (at deferral) licensed for export (£m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 2003/April 2004</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19(^1)</td>
<td>14(^2)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9(^3)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>14(^4)</td>
<td>13(^5)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>60.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>18(^6)</td>
<td>14(^7)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>65.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19(^8)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>12(^9)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>103.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>207</strong></td>
<td><strong>155</strong></td>
<td><strong>88</strong></td>
<td><strong>57</strong></td>
<td><strong>104.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>66</strong></td>
<td><strong>43</strong></td>
<td><strong>351.1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Excludes one case where an item was original thought to be Waverley but subsequently found to have been imported into the UK within the last 50 years.
2 Excludes one case still under deferral at the time of writing and includes two cases where the licence application was withdrawn during the deferral period.
3 Includes one case where the licence application was refused at the end of the first deferral period because the owner refused to confirm that they were willing to accept a matching offer from a UK purchaser.
4 Excludes one case which was carried over to 2010/11.
5 Excludes one case which was carried over to 2010/11.
6 Includes one case which was carried over from 2009/10.
7 Includes one case which was carried over from 2009/10.
8 Includes one case which was considered in 2011/12 but referred to the Secretary of State in 2012/13.
9 Includes one case where the applicant was informed that a licence could be issued but decided to continue negotiations with a UK purchaser. To date an export licence has not been issued.
Table 2

The statistics below show the figures for the values associated with cases from July 2003/April 2004 to 2012/13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>(2) Cases where a decision on the licence application was deferred</th>
<th>(3) Value of items in (2) (£m)</th>
<th>(4) Cases where items were acquired by institutions or individuals in the UK (4)</th>
<th>(5) Value (at deferral) of items in (4) (£m)</th>
<th>(6) Value of items in (5) as % of (3) (£m)</th>
<th>(7) Cases where the application was refused or withdrawn after the announcement of the Secretary of State’s decision</th>
<th>(8) Value of items in (7) (£m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 2003/April 2004</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>19&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>13&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>14&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>19&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>114.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>457.8</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 This only includes items purchased by individuals who agreed to guarantee satisfactory public access, conservation and security arrangements.

2 Excludes one case where an item was originally thought to be Waverley but subsequently found to have been imported into the UK within the last 50 years.

3 Excludes one case which was carried over into 2010/11.

4 Includes one case which was carried over from 2009/10.

5 Includes one case which was considered in 2011/12 but referred to the Secretary of State in 2012/13.
Part II:
Operation of the Control

During the period covered by this report (1 May 2012 to 30 April 2013):

- There were 12,089 applications for export licences
- 1,512 of these applications were for the export of manuscripts, documents or archives
- The applications covered a total of 51,606 items
- 33,842 items with a value of £1,665,255,992 were issued with export licences after they had been referred to expert advisers
- 68 Open Individual Export Licences (OIEL) were in operation over this period. 67 of these were issued in December 2010, and one was issued in August 2011, each taking effect for a period of three years or less ending on 31 December 2013 to regular exporters for the following categories of objects: a) 11 for the export of manuscripts, documents, archives and photographic positives and negatives; b) three for the export of goods over 50 years of age imported into the UK within the past 50 years; c) one for the export of UK origin coins; d) one for the temporary export of a Rolls Royce; e) one for the temporary export of objects in soil samples from archaeological sites in Northern Ireland and f) 51 for the temporary export of objects over 50 years of age owned by or under the control of a national institution or an institution holding a designated collection
- 13,284 items with a value of £8,851,790,997 were issued with export licences after the Export Licensing Unit was satisfied that they had been imported into the United Kingdom within the past 50 years 2,294 of these items with proof of import were manuscripts, documents or archives, with a total value of £93,925,150
- 4,480 items, with a value of £2,612,658,658 were given an EU licence without reference to the question of national importance because they were either: valued at below the appropriate UK monetary limit; owned by a museum or gallery that has an OIEL; manuscripts valued at £1,500 or less or coins valued at £500 or less and the exporter holds a valid OIEL; musical instruments exported for less than three months for use in the course of work by a professional musician; a motor vehicle exported for less than three months for social, domestic or pleasure purposes; a foreign registered motor vehicle exported following importation for less than three months for pleasure purposes; imported into the UK in the last 50 years and being exported on a temporary basis

Cases referred to the Committee

In 2012/13 28 cases were referred to the Committee because the appropriate expert adviser had objected to the proposed export on the grounds of national importance. This is a fraction of the items covered by the export licensing system and shows that expert advisers think very carefully before referring cases to us.

Two cases referred to the Committee in 2011/12 were resolved in the 2012/13 period: the Swinton School Mural was referred to the Committee in the last reporting period but was considered in this one; and the Kathleen & May was considered by the Committee in the last reporting period but gave rise to further issues that have now been resolved.

Of the 28 cases referred to the Committee in 2012/13, three were withdrawn before they reached the stage of consideration by us. Two cases were referred to the Committee but are still awaiting consideration. The criteria that were applied in each case by the Committee were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>History</th>
<th>Aesthetics</th>
<th>Scholarship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is it so closely connected with our history and national life that its departure would be a misfortune?</td>
<td>Is it of outstanding aesthetic importance?</td>
<td>Is it of outstanding significance for the study of some particular branch of art, learning or history?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 24 cases (including one case referred to the Committee in 2011/12) considered by the Committee:

- One case gave rise to issues that are still being resolved
- During the hearing of one case doubts were raised as to how long the item had been in the UK. Following the hearing and before the Committee made any submission to the Secretary of State, evidence was provided that demonstrated that the item had not been in the UK for the last 50 years. The licence was thus issued in accordance with normal established procedures
Items found to meet the Waverley criteria
19 items were found to meet at least one of the Waverley criteria:

Case 1 – A Dutch silver ewer and basin by Christian van Vianen (met second and third criteria)

Case 3 – A painting by Pablo Picasso, *Child with a Dove* (met first, second and third criteria)

Case 4 – An officer’s embroidered grenadier cap (met third criterion)

Case 5 – An atlas of estate maps of Hampton Court, Herefordshire (met third criterion)

Case 6 – A George II silver-gilt ewer and basin, the ‘Bristol ewer and basin’ (met second and third criteria)

Case 7 – A George II ivory-mounted padouk medal cabinet, the ‘Brand cabinet’ (met second and third criteria)

Case 8 – A south German marquetry table top (met second and third criteria)

Case 9 – A Regence Ormolu-mounted Chinese porcelain casket (met second and third criteria)

Case 10 – A pair of Charles II silver-gilt flagons

Case 11 – A painting by Johan Zoffany, *Portrait of Claud Alexander with his brother, Boyd, attended by an Indian servant*

Items found not to meet the Waverley criteria
Three items were found not to meet any of the Waverley criteria. They were:

Case 2 – A pair of Charles II silver-gilt flagons

Case 10 – A Queen Anne silver-gilt toilet service, the ‘Norfolk toilet service’

Case 11 – A painting by Johan Zoffany, *Portrait of Claud Alexander with his brother, Boyd, attended by an Indian servant*

Items where the licence application was withdrawn following the case hearing
One application for an item found to meet the Waverley criteria was withdrawn following the hearing and consequently not referred to the Secretary of State:

Case 4 – An officer’s embroidered grenadier cap

Deferred items that were acquired:

Of the 19 deferred items, the following six items were acquired by institutions or individuals in the United Kingdom.

Case 5 – An atlas of estate maps of Hampton Court, Herefordshire (£5000)
Case 9 – A Regence Ormolu-mounted Chinese porcelain casket (£193,250)

Case 12 – A painting by Pietro Lorenzetti, *Christ between Saints Paul and Peter* (£5,197,500 – tax remission available total price £1,612,940)

Case 13 – Two paintings by George Stubbs, *Kongouro from New Holland (The Kangaroo) and Portrait of a Large Dog (The Dingo)* (£5,500,000 – tax remission available total price £4,455,000)

Case 15 – Seven silk works (£120,000)

Case 18 – A peridot and gold suite of jewellery (£150,000)

The six cases where items were purchased have a total value of £11,165,750 (value price at deferral) which represents 10 per cent of the total value of objects under deferral.

Deferred items that were subsequently exported

Unfortunately, it was not possible to retain in the UK every ‘Waverley’ object which was deferred. Export licences were (or can now be) issued for the 12 items listed below:

Case 1 – A Dutch silver ewer and basin by Christian van Vianen (£7,550,000)

Case 3 – A painting by Pablo Picasso, *Child with a Dove* (£50,000,000,000)

Case 6 – A George II silver-gilt ewer and basin, the ‘Bristol ewer and basin’ (£1,900,000)

Case 7 – A George II ivory-mounted padouk medal cabinet, the ‘Brand cabinet’ (£1,250,700)

Case 8 – A south German marquetry table top (£274,300)

Case 14 – A painting by Jasper Francis Cropsey, *Richmond Hill in the Summer of 1862* (£4,950,000)

Case 16 – Louis de Gruuthuse’s copy of the Deeds of Sir Gillion de Trazegnies in the Middle East (£3,849,250)

Case 17 – A study by Raphael, *Head of a Young Apostle* (£29,721,250)

Case 19 – An amber games board attributed to Georg Schreiber (£821,500)

Case 20 – Four scenes from the Passion of the Christ by Niccolò di Pietro Gerini (£1,105,250)

Case 21 – A Julia Margaret Cameron photo album, the ‘Signor 1857’ (£121,250)

Case 11 (2011/12) – A three-masted topsail schooner, *Kathleen & May* (£2,000,000)

The 12 items where export licences were (or can now be) issued have a total value of £103,543,500 which represents 90 per cent of the total value of objects placed under deferral and 63 per cent in number.
Individual export cases

Case 11 (2011/12)

A three-masted topsail schooner, Kathleen & May

The Kathleen & May is a three-masted topsail schooner built largely in wood with a variety of metal fastenings and fixtures, and is fully rigged with textile sails set from wooden spars. She launched in 1900 and measures 98 feet and 4 inches in length by 23 feet and 2 inches in the beam with a tonnage of 136 gross. The Kathleen & May is in full sailing condition.

The applicant had applied to export the schooner to the British Virgin Islands. The value shown on the export license application was £2,300,000, which represented an agreed sale price.

The curator of Ships, Models and Boat Collections at the National Maritime Museum, acting as expert adviser, had objected to the export of the schooner under the first, second and third Waverley criteria on the grounds that it was so closely connected with our history and national life that its departure would be a misfortune, that it was of outstanding aesthetic importance, and that it was of outstanding significance for the study of naval architecture and wooden ship construction. Furthermore, the fact that this vessel was in full sailing condition allowed the continuance of the art of seamanship to be passed on to future generations.

The expert adviser stated that at build, Kathleen & May incorporated the first known example of the Appledore roller reefing gear which had been fully restored on all three booms for use today. She was fitted with an engine in 1931, her topmasts reduced in height and square topsails removed, and operated as a motor schooner. An ex-lifeboat engine was now installed with twin hydraulically driven propellers, but her rig had been restored to its original specification. During conservation, approximately 85 per cent of her planking and 60 per cent of the frames were replaced and she was re-decked. Most of the internal timbers and fittings remained original. Kathleen & May typified the great era of the British merchant schooner with a rig that was widely adopted from the 1870s to the First World War due to its efficient and economical form. Both rig and hull were crafted, and subsequently repaired and restored between 1999 and 2002, using traditional techniques developed over 400 years.

The expert adviser stated that Kathleen & May remained the sole survivor of both the builders and the Welsh merchant sailing fleet. She was also the sole surviving wooden three-masted topsail schooner, although there were a number of other similar coastal vessels which varied in terms of hull materials and rig. Examples of these were in both the public domain and in private ownership and included the two-masted ketches Irene and Garlandstone, the steel hulled, three-masted topsail schooner Result, and the riveted steel hulled, three-masted schooner De Wadden.

Finally, Kathleen & May was an outstanding vessel of both regional and national significance and was one of a limited number of vessels on the National Register of Historic Vessels to be listed in the National Historic Fleet.

The applicant stated at the meeting that they did not disagree that the Kathleen & May met the Waverley criteria.

We heard this case in March 2012 when the schooner was shown to us. We found that it met the first and third Waverley criteria in that the schooner was so closely connected with our history and national life that her departure would be a misfortune; and as the sole surviving wooden three-masted topsail schooner, and the last Welsh-built merchant sailing vessel, she was of outstanding significance for the study of British maritime history and naval architecture.
The Committee was unable to recommend a fair matching price for the schooner on the basis of the information supplied by the applicant, so recommended that the Secretary of State seek an independent valuation of the schooner. The independent valuer recommended a figure of £2,000,000. We recommended that the decision on the export licence application should be deferred for an initial period of two months to allow an offer to purchase to be made at the fair matching price of £2,000,000. We further recommended that if, by the end of the initial deferral period, a potential purchaser had shown a serious intention to raise funds with a view to making an offer to purchase the schooner, the deferral period should be extended by a further four months. During the initial deferral period, we were informed of a serious intention to raise funds to purchase the schooner. A decision on the export licence application was deferred for a further four months. No offer to purchase the schooner was received. The applicant was informed that a licence could be issued but agreed to continue negotiations with a UK purchaser. To date an export licence has not been issued.

Case 1
A Dutch silver ewer and basin by Christian van Vianen

This silver ewer and basin were made by Christian van Vianen (circa 1600/5–67) and have a combined weight of 85 ounces. Both pieces are marked with van Vianen’s maker’s mark and the Utrecht assay office date mark for 1632. The ewer measures 25.4cm high, its body raised from a single sheet of silver, with a hinged silver lid and applied hollow handle, also made of silver. The body of the vessel is asymmetrical and defined by the ornamental figures and scroll-shapes that follow across its surface. The basin measures 53.3cm x 43cm, is oval in shape and embossed and chased from a single sheet of silver. The form of a fantastical creature, which is embossed on the rim at one end, leans into the basin and appears to drink.

The applicant had applied to export the ewer and basin to the USA. The value shown on the export licence application was £7,550,000, which represented an agreed sale price.

The Acting Keeper of the Sculpture, Metalwork, Ceramics and Glass Department at the V&A, acting as expert adviser, had objected to the export of the ewer and basin under the second and third Waverley criteria, on the grounds that they were of outstanding aesthetic importance, and of outstanding significance to the study of the history and development of European decorative arts, the history of silversmithing, and the history of European royal patronage and collecting.

The expert had provided a written submission stating that the ewer and basin, made for Johan van der Haer (1573–1646) and his wife Maria van Kinschot (1589–1648), were superb examples of the extraordinary and striking ‘auricul’r style, pioneered by Christian van Vianen and his father Adam van Vianen. The auricular style – so called by modern art historians because it was thought to resemble the fleshy curves of a human ear – was a fluid, sculptural approach to silver design. The flowing, organic forms of the works produced by Adam, and then Christian van Vianen, had an intellectual justification, Platonic in origin, that all metals were liquids that had congealed beneath the earth. Moreover, as moisture sustained the vital heat of all living creatures, the aqueous character of metals meant that they could on some level be considered living organisms. The ewer and basin therefore represented a rare moment in the history of art when a branch of decorative arts developed a striking and innovative style.

The expert stated that the ewer and basin demonstrated the close relationship between the work of father and son; the organic form of the ewer, in particular, harking back to the design of a 1619 ewer made by Adam van Vianen. Christian van Vianen’s technical skills were equal to that of his father’s. The fact that the ewer and basin were each raised from a single sheet of silver demonstrated a tremendous feat of goldsmithing skill. Such pieces were commonly constructed in sections that combined parts that had been separately cast and raised. Ewers and basins which survived together were few, as they were so easily separated by the accidents of time. This was the only example by Christian van Vianen extant today and as such was a rare opportunity to appreciate the aesthetic effect of a matching set of ewer and basin.

The expert stated that the ewer and basin were rare examples of a style poorly represented in UK public collections. There was only one signed piece of work by Christian van Vianen in an English museum, the so-called ‘dolphin basin’ in the V&A, which survived without its corresponding ewer. Equally there were few examples in private collections in the British Isles. The Rothschild collections at Waddesdon Manor included a cup of 1640–41 in the auricular style, marked with Christian van Vianen’s ‘CV’ monogram; the faintly-visible monogram on the underside of the footed salver in the collection of the Duke of Northumberland at Alnwick Castle was probably also that of Christian van
Vianen. Other examples of the auricular style in public galleries and stately homes, however, could only be attributed to Christian van Vianen on stylistic or documentary grounds, such as the inkstand on loan to the V&A and the unmarked two-handled covered cup at the Fitzwilliam Museum.

Finally, the expert noted that the two identifiable coats of arms preserved on the ewer and basin, that of Johan van der Haer and his wife Maria and Prince Augustus Frederick Duke of Sussex (1773–1843), provided rare evidence for the status and occupation of the original owners, as well as an indication of the continuing esteem in which works by the Van Vianen goldsmiths were held. The Duke of Sussex had not received the scholarly attention devoted to his older brothers, the Prince Regent and the Duke of York, and his ownership of these items demonstrated that there were still avenues of research into English collecting and aesthetic attitudes to be explored.

The applicant stated at the meeting that they did not disagree that the ewer and basin met the Waverley criteria.

We heard this case in June 2012 when the ewer and basin were shown to us. We found that the set met the second and third Waverley criteria in that it was of outstanding aesthetic importance and of outstanding significance for the study of the history of European decorative arts and seventeenth-century silversmithing, in particular the work of Christian van Vianen, one of the leading masters of the period who worked for both Charles I and Charles II. We recommended that the decision on the export licence application should be deferred for an initial period of four months to allow an offer to purchase to be made at the fair matching price of £7,550,000 (plus VAT). We further recommended that if, by the end of the initial deferral period, a potential purchaser had shown a serious intention to raise funds with a view to making an offer to purchase the ewer and basin, the deferral period should be extended by a further four months.

At the end of the initial deferral period, no offer to purchase the ewer and basin had been made and we were not aware of any serious intention to raise funds. An export licence was therefore issued.

**Case 2**

**A pair of Charles II silver-gilt flagons**

This pair of silver-gilt Charles II cylindrical flagons, made in London circa 1660–68, each measure 40cm high; their combined weight is 8,163 grams. Each flagon bears the maker’s mark ‘orb with a cross’ – attributed to Wolfgang Howzer (active 1652–88) – on both the bodies and covers. The flagons are embossed with a frieze of flowers, foliage and three cherubim, with upper stiff-leaf border. Each has a hinged, slightly domed cover – similarly chased with flowers and cherubim, with a central floral boss. The hollow scroll handles are engraved with the coat-of-arms of the Hon. Ralph Montagu, later 1st Earl and 1st Duke of Montagu (1638–1709), and have pierced scroll thumbpieces. The bases are both engraved with the inscription, ‘Elizabeth Montagu, Duchess Dowr of Buccleuch & Queensberry, 1817’.

The applicant had applied to export the flagons to the USA. The value shown on the export licence application was £690,000, which represented an agreed sale price.

The Acting Keeper of the Sculpture, Metalwork, Ceramics and Glass Department at the V&A, acting as expert adviser, had objected to the export of the flagons under the second and third Waverley criteria, on the grounds that they were of outstanding aesthetic importance, and of outstanding significance for: the study of the history and development of British silver; the history of diplomatic protocol and the use of silver to promote the status of the British ambassador abroad; and the continued use of that silver after completion of a diplomatic posting.

The expert had provided a written submission stating that the flagons were supplied in 1668 by the Royal Jewel House for the Hon. Ralph Montagu – as British Ambassador to the Court of Louis XIV – for use in celebrating Holy Communion in the chapel attached to the British Embassy in Paris. They were a unique survival of embassy chapel plate, supplied for use on the continent during the reign of Charles II to promote the status of the newly restored British monarchy. The ‘orb within a cross’ maker’s mark, present on the flagons, appeared on the grandest ecclesiastical and secular silver commissioned on the restoration of the monarchy for Charles II. The use of a device mark rather than initials suggested that this was the mark of an ‘alien’ goldsmith working in London, and the embossed decoration had been attributed to Howzer. By 1664, Howzer had registered a mark of his own (HW above a
cherub) at Goldsmiths’ Hall. This suggested that, if the attribution to Howzer was correct, the flagons may date from 1660–64 and may have been supplied to Montagu for his embassy to Paris from existing stock held at the Royal Jewel House.

The expert stated that the flagons were an important part of material culture, recording the exceptionally well documented ambassadorial missions undertaken by Montagu in Paris in the 1660s and 1670s. Ralph Montagu’s embassy to Paris was well documented. Charles II sent Montagu as an envoy from October 1662 to February 1663 to seek closer co-operation with France. Six years later, Montagu was appointed Ambassador-Extraordinary to France on 1 January 1669. Montagu was appointed Ambassador-Extraordinary to the court of Louis XIV again in 1676 and then in 1677. Following a bitter quarrel with Charles II’s mistress, Barbara Palmer, Duchess of Cleveland, he left his post on 1 July 1678 without leave of the King. On his return from France, Montagu re-established his homes at Montagu House in Bloomsbury, Ditton House in Buckinghamshire, and Boughton House in Northamptonshire.

The expert informed us that documentary evidence in the records of the Royal Jewel House, for the supply of silver and silver-gilt for Ralph Montagu’s embassy, was confirmed by a parchment fragment which survived in the archives of the present Duke of Buccleuch and Queensberry at Boughton House in Northamptonshire. The parchment detailed: ‘Two gilt chased Flaggon & one gilt chased Bason 0427 oz 2 qr’. It was not known whether the accompanying basin survived. The chased winged cherubs on the flagons indicated that they were originally supplied for use in an ecclesiastical context.

The applicant stated at the meeting that they disagreed that the flagons met the Waverley criteria.

We heard this case in July 2012 when the flagons were shown to us. We found that they did not meet any of the Waverley criteria and recommended that an export licence be issued. An export licence was therefore issued.

**Case 3**

**A painting by Pablo Picasso, Child with a Dove**

This painting by Pablo Picasso (1881–1937) is oil on canvas and measures 73cm by 54cm. The painting, which dates from 1901, depicts an image of a young child holding a dove, next to a multi-coloured ball, standing in front of a subdued background.

The applicant had applied to export the painting to Switzerland. The value shown on the export licence application was £50 million, which represented an agreed sale price.

The Chief Curator at the Scottish National Gallery of Modern Art, acting as expert adviser, had objected to the export of the painting under the first, second and third Waverley criteria, on the grounds that it was so closely connected with our history and national life that its departure would be a misfortune, that it was of outstanding aesthetic importance, and that it was of outstanding significance for the study of the birth and reception of modernism in the UK.

The expert had provided a written submission stating that the painting was one of the earliest and most important works by Picasso to enter a British collection. It was a key work within the development of Picasso’s art and marked the start of the artist’s celebrated ‘blue period’, which dated from the early autumn of 1901. Picasso moved away from the Impressionistic style he was employing around the turn of the century by simplifying the composition and flattening perspective. The simplified design and coarse brushwork were derived from the work of Van Gogh and Gauguin.

The expert informed us that the painting had been acquired in 1924 by Mrs R A Workman, a keen collector of Impressionist and Post-Impressionist paintings. In 1926, Mrs Workman lent the painting to the opening exhibition at the newly built Modern Foreign Gallery at the Tate Gallery. Its display at the Tate constituted the earliest official national recognition of the Spanish artist’s importance. In 1928 Mrs Workman sold the painting to Samuel Courtauld, the most important British collector of modern French art of the period, who co-founded the Courtauld Institute of Art – the first British institute devoted to the study of the history of art. During the 1930s Samuel Courtauld gave a number of works from his collection to the Courtauld Institute and bequeathed most of the remainder of the collection to the institute on his death in 1947. However, a few works were reserved for close friends and family and the Picasso was bequeathed to Lady Aberconway.
(née Christabel McNaughten, wife of Henry McLaren, 2nd Baron Aberconway). In 1974 the painting was placed on long-term loan to the National Gallery where it remained on permanent display until 2010. The painting had thus been at the centre of Britain’s national collection for almost 40 years, in one of the world’s finest and most concentrated displays of art from the 1880–1900 period. The image of *Child with a Dove* was iconic and hugely popular: The National Gallery’s records showed that it had consistently been one of its 10 top-selling postcards.

The expert adviser stated that the majority of major works from Picasso’s early years were in institutional collections, particularly in America, France and Spain. As the exhibition *Picasso and Modern British Art* (Tate Britain, February–July 2012) made clear, British museums, galleries and collectors were slow to show interest in Picasso’s work and most of the great works that were in UK collections were now abroad. *Child with a Dove*’s long, uninterrupted history in a British collection meant that it was of enormous interest to the study of British collecting in the 20th century. There were just five early oil paintings by Picasso in UK public collections and *Child with a Dove* filled an important gap between Picasso’s more derivative impressionistic works, represented by paintings at the Tate (*Flowers*, 1901), the Ashmolean Oxford (*Blue Roofs, Paris*, 1901) and Glasgow Art Gallery (*The Flower Seller*, 1901) and the two slightly later blue period works at Edinburgh (*Mother and Child*, 1902) and the Tate (*Girl in a Chemise*, circa 1905).

The applicant had stated in a written submission that they did not contest that the Waverley criteria applied. We heard this case in July 2012 when the painting was shown to us. We found that it met the first, second and third Waverley criteria on the grounds that it was of outstanding significance for the study of Picasso’s early works and artistic development and British collecting of European avant-garde in the first decades of the 20th century. We recommended that the decision on the export licence application should be deferred for an initial period of four months to allow an offer to purchase to be made at the fair matching price of £50,000,000 (inclusive of VAT). We further recommended that if, by the end of the initial deferral period, a potential purchaser had shown a serious intention to raise funds with a view to making an offer to purchase the painting, the deferral period should be extended by a further six months.

At the end of the initial deferral period, no offer to purchase the painting had been made and we were not aware of any serious intention to raise funds. An export licence was therefore issued.

**Case 4**

**An officer’s embroidered grenadier cap**

This officer’s embroidered grenadier cap of the 27th (Enniskillen) Regiment, circa 1751–68, is 31cm high by 26cm wide and manufactured from coloured cotton velvet with gold and silver embroidery, spangles and threads.

The applicant had applied to export the cap to the USA. The value shown on the export licence application was £44,000, which represented the price at which the present owner had agreed to sell, subject to the granting of an export licence.

The Director of the National Maritime Museum, acting as expert adviser, had objected to the export of the cap under the first, second and third Waverley criteria, on the grounds that it was so closely connected with our history and national life that its departure would be a misfortune, that it was of outstanding aesthetic importance, and that it was of outstanding significance for the study of the history of Ireland and its relationship with the British Army.

The expert had provided a written submission stating that the cap was thought to be a unique surviving example of the type of headdress worn by grenadier officers of the Enniskillen Regiment in the mid-eighteenth-century, not represented in the collections of either the National Army Museum or the Inniskillings Museum collection. This type of cap, sometimes known as a ‘Mitre cap’ after its shape was issued to grenadiers who were the elite soldiers of the age. The brimless, highly decorated headgear distinguished the grenadiers from other soldiers. The National Army Museum held 11 similar grenadier caps from other British Army regiments dating 1751–68.

The expert stated that this cap was thought to be a unique survivor from the Enniskillen Regiment and of outstanding importance to the local history of Enniskillen in particular and Northern Ireland in general. The expert stated that the cap reflected an important period in the story of the British Army and its relationship with Ireland. The origins of the Enniskillen Regiment lay in a local force raised in defence of the town of Enniskillen against the catholic King James II.
The regiment was originally known as ‘Tiffin’s Inniskillings’ and became part of the British Army in June 1689. It fought both in Ireland and Flanders under William III, and was at the final defeat of the Jacobite cause at Culloden in 1746. In 1751, when foot regiments were given numbers to reflect their seniority, it became the 27th (or Inniskilling) Regiment, and was the first regiment in the army formally to boast a territorial element to its title – a fitting acknowledgement of the strong ties it maintained with the town of Enniskillen.

Finally, the expert stated that the design on the cap depicted the Castle of Enniskillen with the flag of St George, above the motto, ‘nec espera terrent’ (‘by difficulty undaunted’) and the White Horse of Hanover – a symbol of the British Hanoverian kings. Both symbols were surmounted by an embroidered royal crown. There did not appear to be moth-damaged or missing spangles, and the embroidery was skilfully applied. The quality of the gold and silver thread embroidery was of the same very high standard found in other officers’ caps from this period; however, although based on a template, grenadier caps were never uniform in design, making each cap unique.

The applicant had stated in a written submission that they found it difficult to believe that the cap exactly fulfilled the Waverley criteria. Additionally, the applicant understood that the prospective purchaser would cooperate fully in making information, data and images of the item available to any interested individual or institution.

We heard this case in September 2012 when the grenadier’s cap was shown to us. We found that it met the third Waverley criterion in that it was of outstanding significance for the study of Anglo-Irish military history. We recommended that the decision on the export licence application should be deferred for an initial period of two months to allow an offer to purchase to be made at the fair matching price of £44,000. We further recommended that if, by the end of the initial deferral period, a potential purchaser had shown a serious intention to raise funds with a view to making an offer to purchase the cap, the deferral period should be extended by a further three months.

Before the end of the first deferral period the applicant withdrew their export licence application and the cap remains in the UK.

Case 5
An atlas of estate maps of Hampton Court, Herefordshire

This atlas, made of paper and vellum, consists of 15 estate maps and 48 pages of reference tables with notes relating to the Hampton Court estate in Herefordshire. It measures 55cm by 44cm when closed and has maps of varying sizes, from 27cm by 40cm to 53cm by 110cm. It is believed to have been initially assembled in 1698, expanded in 1719 and rebound and further expanded after 1774. The atlas includes maps by Thomas Cleer (fl. 1685–1706) and William Godson (fl. 1717–32), who were among the leading estate surveyors of their time.

The applicant had applied to export the atlas to the USA. The value shown on the export licence application was £5,000, which represented the agreed sale price.

The Head of Map Collections at the British Library, acting as expert adviser, had objected to the export of the atlas under the first and second Waverley criteria on the grounds that it was of outstanding significance to the history of British local mapping, the history of Herefordshire and for English late seventeenth/early eighteenth-century political, cultural and social history, and that it was of outstanding aesthetic importance.

The expert adviser had provided a written submission stating that the atlas provided the earliest surviving accurate detailed depiction of a significant portion of Herefordshire, and would seem to be the sole surviving corpus of maps of what was at the time the largest estate in the county. Though much depleted, it was an outstanding example of the type of lavish estate atlas that was commissioned by great English landowners in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, of which very few survived. The majority of the estate maps in the atlas were commissioned by Thomas Coningsby, 1st Earl Coningsby (1657–1729), who came from a long-established Herefordshire family. He rose from being MP for Leominster to being a member of the inner cabinet, confidential adviser to William III and one of the foremost ‘lord treasurer’s whigs’ under Queen Anne. These maps provided a record of how Coningsby chose to advertise his landed wealth, commissioning leading London and local surveyors, in order to further his career. They were primarily intended not for estate administration but for the library for Coningsby’s own satisfaction, as well as being an instrument in the aggrandising of his own political ambitions. The maps therefore bore testimony to the actual and perceived importance of land as a source of
power and influence in the structure of English government and society in the decades following the Glorious Revolution. The expert stated that these maps could only be fully understood in the context of the manorial court rolls (the export of which is forbidden), with the maps (with their tables of reference) enabling a fuller understanding of the significance of the transactions recorded in these court rolls.

The expert stated that the 1704 plan of Hampton Park by William Whittell (born 1684, fl. 1705–9), was of extraordinary quality and particular importance. It foreshadowed the early nineteenth-century pictorial maps of Thomas Hornor (1785–1844). The ‘Whittell map’ was remarkable in that it appeared to combine geometric precision with panoramic landscape depiction. The only earlier comparators would be the German Landtafeln of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, and the work of individual early English estate mappers like John Darby, Moses Glover and (to a much lesser extent) Mark Peirce in the same period.

The applicant had provided a written submission in which they neither agreed nor disagreed that the Waverley criteria applied.

We heard this case in September 2012 when the atlas was shown to us, and found that it met the third Waverley criterion on the grounds that it was of outstanding significance for the study of the history of cartography, the history of Herefordshire and the relationship between power and land in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. We recommended that the decision on the export licence application should be deferred for an initial period of two months to allow an offer to purchase to be made at the fair matching price of £5,000. We further recommended that if, by the end of the initial deferral period, a potential purchaser had shown a serious intention to raise funds with a view to making an offer to purchase the atlas, the deferral period should be extended by a further two months.

During the initial deferral period, we were informed of a serious intention to raise funds to purchase the atlas by Herefordshire Archive Service. A decision on the export licence application was deferred for a further two months. We were subsequently informed that the atlas had been purchased by Herefordshire Archive Service with assistance from the Friends of the National Libraries, the V&A Purchase Grant Fund and the Friends of the Herefordshire Record Office.

Case 6
A George II silver-gilt ewer and basin, the ‘Bristol ewer and basin’

This silver-gilt ewer and basin, known as the ‘Bristol ewer and basin’, was made by leading London goldsmith George Wicks circa 1735. The ewer measures 36.2cm high and weighs 2,520 grams. The basin has a diameter of 55.2cm and weighs 5,972 grams. Both ewer and basin bear the maker’s mark and the post-1893 French import mark, and the basin is also marked with ‘London’ and the date letter V for 1735/6. The ewer is of baluster shape with applied cast rococo elements, the handle with a finial in the shape of a female head. The circular basin has an undulating, moulded outline with shell motifs; at the centre a circular panel contains two shields, with the applied crest and engraved monogram of John Scrope (circa 1662–1752). The wider base and rim of the basin is set with 12 applied profile heads of Roman emperors.

The applicant had applied to export the ewer and basin to the USA. The value shown on the export licence application was £1,900,000, which represented an agreed sale price.

The Acting Keeper of the Department of Metalwork, Ceramics and Glass at the V&A, acting as expert adviser, had objected to the granting of an export licence under the second and third Waverley criteria, on the grounds that they were of outstanding aesthetic importance and of outstanding significance for the study of the European context and influence of style in eighteenth-century London-made silver, and additionally for the revival and reception of rococo forms in British silver in the late nineteenth-century.

The expert had provided a written submission stating that the ewer and basin were given as a gift to John Scrope by the Corporation of the City of Bristol, in recognition of his services to the city as Recorder. According to the ledgers once owned by the firm R & S Garrard & Co, the pieces were commissioned by Leonell Lyde, the Mayor of Bristol. One member of the Committee proposed an alternative hypothesis: that the gift was more likely to be connected with Scrope’s defeat in the 1734 general election as one of two Members of Parliament for the constituency of Bristol. Scrope had long supported trade bills in Parliament, which had been directly to the benefit of Bristol’s senior merchants. The Bristol Common Council had voted the money for the costly commission of the ewer and basin,
and the timing of the vote supported the suggestion that it was for his duties as MP rather than Recorder.

The expert said that the ewer and basin combined forms and types of decoration that were first introduced into the manufacture of British silver in the early eighteenth-century. Of particular significance was the undulating edge of the basin, the overall form of the helmet-shaped ewer, the classical portrait medallions and cast rococo ornament. The expert stated that, to the best of their knowledge, this was the only example of a 1730s ewer and basin that showed this unusual marriage of styles in such a lavish and successful manner.

The expert stated that such generous commissions gave goldsmiths the opportunity to create daring silver by exploring innovative designs and pushing manufacturing techniques to new limits. Silver was produced in England in the 1730s in a range of different styles. Extant pieces marked by George Wickes demonstrated a mastery of these emerging styles. While the ‘Bristol ewer and basin’ were rococo in form, the ‘Pelham gold cup and cover’ – hall-marked for the same year – were designed by William Kent in a classically Baroque style, and demonstrated that Wickes was equally at home working in both styles.

The ewer and basin were subsequently supplied by the London goldsmith firm Garrards in 1876 for use as the ‘Doncaster cup’. The crest of John Scrope was erased and replaced by the coat of arms and initials of William Stuart Stirling Crawfurd, owner of the winning horse. Additionally, the ewer and basin played an influential role in the nineteenth-century revival of the rococo style in London-made silver and, like other important eighteenth-century pieces, were used as models in Garrards’ workshop.

The expert said that comparable rococo interpretations did survive in UK and overseas collections, but that the designers and makers of such pieces were so far mostly unknown, and the many different hands involved had yet to be distinguished. Only direct first-hand experience and comparison of a significant number of objects would enable scholars to develop a better understanding of individual skills and how they relate to particular workshops. Furthermore, due to their unusually well documented history and survival as a complete ensemble, the ewer and basin were critical to this process.

The applicant had provided a written submission in which they neither agreed nor disagreed that the ewer and basin met the Waverley criteria.

We heard this case in October 2012 when the ewer and basin were shown to us. We found that they met the second and third Waverley criteria on the grounds that they were of outstanding aesthetic importance, and of outstanding significance for the study of the influence of European style on the development of British silver in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Furthermore, they were of particular significance due to their being exceptionally well documented in the Bristol City and Wickes Archives. They appeared to be the most magnificent known surviving gift made by a corporation in the eighteenth-century to a private citizen, and had an interesting later history being recycled as the ‘Doncaster Cup’.

We recommended that the decision on the export licence application should be deferred for an initial period of two months to allow an offer to purchase to be made at the fair matching price of £1,900,000 (net of VAT). We further recommended that if, by the end of the initial deferral period, a potential purchaser had shown a serious intention to raise funds with a view to making an offer to purchase the ewer and basin, the deferral period should be extended by a further four months.

During the initial deferral period, we were informed of a serious intention to raise funds to purchase the ewer and basin. A decision on the export licence application was deferred for a further four months.

At the end of the second deferral period, no offer to purchase the ewer and basin had been received. An export licence was therefore issued.

Case 7

A George II ivory-mounted padouk medal cabinet, the ‘Brand cabinet’

This cabinet, known as the ‘Brand cabinet’, was designed by Horace Walpole (1717–97) and perhaps made by William Hallett senior (circa 1707–81) between 1743 and circa 1750. The cabinet measures 134cm high, 98cm wide and 21cm deep. Its pine carcass is veneered with padouk, the interior is lined in black velvet and the bottom drawer is oak-lined. At the base are two carved ivory eagles’ heads, made in England between 1743 and 1750 by an anonymous carver. The front is set with 20 carved ivory reliefs – after classical subjects and sixteenth-century paintings – made by Giovanni Battista Pozzo (or Pozzi, 1670–1752) and anonymous Italian carvers of the first half of the eighteenth-century.
The applicant had applied to export the cabinet to the USA. The value shown on the export licence application was £1,250,700, which represented a hammer price at auction of £1,050,000 plus buyer’s premium of £200,700.

The Keeper of the Furniture, Textiles and Fashion Department at the V&A, acting as expert adviser, had objected to the export of the cabinet under the second and third Waverley criteria, on the grounds that it was of outstanding aesthetic importance, and that it was of outstanding significance for the study of English furniture, and the history of taste and collecting in the eighteenth-century.

The expert adviser had provided a written submission stating that the Brand cabinet could be clearly distinguished from the superficially comparable cabinet which was in the collection of the V&A and which was completed in 1743 for Horace Walpole, son of the first British Prime Minister, Sir Robert Walpole, following his Grand Tour in Europe from 1739–41. Thomas Brand was in Italy at the same time. The clearest difference between the two cabinets was the group of three ivory figures surmounting the pediment of the Walpole cabinet. Small ivory statues of two architects, Inigo Jones and Andrea Palladio, along with the sculptor François Duquesnoy, top the pediment in a manner familiar from engravings in Palladio’s seminal architectural treatise, I Quattro Libri dell’Architettura, published in 1570. The design of the Walpole cabinet is particularly evocative of Palladio’s engraving of the Temple of Mars in Rome. Other elements such as the oak-wreath torus frieze can be related to designs by William Kent and James Gibbs, while the eagles and swags at the bottom of the cabinet can be related to designs by Henry Flitcroft for neo-Palladian tables made for Ditchley Park in Oxfordshire. The design of the Brand cabinet, it was argued, was of purer architectural form, avoiding the Palladian figures on the pediment so conforming to ancient precedent, and avoided Walpole’s architectural error of having two architrave fascias of almost the same height. Overall the design of the Brand cabinet was both purer and more pleasing by being more restrained – both in the decoration within the pediment, and the less Baroque lines of the eagles’ heads at the base.

The expert stated that Thomas Brand was both a collector of prints, drawings and paintings, as well as antiquities, and a leading figure in the Society of Dilettanti following his election in 1742. The mixture of architectural seriousness and salaciousness of the ivory reliefs that decorate the Brand cabinet reflect a typical Dilettanti theme – which has known parallels in the ‘Society’s Ballot Box’ and ‘Tomb of Bacchus’. The Brand cabinet is one of only two such items that combine wood and ivory in eighteenth-century English furniture, and represents an early and outstanding example of the increasing respect and seriousness for the antique in the middle of the eighteenth-century. The expert also noted that the Brand cabinet had come before the Reviewing Committee in September 1981 when it had been found to meet the second and third Waverley criteria.

When questioned about how collectors displayed their objects, the expert replied that the design of this cabinet and the Walpole cabinet was unique. No other wall-mounted ivory decorated cabinets were known. Previously collectors had displayed their pieces in quite different containers. Sir Andrew Fountaine (1676–1753), the notable Norfolk collector of the previous generation, had a cabinet of plain rectangular form. With regard to the ivories on the Brand cabinet, it could not be established with certainty where Brand had gathered them. The most likely source would have been when he was on the grand tour but it is possible that they had been acquired in London or even given to him by Walpole. It was argued that they were chosen with more care than those on Walpole’s cabinet. The small portrait medallions all looked inwards, avoiding the more random arrangement on the Walpole cabinet. The Walpole cabinet was regarded as being earlier than the Brand on the basis of Horace Walpole’s claim that he had designed the cabinet now in the V&A. The extent of his involvement in the design, however, was not known.

The applicant had stated in a written submission that in their view the Brand cabinet did not meet any of the three Waverley criteria. According to the applicant, Thomas Brand was not himself of outstanding significance, a view supported by the fact that he does not merit an entry in the Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. He was therefore of interest, but not exceptionally so. The applicant stated that the cabinet did not meet the second criterion – of outstanding aesthetic importance – since it was neither the equal of the Walpole cabinet nor the prime version, being rather derivative of Walpole’s prime version.

The applicant added that it could not reasonably be argued that the cabinet was of outstanding significance for study: the third Waverley criterion. Both houses with which it is associated, The Hoo, Hertfordshire and 22 St James’s Square, London, had not survived. No collection of other pieces owned by Thomas Brand had survived nor did his papers. Soon after the Brand cabinet came to light in 1938, Ralph Edwards concluded that it was made by the same craftsman as the Walpole cabinet,
proposing an attribution to William Hallett, and since then no convincing alternative had been put forward. Furthermore, Edwards argued that this ‘replica’ cabinet had a less considered choice of ivories. Looked at independently, the ivories, while interesting, were not of national significance and are principally copies after antique sculptures or famous paintings. Only one can be attributed: that depicting Flora is signed ‘GP’, almost certainly Giovanni Battista Pozzi (or Pozzo). Five of the ivories are known in other UK private collections and in two cases in duplicate. Retention of the Brand cabinet in the UK would, according to the applicant, not of itself lead to any further information being discovered on the patron, the maker, or the designer, and it would be incorrect therefore to say it was of outstanding importance for study.

We heard this case in November 2012 when the cabinet was shown to us. We found that it met the second and third Waverley criteria, on the grounds that it was of outstanding aesthetic importance and of outstanding significance for the study of English furniture in the eighteenth-century. We recommended that the decision on the export licence application should be deferred for an initial period of two months to allow an offer to purchase to be made at the fair matching price of £1,250,700 (inclusive of VAT). We further recommended that if, by the end of the initial deferral period, a potential purchaser had shown a serious intention to raise funds with a view to making an offer to purchase the cabinet, the deferral period should be extended by a further four months.

During the initial deferral period, we were informed of a serious intention by Leeds Museums and Galleries to raise funds to purchase the cabinet. A decision on the export licence application was deferred for a further four months. No offer to purchase the cabinet was received. An export licence was therefore issued.

Case 8

A south German marquetry table top

This rectangular table top measures 74cm high, 129cm wide and 124cm deep (including stand). It has marquetry decoration of strapwork and foliage, and pictorial cartouches depicting ‘the Victories of Charles V’, in sycamore, walnut, olive, yew wood and fruitwood, with engraved detail. The table top dates from circa 1556–60 and was acquired in circa 1820–50 by Gregory de Ligne Gregory (1786–1854) for Harlaxon Manor in Lincolnshire.

The applicant had applied to export the table top to France. The value shown on the export licence application was £274,300, which represented a hammer price at auction of £220,000 plus buyer’s premium of £54,300.

The Keeper of the Furniture, Textiles and Fashion Department at the V&A, acting as expert adviser, had objected to the export of the table top under the second and third Waverley criteria on the grounds that it was of outstanding aesthetic importance and that it was of outstanding significance for the study of early European marquetry.

The expert had provided a written submission stating that the design of the marquetry table top celebrated the military acumen and political courage of the Holy Roman Emperor, Charles V, who abdicated voluntarily in 1556 and died in 1558. Although the circumstances surrounding its commission were not known, it was clearly intended to celebrate Charles V’s achievements and serve as a reminder to his successors of his skills at maintaining the integrity of the Habsburg territories through military and diplomatic means, and of their duty to preserve this inheritance. The table top was likely to have been commissioned by a very senior member of the imperial court, developed by someone with a thorough understanding of marquetry design and realised by one of the most accomplished workshops in Augsburg – the city where the most important developments in sixteenth-century marquetry had been centred. It was an exceptionally rare and complex design of south German marquetry, of very fine workmanship and in unusually good condition. Unlike a great deal of early furniture that displays only a faded grandeur, it retained much of the pristine impact it must have had when it was originally produced as an exceptional luxury object. The expert stated that there were no comparable table tops in either public or private collections in the UK.

The design combined four series of pictorial cartouches and allegorical medallions, within (but not overwhelmed by) complex interwoven Mannerist strapwork and foliage. The design was intended to be seen from all sides, perhaps suggesting the multi-faceted challenges of imperial rule (like playing four games of chess simultaneously). The drawing, cutting and fit of the marquetry was very proficient, and the pictorial panels – which had been based directly on prints by Maarten van Heemskerck – had been translated into a new medium with clarity and vigour. Such a table would always have had the status of a work of art, perhaps as the centrepiece of a cabinet room or gallery. Unlike
much early marquetry furniture, the surface did not appear to have been scraped and refreshed with re-engraving.

The expert stated that nothing was currently known of the table’s history before it was acquired in circa 1820–50 by Gregory de Ligne Gregory. The collecting of German Renaissance furniture in Britain was a relatively brief nineteenth-century phenomenon, characterised by a small number of wealthy collectors who acquired impressive individual pieces rather than systematically amassing a range of furniture. As a result, British collections were weak in early German furniture and the study of sixteenth-century German furniture was not especially well advanced. This table top, if retained in Britain, could therefore add substantially to the national holdings.

The expert indicated that there was some factual information contained in German secondary literature of the past 30 years which provided names of some German sixteenth-century cabinet makers, but the difficulty was in linking those names to individual, surviving pieces. It was hoped that the present table top, with such a distinctive and complex iconographic scheme and which was in outstanding condition, might be a key piece in refining attributions and linking groups of furniture to the names of specific makers. He added that in terms of its quality this was the best marquetry table top of this period in the UK; there was a small group of tables against which to compare it but these by comparison were vastly simpler and less complex in their iconography.

The applicant had stated in a written submission that they disagreed that the table top fulfilled the Waverley criteria. It had only spent 150 years, about one third of its entire history, in a British collection and its presence in that collection was practically unknown until its sale in the summer of 2012. It therefore could not be said to be connected to any British historic event or any part of British national life and its departure could not reasonably be described as a misfortune. There was an abundance of other very good examples of sixteenth-century marquetry in UK collections, in the collections of the National Trust and other historic houses, provided ample opportunity for the study of Renaissance marquetry and south German cabinet-making of the time. Although they agreed that the design made it an interesting item for the study of the Holy Roman Empire, Charles V, Augsburg and the German league, they did not consider it to be of outstanding significance for such study nor for the study of south German marquetry furniture of the sixteenth-century.

We heard this case in November 2012 when the table top was shown to us. We found that it met the second and third Waverley criteria, on the grounds that it was of outstanding aesthetic importance and outstanding significance for the study of early European marquetry.

We recommended that the decision on the export licence application should be deferred for an initial period of two months to allow an offer to purchase to be made at the fair matching price of £274,300 (inclusive of VAT). We further recommended that if, by the end of the initial deferral period, a potential purchaser had shown a serious intention to raise funds with a view to making an offer to purchase the table top, the deferral period should be extended by a further three months.

At the end of the initial deferral period, no offer to purchase the table top had been made and we were not aware of any serious intention to raise funds. An export licence was therefore issued.

Case 9

A Regence ormolu-mounted Chinese porcelain casket

This rectangular casket measures 24cm high, 37.5cm wide and 23.5cm deep. It is formed of Chinese porcelain plaques and European gilt bronze mounts, with gilt bronze lockplate and carrying handles, and the inside lined with dark wood. The porcelain plaques are by an unknown maker in Jingdezhen, China, during the Kangxi reign period (1662–1722); the gilt bronze mounts are also by an unknown maker, possibly in Vienna, circa 1710–20.

The applicant had applied to export the casket to the USA. The value shown on the export licence application was £193,250, which represented a hammer price at auction of £160,000 plus buyer’s premium of £33,250.

The Senior Curator of the Asian Department at the V&A, acting as expert adviser, had objected to the export of the casket under the second and third Waverley criteria on the grounds that it was of
outstanding aesthetic importance, and of outstanding significance for the study of trade in East Asian ceramics, in particular for the understanding the role played by Chinese porcelain in furnishing European palaces and stately homes in the early part of the eighteenth-century.

The expert had provided a written submission stating that the differently decorated Chinese porcelain plaques, framed within bands of engraved gilt bronze straps, were transformed into a beautiful, visually compelling artefact. The casket was extremely rare, the expert being unaware of a similar object made from Kangxi porcelain anywhere in the world.

The expert stated that in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, China exported many porcelain vessels in round shapes, such as vases and bowls, but it produced few objects in square or rectangular forms. The significance of this casket therefore lay in its rectangular shape. The only non-round forms of the period were square vases (usually more than 30cm tall), square bottles or oblong trays and plaques, which were neither mass produced nor readily available in Chinese shops. The flatness of the porcelain plaques suggested that they were either specially ordered or cut down from square bottles, vases or plaques, few examples of which have survived.

Three different styles of Chinese porcelain plaque were used to make the casket. The first, known as ‘Chinese Imari’, being a landscape painted in underglaze blue and overglaze red and gold. The second, known as ‘parcel-gilt powdered blue’, incorporating floral designs (prunus/chrysanthemum) painted in gold over a blue background. The third, known as ‘famille verte’, whereby all colours were painted in enamels over the transparent glaze. The designs included peonies and butterflies, prunus with birds and the hundred antiques and landscapes pattern. The larger panels were edged by blue fretwork borders. Of the three, the famille verte plaques were of particular importance, measuring 16cm in height. These three decorative styles did not appear in combination on any examples of Chinese porcelain made before the 20th century.

The casket’s first owner was unknown, however, it passed into the collection of the significant collector and patron Charles Alexandre de Lorraine (1712–80), youngest son of Leopold, Duke of Lorraine, and Elisabeth Charlotte d’Orleans, husband of Maria Anna of Habsburg and brother-in-law of Empress Maria Theresa of Austria. A number of items from his collection are now housed in the Hofsilber-und Tafelkammer in Vienna, among which is a casket of similar size and construction to this casket, but made from Japanese porcelain plaques. In light of the similarities between the two caskets, it was likely that they were commissioned by the same patron within a few years of one another. Charles Alexandre’s property was sold at auction in Brussels in May 1781. Subsequently, the casket came into the possession of William Lowther, 2nd Earl of Lonsdale (1787–1872) and passed via descent until sold on the instruction of Caroline, Countess of Lonsdale.

The applicant had stated in a written submission that they contested that the casket met the Waverley criteria. Firstly, the applicant stated that it was only in the nineteenth-century that the casket had come to England. Therefore, while it could probably be argued that there was a connection with our history and national life, it was not reasonable to support that the casket was so closely connected that its departure would be a misfortune. Secondly, the applicant stated that while the casket was undeniably of aesthetic value, it was not of outstanding aesthetic importance. Chinese porcelain objects mounted in eighteenth-century France, which in the applicant’s opinion were more accomplished and of finer craftsmanship than the present casket, were already in British collections. Thirdly, the applicant stated that although the present casket was relevant to the study of European mounted Chinese porcelain works of art, and in particular those executed in the Japanese taste, it was not of outstanding significance from an art historical perspective. Other works of art which were highly pertinent to that field of study were already in British collections. Furthermore, having already been sold twice at public auction over the course of the last 12 months, the casket was well-documented and the research material garnered in connection with its sale was now publically available. Information relating to the present casket was also made available by the extensive study of the Kangxi porcelain casket in the Hofburg Museum in Vienna.

We heard this case in November 2012 when the casket was shown to us. We found that it met the second and third Waverley criteria, on the grounds that it was of outstanding aesthetic importance, and of outstanding significance for the study of trade in Chinese porcelain in the eighteenth-century, and the history of taste in European Courts.

We recommended that the decision on the export licence application should be deferred for an initial period of two months to allow an offer to purchase to...
be made at the fair matching price of £193,250 (net of VAT). We further recommended that if, by the end of the initial deferral period, a potential purchaser had shown a serious intention to raise funds with a view to making an offer to purchase the casket, the deferral period should be extended by a further three months.

During the initial deferral period, we were informed of a serious intention by the Bowes Museum to raise funds to purchase the casket. A decision on the export licence application was deferred for a further three months. We were subsequently informed that the casket had been purchased by the Bowes Museum with assistance from the Art Fund, the V&A Purchase Grant Fund and the Friends of The Bowes Museum.

Case 10
A Queen Anne silver-gilt toilet service, the ‘Norfolk toilet service’

This silver-gilt toilet service consists of 34 pieces, and was made in 1708 by leading London goldsmith Benjamin Pyne.

The applicant had applied to export the toilet service to Australia. The value shown on the export licence application was £1,380,000, which represented an agreed sale price.

The Acting Keeper of the Department of Sculpture, Metalwork, Ceramics and Glass at the V&A, acting as expert adviser, had objected to the export of the toilet service under the second and third Waverley criteria on the grounds that it was of outstanding aesthetic importance, and that it was of outstanding significance for the study of the history of patronage and collecting in the north west of England.

The expert adviser had provided a written submission stating that the toilet service was commissioned in 1708 for Mary Shireburn by her father, Sir Nicholas Shireburn (1658–1717) of Stonyhurst. Sir Nicholas Shireburn was a prominent member of the Catholic gentry in Lancashire and commissioned the toilet service to celebrate his daughter’s marriage in 1709, aged 16, as his heiress to Thomas Howard, 8th Duke of Norfolk (1683–1732), head of the leading Catholic Howard family and hereditary Earl Marshal of England. The prominent engraving of the coat of arms of Thomas Howard demonstrated that the toilet service was intended to enhance the status of the new Duchess through her morning levee.

The expert stated that the toilet service was supplied to Sir Nicholas Shireburn by leading native goldsmith Benjamin Pyne, whose maker’s mark, registered at Goldsmiths’ Hall in 1697, was punched on 33 of the pieces. The expert stated that the toilet service provided important evidence for the quality of design and execution produced by the workshop of a London goldsmith working in the plain English style, in competition with the leading Huguenot immigrant goldsmiths who specialised in making such services. The expert informed us that there was no comparable complete toilet service in the UK bearing Pyne’s mark, with this service being both the most complete and the largest surviving London-made toilet service from the period 1660–1770. Furthermore, it was thought to be the only such surviving service to be equipped with a pair of hand candlesticks as well as table candlesticks, reflecting the importance of this special commission for a double set of dressing plate.

The expert informed us that the toilet service was later acquired by the Royal Goldsmiths, Rundell Bridge and Rundell, and was boxed by them for re-sale to William Lowther, 1st Earl of Lonsdale (1757–1844). Each of the thirty four pieces were then discreetly engraved with Lord Lonsdale’s cypher. This, and the surviving case supplied by Rundells, added another historical layer to the importance of this toilet service, without obscuring the earlier provenance.

The applicant had provided a written submission in which they neither agreed nor disagreed that the toilet service met the Waverley criteria.

We heard this case in September 2012 when the toilet service was shown to us. We found that it did not meet any of the Waverley criteria. An export licence was therefore issued.

Case 11
A painting by Johan Zoffany, Portrait of Claud Alexander with his brother, Boyd, attended by an Indian servant

This painting by Johan Zoffany (1733–1810) is oil on unlined canvas, dated 1783–84 and measures 227.5cm by 195.5cm. Near life-sized the painting shows Claud Alexander (1752–1809) and his brother Boyd Alexander (1758–1825) with an Indian servant.

The applicant had applied to export the painting to the USA. The value shown on the export licence application was £2 million, which represented an estimated value.
The Curator of British Art 1790–1850 at Tate Britain, acting as expert adviser, had objected to the export of the painting under the first and third Waverley criteria on the grounds that it was so closely connected with our history and national life that its departure would be a misfortune, and that it was of outstanding significance for the study of the British Empire (specifically from a Scottish perspective), late eighteenth-century portraiture, and the practicalities of artistic production in the period.

The expert adviser’s representatives – Lead Curator of pre-1800 British Art, and Curator of British Art 1750–1830 at the Tate Britain – had provided a written submission stating that the painting by Zoffany, one of the most important figures in eighteenth-century British art, was a testament to the cultural life of the British in eighteenth-century India. The portrait depicted Claud Alexander – an important East India Company servant from 1772–85 – holding a handwritten letter, a pointer dog at his feet, and his brother Boyd Alexander, leaning upon his shoulder. An Indian servant stood to the left of the scene in front of a richly coloured Indian landscape. The letter provided the focal point of the scene and, although its exact identity was open to question, was traditionally said to depict the precise moment at which Claud Alexander received word that he had purchased Ballochmyle – a country house near Mauchline, East Ayrshire, in his native Scotland. The painting was commissioned to commemorate this momentous purchase, with a view to decorating Alexander’s new home with a reminder of his career in India that had enabled him to become a very wealthy man. Commissioned and painted in India, but destined for a Scottish domestic setting, it provided a testament to the connections between colonial wealth and cultural patronage. It also provided numerous insights into material history. Alexander wore a brown coat, suggested to be official garb, and the servant carried Alexander’s metal-tipped, Malacca cane and tricorn hat.

The expert informed us that Zoffany was one of the first members of the Royal Academy, having been nominated by George III. He arrived in Calcutta in 1783 and spent a six-year long, pioneering sojourn in India, making his career of further special interest from the perspective of global and imperial history. There were no other known works in which a purchase of a British country house through the accumulation of Indian wealth was so eloquently encapsulated, nor were there any other full-length, near life-size, multi-figured compositions from Zoffany’s Indian period. Eight of Zoffany’s portraits from this period were publicly accessible in UK collections, yet only four of these were multi-figured portraits, and none on such a monumental scale. The nearest comparison was Zoffany’s companion portraits in the Dunvegan Castle collection, General Norman MacLeod and Sarah, Second Wife of Norman MacLeod, dated to 1787, yet these were said to have none of the drama created by the scene and the interacting figures. Furthermore, there was no reference to any other paintings, by any artist, of Claud Alexander.

The applicant had stated in a written submission that although the painting was a very fine example of Zoffany’s work from this period, major works from the Indian period were already represented in British museums, including Colonel Mordaunt’s Cock Match (1784–86) and The Blair Family (1786–87) in the Tate Britain and The Morse and Cator families (circa 1784) in Aberdeen Art Gallery.

We heard this case in December 2012 when the painting was shown to us. We found that it did not meet any of the Waverley criteria. An export licence was therefore issued.

**Case 12**

**A painting by Pietro Lorenzetti, Christ between Saints Paul and Peter**

This painting by Pietro Lorenzetti (active 1306(?); died probably 1348) is tempera on panel and measures 32.2cm by 70.4cm. It was painted circa 1320.

The applicant had applied to export the painting to the USA. The value shown on the export licence application was £5,081,250, which represented the hammer price at auction of £4,500,000 plus buyer’s premium of £581,250.

The Director and the Curator of Italian Paintings before 1500 at the National Gallery, acting as expert advisers, had objected to the export of the painting under the second and third Waverley criteria on the grounds that it was of outstanding aesthetic importance and that it was of outstanding significance for the study of early fourteenth-century Sienese painting.

The expert had provided a written submission stating that this small panel painting represented a quintessential work by one of the most important artists of late medieval Sienna. Christ between Saints Paul and Peter has a simple composition; however it combines the qualities of naturalism and sculptural monumentalism that was so salient of Pietro’s artistic characteristics. This piece was painted around 1320,
during the early period of Pietro’s maturity whilst he was concerned with constructing relationships between figures in his paintings. Christ, represented as Pantocrator, or the All-Mighty, inclines his head slightly towards Saint Paul. This connection is explained by Paul’s identity as the convert, rather than Peter, who merely continued to follow his master. The saints acted as intercessors between the original devotional users of the painting and Christ.

The painting had recently been identified as a major constituent of the predella section of what must have been one of Lorenzetti’s most important altarpiece commissions of the 1320s. X-radiography had revealed the panel to possess a distinctive wood grain that is also found in Pietro’s *Virgin and Child with a Donor* in the Philadelphia Museum of Art, suggesting that both pieces belonged to the same structure, either a dismembered polyptych, or multi-field altarpiece.

Aside from Simone Martini, Pietro and his brother Ambrogio Lorenzetti were the most important painters of the fourteenth-century, an outstanding period of Sienese pictorial production. *Christ between Saints Peter and Paul* was the only picture in a British collection with an unquestioned attribution to Pietro. The six other paintings in Britain associated with his name have all been attributed in part to members of his workshop. This painting therefore provides a rare example of Pietro’s innovative work, notably in naturalism and illusionism, which was not equalled in panel painting until the fifteenth-century.

The applicant had stated in a written submission that they did not believe that the painting met the first Waverley criterion because it was not closely associated with our history and national life. The applicant did not contest that the painting met the second and third Waverley criteria.

We heard this case in December 2012 when the painting was shown to us. We found that it met the second and third Waverley criteria in that it was of outstanding significance for the study of early fourteenth-century Sienese painting and in particular the work of Pietro Lorenzetti, one of the leading artists of the period. We recommended that the decision on the export licence application should be deferred for an initial period of three months to allow an offer to purchase to be made at the fair matching price of £5,197,500 (inclusive of VAT). We further recommended that if, by the end of the initial deferral period, a potential purchaser had shown a serious intention to raise funds with a view to making an offer to purchase the painting, the deferral period should be extended by a further four months.

During the initial deferral period, we were informed of a serious intention by the Ferens Art Gallery in Hull to raise funds to purchase the painting. A decision on the export licence application was deferred for a further four months. We were subsequently informed that the painting had been purchased by the Ferens Art Gallery with assistance from the gallery’s Ferens Endowment Fund, the Heritage Lottery Fund and the Art Fund.

Case 13

Two paintings by George Stubbs, *Kongouro, from New Holland* (The Kangaroo) and *Portrait of a Large Dog* (The Dingo)

This pair of paintings by George Stubbs (1724–1806) are both oil on panel measuring 60.5cm by 71.5cm and 61cm by 71cm are signed and dated 1772. The pair of paintings represent Australian mammals in landscape settings, one identified as a kangaroo and the other as a dingo.

The applicant had applied to export the paintings to Australia. The value shown on the export licence application was £5.5 million, which represented an agreed sale price.

The Curator of British Art 1790–1850 at Tate Britain, acting as expert adviser, had objected to the export of the paintings under the first and third Waverley criteria on the grounds that they were so closely connected with our history and national life that their departure would be a misfortune and that they were of outstanding significance for the study of late eighteenth-century British painting, and the history of exploration, science and natural history illustration.

The expert had provided a written submission stating that the pair of paintings by George Stubbs (1724–1806) – the pre-eminent painter of animal subjects in the eighteenth-century – related to a seminal moment in the history of British scientific exploration and the discovery of Australia. *The Dingo* represents a fox-like animal walking, from right to left, before an open landscape of low hills. The creature had first been identified as a ‘Large Dog’ and was believed to be intended to depict a dingo, native to Australia. *The Kangaroo* represents an upright mammal, looking back over its shoulder and sitting on a rock before an extensive, sparsely wooded landscape with mountains in the background. The creature was identified by the
artist when the painting was first exhibited as a ‘Kongouro, from New Holland, 1770’. The expert stated that the precise species has been disputed in modern times, and the animal had been variously identified as a wallaby, wallaroo, or a small or young kangaroo, all of which are native to Australia.

The expert stated the two paintings were almost certainly the result of a commission to Stubbs from the scientist Sir Joseph Banks (1743–1820), immediately following his part in Captain James Cook’s celebrated ‘first voyage of discovery’ to the Pacific (1768–71) and had remained in the possession of the family ever since. Stubbs’ paintings were the most significant artistic products directly related to the voyage: first exhibited in London in 1773 immediately after their execution, they brought to public attention two of the animals which were to be most closely identified with the extraordinary, even baffling, new world of Australia. They were iconic not only of the discovery of Australia, but of the values and methods of the Enlightenment as a whole.

George Stubbs was a major figure in British art history and internationally acknowledged as an eighteenth-century master. Predominantly a painter of horses, dogs and sporting subjects, although also producing a small number of studies of ‘exotic’ animals, he established the standard for sporting art for generations to come. While there were a number of Stubbs’ pictures that remain in the UK – including the Bull Moose (1770) and Blackbuck (circa 1770–8), both painted for the anatomist William Hunter (now held at the Hunterian Museum and Art Gallery in Glasgow) – The Kangaroo and The Dingo remain unique as painted portraits by Stubbs of Australian animals and as the only apparently direct commissions from Sir Joseph Banks. Furthermore, the expert informed us that The Kangaroo and The Dingo were the only creatures Stubbs was unable to paint from life. Instead, he worked from verbal accounts and, in the case of The Kangaroo, from slight sketches, preserved skin and a skeleton which no longer survive. While this explained the shortcomings, from a strictly scientific point of view, in the treatment of the anatomy of these animals, and while it may also have contributed to the relative weakness of these images as artworks according to conventional aesthetic criteria, the process behind the production of these works is historically significant. It exposes the material circumstances which helped determine the transmission of knowledge about Australia to Britain, and the importance of pictures – and of art as such, with its imaginative dimension – in disseminating that knowledge.

The applicant did not disagree that the paintings met the Waverley criteria. However, they contended that the UK already had the most important holdings relating to the achievements of Stubbs, Banks and to Cook’s discovery of eastern Australia, and that the retention of these paintings would only slightly augment the country’s enviable holdings in these fields.

We heard this case in January 2013 when the paintings were shown to us. We found that they met the first and third Waverley criteria. We recommended that the decision on the export licence application should be deferred for an initial period of six months to allow an offer to purchase to be made at the fair matching price of £5,500,000 (net of VAT) We further recommended that if, by the end of the initial deferral period, a potential purchaser had shown a serious intention to raise funds with a view to making an offer to purchase the paintings, the deferral period should be extended by a further three months.

During the initial deferral period, we were informed of a serious intention by the National Maritime Museum to raise funds to purchase the paintings. A decision on the export licence application was deferred for a further three months. We were subsequently informed that the paintings had been purchased by The National Maritime Museum, Royal Museums Greenwich, with assistance from the Heritage Lottery Fund, The Monument Trust, the Art Fund and a number of private individuals.

Case 14

A painting by Jasper Francis Cropsey, Richmond Hill in the Summer of 1862

This painting by Jasper Francis Cropsey (1823–1900) dates from 1862. It is oil on canvas and measures 137cm by 244cm.

The applicant had applied to export the painting to the USA. The value shown on the export licence application was £6,237,914 which represented an estimated price.

The Director acting as expert adviser, had objected to the export of the painting under the second and third Waverley criteria on the grounds that it was of outstanding aesthetic importance and that it was of outstanding significance for the study of the central role Britain continued to play in American art throughout the nineteenth-century.

The expert had provided a written submission stating that the painting, Richmond Hill in the Summer of 1862, was a rare large-scale landscape of an English scene by
a leading American painter, and was executed at a pivotal moment in the artist’s career when he was living in Britain during the American Civil War. Born on Staten Island, New York, and trained as an architect, Jasper Francis Cropsey showed precocious artistic talent. He was drawn to landscape painting, which had emerged in the early nineteenth-century as the most innovative branch of American painting, and first showed at New York’s National Academy. From 1847 he spent two years in Europe, which exposed him to Britain and the Continent, and undertook increasingly more ambitious works upon his return to America. He returned to England in 1856, befriended Ruskin, Eastlake and other leading figures of the art world, showed regularly at the Royal Academy and was presented to the Queen in 1861.

The expert stated that Britain continued to play a central role in American art throughout the nineteenth-century. Many American artists, particularly landscape painters, visited Britain to study. The works of Turner were a touchstone for these artists as they sought ways to deal pictorially with the vastness and grandeur of the American frontier. For Cropsey, Frederic Church (1823–1900) and their contemporaries, it was also vitally important to exhibit major paintings in Britain and to receive critical acclaim. The approval of London significantly influenced success at home.

The expert suggested that the artist painted *Richmond Hill* soon after the completion of the painting *Autumn on the Hudson River*, and that they were intended as companion pieces contrasting English and American landscapes, one tamed by the hand of man, the other still wild. Furthermore, they contrasted the intimately related but increasingly divergent cultures of the two nations, both of which the artist felt a strong affinity to. Whereas the Hudson River is bathed in flame-like autumnal colours, *Richmond Hill* is seen in the haze of summer sunlight. The painting depicted a sweeping view down the hill where a number of sight seers have gathered, across green lawns and greener stands of trees, past Ham House and along the meandering river to a miniscule Windsor Castle in the distance. The foreground was full of lively, almost Frith-like incident while people of various classes, including soldiers and children, enjoyed the park and fine weather. The expert told us that it had been suggested that the two figures in grey uniforms might be American Confederate soldiers, a reference to the American Civil War; however, it was the pure Englishness of the scene that captivated its first critics.

Finally, a surprising number of American landscape paintings were shown in London and subsequently entered British collections in the nineteenth-century; however, few such paintings now remain in the country. *Richmond Hill*, known in the literature from the time of its first exhibition but only rediscovered in 1999, was a rare survivor.

The applicant did not disagree with the opinion the Committee had formed at their meeting in February 2000, (when the painting had been the subject of a previous export licence application) that the painting met the second and third Waverley criteria. However, they believed that there were some important points that should be taken into consideration when reviewing this fresh application. Not having been publicly exhibited in the present or previous centuries, the applicant stated that the painting was not held in any special esteem by the British public. The applicant also stated that the painting did not depict any event or person of national significance. It was conceived as a companion painting to the artist’s *Autumn on the Hudson River* (1860), which is now in the National Gallery of Art, Washington DC. Finally, the view of Richmond Hill was well known and had been widely treated by British and Continental painters alike.

We heard this case in October 2012 when the painting was shown to us. We found that it met the third Waverley criterion on the grounds that it was of outstanding significance for the study of the relationship between British and American painting in the nineteenth-century, in particular the development of the ‘Hudson River School’ of landscape painting. The Committee was unable to recommend a fair matching price for the painting on the basis of the information supplied by the applicant, so recommended that the Secretary of State seek an independent valuation of the painting. The independent valuer recommended a figure of £4,950,000. We recommended that the decision on the export licence application should be deferred for an initial period of two months to allow an offer to purchase to be made at the fair matching price of £4,950,000 (net of VAT). We further recommended that if, by the end of the initial deferral period, a potential purchaser had shown a serious intention to raise funds with a view to making an offer to purchase the painting, the deferral period should be extended by a further four months.

At the end of the initial deferral period, no offer to purchase the painting had been made and we were not aware of any serious intention to raise funds. An export licence was therefore issued.
Case 15

Seven silk works

This set of seven textile hangings depict different views of the Temple of Solomon, embroidered in gold or silver-gilt thread and coloured silks. The largest of the hangings has an inscription in Hebrew. The hangings measure: 107cm by 182cm; 94cm by 58cm; 91cm by 58cm; 77cm by 58cm; 77cm by 58cm; 33cm by 56cm; and 33cm by 56cm and are in excellent condition.

The applicant had applied to export the works to the USA. The value shown on the export licence application was £120,000, which represented an estimated price.

The Keeper (Furniture, Textiles, and Fashion) at the V&A, acting as expert adviser, had objected to the export of the works under the second and third Waverley criteria on the grounds that they were of outstanding aesthetic importance and of outstanding significance for the study of Jewish ritual art.

The experts said that the largest of the hangings had an inscription in Hebrew, ‘Lich’vod beit Eloheynu’, meaning ‘For the Glory/Honour of the House of our God’. It was noted that this particular spelling used for the Hebrew word for God indicated a clear religious purpose. The technique of goldwork embroidery was used to particularly successful effect in conveying the emphatic biblical description of Solomon’s decoration of the Temple: ‘So Solomon overlaid the house within with pure gold: and he made a partition by the chains of gold before the oracle; and he overlaid it with gold. And the whole house he overlaid with gold, until he had finished all the house: also the whole altar that was by the oracle he overlaid with gold.’ The objects depicted inside the Temple include the altar for sacrifice and an altar for incense, the menorah (candelabrum), basin and vase.

The experts stated that the hangings were likely to have been commissioned from a professional workshop; however, their designer was unknown. Their style and technique indicated they may have been worked in northern Italy or the Netherlands in the first half of the eighteenth-century. They were likely to have been commissioned for the adornment and possible sanctification of a space used for Jewish religious practise, but nothing was known of their origin and provenance before the 20th century. Because of the quality of the workmanship, as well as the very high amount of precious metal incorporated in them, they would have been a very costly commission. The Curator of Textiles at the Jewish Museum in Prague had commented that among other possibilities, they might have been used for the inner decoration of a private family prayer hall, which was quite common in wealthier Jewish circles in central Europe.

The expert had also suggested that the hangings may have been used as decorations for a sukkah, the temporary structure built to commemorate the festival of Sukkot. Their dimensions may support this idea as the hangings depicting the pillars, Jachin and Boaz, might have been positioned on either side of the entrance, the large panel on the opposite wall, and the others along the side walls.

The hangings resembled biblical illustrations of the early eighteenth-century. However, unlike Bible illustration intended to illuminate the scriptures, and other types of textile hangings deriving from such sources as woven tapestry, they were entirely devoid of figures. This may reflected their particular ritual rather than illustrative function. The works appear to be a unique survival and therefore may be evidence of a category and quality of art and craftsmanship made specifically for a Jewish religious purpose, which had not yet been identified.

The applicant disagreed that the works met the first and second Waverley criteria, stating that they were unconnected to British history or national life and could not be considered of outstanding aesthetic importance, unlike some outstanding works of medieval embroidery. The applicant did not disagree that the works met the third Waverley criterion.

We heard this case in February 2013 when the works were shown to us. We found that they met the second and third Waverley criteria. We recommended that the decision on the export licence application should be deferred for an initial period of two months to allow an offer to purchase to be made at the fair matching price of £120,000. We further recommended that if, by the end of the initial deferral period, a potential purchaser had shown a serious intention to raise funds with a view to making an offer to purchase the works, the deferral period should be extended by a further three months.

During the initial deferral period we were informed of a serious intention to raise funds to purchase the silk works. A decision on the export licence application was deferred for a further three months. We were subsequently informed that the silk works had been purchased under the ‘Ridley Rules’ by the Rothschild Foundation which has agreed to display the works at Waddesdon Manor for ten years.
Case 16
Louis de Gruuthuse’s copy of the Deeds of Sir Gillion de Trazegnies in the Middle East

This illuminated manuscript on parchment contains the rare anonymous French romance, *Gillion de Trazegnies*. Dated 1464, it was transcribed by the Burgundian court scribe David Aubert. It includes eight half-page miniatures with painted borders and 44 historiated initials, all by Lieven Van Lathem (fl. 1454-93), one of the most successful painters in the Low Countries during this period. The manuscript comprises 237 leaves, each of which measures 275mm by 262mm.

The applicant had applied to export the manuscript to the USA. The value shown on the export licence application was £3,849,250, which represented a hammer price at auction of £3,400,000 plus buyer’s premium of £449,250.

The Head of History and Classics at the British Library, acting as expert adviser, had objected to the export of the manuscript under the second and third criteria on the grounds that it was of outstanding aesthetic importance, that it was of outstanding significance for the study of French chivalric texts and of Netherlandish art of the period and indicated that it possibly also met the first Waverley criterion, that it was so closely connected with our history and national life that its departure would be a misfortune.

The expert adviser had provided a written submission stating that the manuscript had been made for Louis de Gruuthuse (1422–92), one of the most trusted governors of the northern territories held by the dukes of Burgundy. Gruuthuse was a great bibliophile and art patron in the Netherlands. The manuscript includes a dedication to Louis as well as his heraldic arms, emblem, and motto. The expert stated that the manuscript was arguably the finest, artistically, of the nearly 200 manuscripts that survived from his large and important library. Most of Gruuthuse’s manuscripts passed from the French Royal Library to the Bibliothèque Nationale de France, but *Gillion de Trazegnies* came into possession of William George Spencer Cavendish, sixth Duke of Devonshire (1790–1858) by 1817. It remained at Chatsworth until its sale at Sotheby’s in 2012. The manuscript had therefore been an integral part of the remarkable collection of art and books at Chatsworth since the early nineteenth-century. The Duke was the creator of one of the greatest aristocratic libraries in the country and the manuscript’s inclusion in the collection epitomised the bibliophilia and cultural tastes of both the Duke and contemporary noble collectors in Britain.

The expert stated that the manuscript was the finest copy of the romance, *Gillion de Trazegnies*. Van Lathem lavishly illustrated the manuscript with an inventive interpretation of a secular text which constituted his most ambitious narrative cycle. The historiated initials were created with extraordinary delicacy. The manuscript demonstrated the developing interest of early Netherlandish painters in the depiction of the natural world – the human form, the landscape and the effects of light. Van Lathem was also known for his distinctive treatment of space, particularly exemplified in his painting of a duel between Gillion and the Saracen nobleman Lucion.

The expert noted that this text was rare; there were no other copies of the text in the UK, either in the French prose version, or in the Latin translation. This vernacular chivalric text was particularly interesting for its view of the East, at a point when a crusade to recover Constantinople from the Turks was the focus of Burgundian aristocratic fantasy. When questioned at the case hearing about how well Lieven Van Lathem was represented in the UK, the expert stated that a Book of Hours in Cambridge was partly attributed to him. Additionally, there was one painting in the National Gallery that may have been initiated by him. The expert adviser was also asked about the layout of the manuscript to which he opined that manuscripts were often created in stages, sometimes over a period of many years, by a series of individuals. It was likely that the size and number of the illustrations were dictated by the available space. In particular, it was noted that the historiated initials appeared to rebel against the constraints of the page.

The applicant had stated in a written submission that any work of art from Chatsworth must to some extent be associated with British life. However, the manuscript was made in Flanders, for a Flemish patron, was written in French and illuminated by a Flemish artist. It became part of the French royal collection around 1500 and it was not known how or when the manuscript came to England. The manuscript was a beautiful example of the art of Flemish illumination; however, there were other important Flemish manuscripts in UK collections. In addition the UK had more Flemish Renaissance codices originally intended for Louis de Gruuthuse than any other country in the world, with the exception of France. Furthermore, the manuscript’s illuminations had been well studied and published. In their view, the lengthy bibliography found in recent sales catalogues
testified to the manuscript’s significance among scholars. It was however, difficult to judge the manuscript as a whole as there were a number of leaves and miniatures missing. They stated that the retention of the manuscript would not significantly add to the resources for scholars as Flemish Renaissance illumination was already well-represented in the UK.

We heard this case in March 2013 when the manuscript was shown to us. We found that it met the second and third Waverley criteria, on the grounds of outstanding significance for the study of illuminated manuscripts and of fifteenth-century Netherlandish secular art. We recommended that the decision on the export licence application should be deferred for an initial period of three months to allow an offer to purchase to be made at the fair matching price of £3,849,250 (net of VAT). We further recommended that if, by the end of the initial deferral period, a potential purchaser had shown a serious intention to raise funds with a view to making an offer to purchase the manuscript, the deferral period should be extended by a further four months.

At the end of the initial deferral period, no offer to purchase the manuscript had been made and we were not aware of any serious intention to raise funds. An export licence was therefore issued.

Case 17

A study by Raphael, Head of a Young Apostle

This study by Raphael (1483–1520), Head of a Young Apostle, circa 1519–20, was drawn with black chalk over a pounced, dotted outline, and measures 37.5 cm by 27.8 cm. It is a cartoon (ie a same-size study) for the head of one of the figures in Raphael’s Transfiguration altarpiece in the Vatican and is in relatively good condition.

The applicant had applied to export the study to the USA. The value shown on the export licence application was £29,721,250, which represented the hammer price at auction of £26,500,000 plus the buyer’s premium of £3,221,250.

The Keeper of Prints and Drawings and Curator of Italian and French Drawing Pre-1800 at the British Museum, acting as expert adviser, had objected to the export of the study under the first, second and third Waverley criteria on the grounds that it was so closely connected with our history and national life that its departure would be a misfortune, that it was of outstanding aesthetic importance, and that it was of outstanding significance for the study of Raphael and the history of aristocratic collecting of old master drawing in eighteenth-century Britain.

The expert adviser had provided a written submission stating that the drawing was one of the greatest remaining Italian Renaissance drawings at Chatsworth collected by William Cavendish, 2nd Duke of Devonshire. The drawing collection at Chatsworth, for which the Duke was mostly responsible, was the last substantially intact example of a major aristocratic collection from the first half of the eighteenth-century. The work took on a greater significance in the formation of English taste for drawing by the very plausible suggestion, made in the Sotheby’s catalogue, that it once belonged to the fourteenth Earl of Arundel (described as ‘the first heroic figure in the history of British collecting’ in Stourton and Sebag-Montefiore’s The British as Art Collectors, 2012, page 49). The collecting of old master drawings by Arundel and the Duke of Devonshire set the pattern for other British aristocrats, such as the 1st Earl of Leicester (1754–1842) and 2nd Earl Spencer (1758–1834), albeit never again at such an exalted level.

The expert stated that Raphael was one of the greatest European draughtsmen and the cartoons he created for the Transfiguration were regarded as some of the most beautiful drawings made by him, or indeed by any artist. Paul Joannides eloquently expressed the qualities of the study: ‘the combination of breadth and precision, relief and texture is incomparable in this auxiliary cartoon’.

The quality and number of Raphael drawings in UK museums (notably the Ashmolean Museum in Oxford with 77 and the British Museum with 42) testified to the long-standing admiration for his work by British collectors. Three of Raphael’s auxiliary cartoons for the Transfiguration, the last and arguably most dramatic of the artist’s altarpieces, were in museum collections in this country (two in the British Museum and one in the Ashmolean) with a further three not in UK public collections. These auxiliary cartoons were even more precious to the nation’s holdings as none of the preparatory studies for the Transfiguration were in museum collections in this country (although three were at Chatsworth). Drawing was central to how Raphael kept in command of the varied output of his productive workshop, and there was still a great deal to be learnt about how his design process functioned. The expert stated that the loss of a graphic work by him of this calibre would certainly be felt. One innovative aspect of this process was the invention of auxiliary cartoons with Raphael producing highly detailed tonal drawings to act as guides for him and his workshop to paint the heads...
of key protagonists in his paintings. The study was a superlative example of this specialist type of drawing that, above all others, demonstrated the importance of drawing in Raphael’s creative process.

When questioned at the meeting about where this drawing stood in Raphael’s oeuvre, the expert replied that there were earlier examples of his innovative auxiliary cartoons but this particular study was the apogee of his ability as a draughtsman.

The applicant had stated in a written submission that they agreed the study met the second and third Waverley criteria and possibly the first in light of the Chatsworth provenance.

We heard this case in March 2013 when the study was shown to us. We found that it met the second and third Waverley criteria on the grounds that it was of outstanding aesthetic importance and of outstanding significance for the study of Raphael and the history of aristocratic collecting of old master drawing in eighteenth-century Britain. We recommended that the decision on the export licence application should be deferred for an initial period of three months to allow an offer to purchase to be made at the fair matching price of £29,721,250 (net of VAT). We further recommended that if, by the end of the initial deferral period, a potential purchaser had shown a serious intention to raise funds with a view to making an offer to purchase the study, the deferral period should be extended by a further six months.

At the end of the initial deferral period, no offer to purchase the study had been made and we were not aware of any serious intention to raise funds. An export licence was therefore issued.

Case 18

A peridot and gold suite of jewellery by Rundell, Bridge and Rundell

This set of peridot and gold jewels was made in 1816 by the London firm of jewellers Rundell, Bridge and Rundell. The set comprises a necklace with pendant cross, a pair of pendant earrings, a pair of bracelets and a brooch, all of which have open-backed setting. The overall condition of the jewellery is good.

The applicant had applied to export the jewellery to Japan. The value shown on the export licence application was £150,000, which represented the agreed sale price.

The Senior Curator, Sculpture, Metalwork, Ceramics and Glass Department at the V&A, acting as expert adviser, had objected to the export of the jewellery under the third Waverley criterion on the grounds that it was of outstanding significance for the study of the history of jewellery in the early nineteenth-century.

The expert adviser had provided a written submission stating that the set of gold and peridot jewels was bought by the Prince Regent as a gift to ‘Miss Coats’ to be worn at the wedding of his daughter and only legitimate heir, Princess Charlotte, to Prince Leopold of Saxe-Coburg on 2 May 1816. The suite was accompanied by a letter from Princess Elizabeth, sister of the Prince Regent. Miss Cotes was either Charlotte Cotes or Lucy Cotes, nieces of the Dowager Countess of Rosslyn who served in the household of Princess Charlotte and were referred to as ‘Famine & the consequences’. The set was accompanied by a copy of an invoice in the Royal Archives to the Prince Regent from Rundell, Bridge and Rundell.

The expert stated that the two Cotes sisters were appointed by the Prince Regent as part of a royal household that kept Princess Charlotte under close surveillance after she had fled to her mother following her rejection of Prince William of Orange as a suitor. A number of the household were duly rewarded by the Prince Regent when, in most cases, their responsibilities ended with Princess Charlotte’s wedding to Prince Leopold. In a letter of 6 May 1816, Mrs Campbell mentions that the Cotes sisters had received ‘a set of amethysts and one of chrysolites, very handsome’.

The reputation of the jewellers, Rundell, Bridge and Rundell, was exceptional. In 1815 the shop was described as exceeding ‘all others in the British Empire, if not in the whole world, for the value of its contents.’ ‘These jewellers’, reported the Persian ambassador describing Rundell’s in 1810, ‘have no equal in Europe.’ Yet the descriptions of contemporaries, and the richness of the silver and silver-gilt plate in public collections in Britain, cannot obscure the rarity of significant surviving gem-set jewellery like the peridot set. Very few of the more expensive creations survive the vagaries of fashion. Jewellery is normally neither signed nor marked. Whereas many other items bear Rundell’s name, only jewels documented by the archives of their purchasers or by named cases can be identified as the work of Rundell’s.

The expert adviser stated that the set, in its original case and with a note from Princess Elizabeth, was a major addition to the jewellery of the period. It was outstanding as a set of documented coloured-stone jewellery, as an example of the open-set work of the
pre-eminent jeweller of the age, and as a commission from the Prince Regent for the wedding of Princess Charlotte. It would be a key work of reference for the study of early nineteenth-century jewellery in Britain. Whatever their role in the custodianship of the princess, the expert adviser stated that we are indebted to one of the ‘consequences’ and her heirs for having preserved this superb peridot set when so much other jewellery had been recycled or lost its identity.

The applicant had stated in a written submission that the suite possibly met the first Waverley criterion but that it did not meet the second or third.

We heard this case in April 2013 when the suite was shown to us. We found that it met the third Waverley criterion, on the grounds that it was of outstanding significance for the study of the history of jewellery in the early nineteenth-century. We recommended that the decision on the export licence application should be deferred for an initial period of two months to allow an offer to purchase to be made at the fair matching price of £150,000 (net of VAT). We further recommended that if, by the end of the initial deferral period, a potential purchaser had shown a serious intention to raise funds with a view to making an offer to purchase the suite, the deferral period should be extended by a further three months.

During the initial deferral period, we were informed of a serious intention by the V&A to raise funds to purchase the suite. Although the expression of interest came from the Secretary of State’s expert adviser confirmation was obtained at the time of the objection, and at the meeting, that the institution with which they were connected was not making enquiries with a view to purchasing or in the process of purchasing the item. We were subsequently informed that the suite had been purchased by the V&A.

**Case 19**

**An amber games board attributed to Georg Schreiber**

Attributed to the amber artist George Schreiber, this hinged amber games board measures 4cm by 69cm by 24.4cm when open and dates from 1607. It was constructed in wood onto which amber panels have been affixed. Strips of ebony have been used to edge the board and the corners are adorned with mica overlaid with silver mounts. The games board is accompanied by 28 draughtsmen, each measuring 4cm in diameter, which appear to date from the early seventeenth-century.

The applicant had applied to export the games board to Germany, and the ultimate destination was Switzerland. The value shown on the export licence application was £821,500, which represented an agreed sale price.

The Senior Curator of Sculpture at the V&A, acting as expert adviser, had objected to the export of the games board under the second and third Waverley criteria on the grounds that it was of outstanding aesthetic importance and of outstanding significance for the study of seventeenth-century amber work.

The expert adviser had provided a written submission stating that the top exterior face formed a board for the game ‘nine men’s morris’. The playing surface was surrounded by nine small decorative panels consisting of allegorical reliefs, in white amber, of the four virtues; each of these smaller panels were bordered with metal foil, painted with stencils of arabesques, set under translucent orange amber. The underside of the exterior formed a chess board and when open the interior displayed a backgammon board decorated with reliefs depicting scenes from Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*. The accompanying counters were comparatively large, and whether they were a complete set which could actually have been used on this particular board was questionable.

The expert stated that according to the family tradition of the previous owners, the Heskeths, this games board was originally owned by King Charles I (1600–49), or possibly initially by his elder brother Prince Henry Frederick, who died prematurely in 1612. It was believed to have been given by Charles just before his execution to his confidant, the Right Reverend William Juxon (1582–1663), Bishop of London and later Archbishop of Canterbury.

At this date, in the early baroque period, luxury amber goods were highly prized as diplomatic gifts. As amber was such a cherished and costly material, such pieces were normally only in the possession of royalty or the aristocracy. The games board was inscribed with the phrase ‘ZU GOT ALLEIN DIE HOFFNUNG MEIN’ (my only hope is in God) and was similar to the personal motto of King Frederick II of Denmark (1534–88), ‘DEUS REFUGIU ET FIDUSIA MEA’. King Frederick was Prince Henry’s and Charles’s maternal grandfather.

The expert adviser stated that amber is a fragile, rare and visually compelling material and that the greatest works of art made from it exhibit extraordinarily fine and complex techniques. This elaborate and sophisticated item was produced at the beginning of the great age of amber working. The expert explained that it had survived virtually intact and as such was...
unique in Britain. The high quality of this piece, its variety of sophisticated techniques, as well as the choice of subjects for the reliefs, inscriptions and parallels with other signed pieces strongly implied it was by the amber artist Georg Schreiber. Schreiber was active in Königsberg in Prussia in the first half of the seventeenth-century. When questioned at the Reviewing Committee meeting about how important Georg Schreiber was in the context of amber craftsmen, the expert adviser replied that he was the first known and documented amber worker. The expert stated that there were two games boards in the V&A in poorer condition and a further board attributed to Schreiber in an unknown private collection.

The applicant had stated in a written submission that although the games board was said (without proof) to have an English royal provenance, it was considerably more important for the cultural history of the Germanic countries than it was for the UK. The applicant did not contest that the games board met the second Waverley criterion but felt that it did not particularly meet the third. When questioned at the Reviewing Committee meeting about the likelihood of the draughtsmen being those that were originally made for the games board, the applicant stated that they did not believe they belonged together.

We heard this case in April 2013 when the games board was shown to us. We found that it met the second Waverley criterion. We recommended that the decision on the export licence application should be deferred for an initial period of two months to allow an offer to purchase to be made at the fair matching price of £821,500 (net of VAT). We further recommended that if, by the end of the initial deferral period, a potential purchaser had shown a serious intention to raise funds with a view to making an offer to purchase the games board, the deferral period should be extended by a further three months.

At the end of the initial deferral period, no offer to purchase the games board had been made and we were not aware of any serious intention to raise funds. An export licence was therefore issued.

Case 20

Four scenes from the Passion of the Christ by Niccolò di Pietro Gerini

These four scenes from the Passion of Christ were painted circa 1385–90 by Niccolò di Pietro Gerini (documented 1368, probably active from 1366 and died circa 1414–15), is tempera on linen and measures 95.5cm by 101cm, 95.5cm by 100cm, 89.5cm by 92cm, and 89.5cm by 91.5cm. Each of these large, almost-square pictures depict a discrete episode from Christ’s passion: Peter Protesting at Christ washing the Feet of the Disciples; The Betrayal of Christ in the Garden of Gethsemane; The Mocking of Christ; and The Flagellation.

The applicant had applied to export the paintings to the USA. The value shown on the export licence application was £1,105,250, which represented a hammer price of £950,000, plus buyer’s premium of £155,250.

The Director of the National Gallery, acting as expert adviser, had objected to the export of the paintings under the third Waverley criterion, on the grounds that they were of outstanding significance for the study of the techniques and formats of fourteenth-century painting.

The expert adviser had provided a written submission stating that very few paintings on fabric survived from fourteenth-century Italy. Most narrative paintings from this period were frescoes which could still be found on the walls of the churches, chapels and civic buildings for which they were painted. The four scenes from the Passion of Christ were large-scale narrative pictures from Trecento Italy that were painted on a fabric support and, as such, were exceptionally rare. Tuscan pictures on fabric were particularly unusual and the production of such works seemed to have been more common in northern Italy and the Veneto. The fact that two scenes, The Mocking of Christ and The Flagellation, immediately followed each other in the Passion narrative, suggested that these works originally formed part of a much larger cycle.

The expert stated that Niccolò di Pietro Gerini was one of the most successful Florentine painters of the second half of the fourteenth-century. His compositions were noteworthy for their clarity, dynamism, and their attention to detail. The four scenes were depicted using vibrant and varied colours, and with exaggerated facial expressions of the figures. This indicated that the compositions were intended to be clear and understandable even when viewed from afar. The
compositions focused on Christ’s humiliation and sorrow. The suffering, human Christ was in keeping with the devotional practices which developed in thirteenth and fourteenth-century Italy under the influence of the mendicant orders and of the lay confraternities. Christians were encouraged to seek a more personal and emotional relationship with Christ.

Until recently it had been assumed that all Italian paintings on fabric supports were made as banners to be carried during religious processions. During conservation treatment it was discovered that a thick layer of ground had been applied to disguise the weave of the textile surface, a practice comparable to the preparation of a wooden panel so that it had a smooth surface for painting. As the paintings were richly decorated, with high quality and costly materials, including ultramarine, mordant gilding and silver leaf, and furthermore did not exhibit the signs of frequent folding, it seemed highly unlikely that they were made as banners.

Nearly 500 years after their creation, these scenes from the Passion of Christ once more assumed a devotional function. They were displayed in the church of St Michael and All Angels at Withyam, Sussex, in 1849. The pictures, then attributed as ‘school of Giotto’, were hung in the chancel but they were not simply decorative: The Mocking of Christ was placed over the altar, and these paintings were used in a devotional context in Britain for over 140 years.

The expert informed us that five paintings by Niccolò di Pietro Gerini were held in British public collections, while a smaller picture was on long-term loan to the National Gallery. None of these paintings were executed on canvas or formed part of large-scale narrative cycles. There were two other examples of paintings on fabric dated before 1400 in British public collections, but neither were narrative pictures. One was in the V&A and the second in the National Gallery. When questioned at the Reviewing Committee meeting about how rare it was to see paintings from this period on linen, the expert adviser replied that less than 20 examples survived and as a result this cycle was very remarkable.

The applicant had stated in a written submission that in their view the first Waverley criterion did not apply: the works were not by a British artist, and did not come to the UK until some 400 years after their creation. Accordingly, they stated that it could not be said that the paintings’ departure from the UK would be a misfortune. They did not, however, dispute that the second and third criteria applied.

We heard this case in April 2013 when the paintings were shown to us. We found that they met the third Waverley criterion, on the grounds that they were of outstanding significance for the study of Italian painting of the Trecento and in particular the techniques of painting on linen. We recommended that the decision on the export licence application should be deferred for an initial period of three months to allow an offer to purchase to be made at the fair matching price of £1,105,250 (net of VAT). We further recommended that if, by the end of the initial deferral period, a potential purchaser had shown a serious intention to raise funds with a view to making an offer to purchase the paintings, the deferral period should be extended by a further four months.

At the end of the initial deferral period, no offer to purchase the paintings had been made and we were not aware of any serious intention to raise funds. An export licence was therefore issued.

Case 21

A Julia Margaret Cameron photo album, the ‘Signor 1857’

This album, compiled by Julia Margaret Cameron (1815–79) and dated 1857, is bound in green morocco leather with marbled endpapers, gilt borders and gilt stamped ‘Signor.1857’ on the upper cover. It is 35 pages, plus blanks, 4to and measures 246mm by 197mm. It consists of 35 photographs by various photographers, including Cameron, Reginald Southey, Rejlander, and second Earl Brownlow, all mounted individually within the album (comprising three salted paper prints and 32 albumen prints). Some of these images are accompanied by later notes and inscriptions identifying the sitters. There is also a later inscription on the front pastedown giving an (incorrect) summary of the content.

The applicant had applied to export the photo album to Italy. The value shown on the export licence application was £121,250, which represented a hammer price at auction of £100,000 plus buyer’s premium of £21,250.

The Head of Collections, Projects, at the National Media Museum, acting as expert adviser, had objected to the export of the album under the third Waverley criterion, on the grounds that it was of outstanding significance for the study of the history of photography.

The expert adviser had provided a written submission stating that Julia Margaret Cameron took her first photograph in 1864 but was actively involved with photography prior to this, compiling a number of
albums. This album, known as the ‘Signor 1857’ album was the earliest of eight recorded photographic albums assembled by Cameron in the period before she took up photography herself. Almost certainly compiled by Cameron as a gift for her friend, the artist George Frederic Watts, the album anticipated the photographs she would later make with her own camera, mixing images of the famous (Henry Taylor, Alfred Tennyson and GF Watts) with the familial to create a celebration of art, photography, family and friendship. It contained work by several different photographers (some unattributed), including 15 unique images. The Signor 1857 album hinted at a direct connection between Cameron’s own practice and contemporary commercial photography, a connection that had generally been overlooked by Cameron scholars.

The album was a testament to Cameron’s engagement with the work of GF Watts and her growing interest in photography’s place within the fine arts. From the early 1850s, Watts lived with Cameron’s sister Sara and her husband Henry Thoby Prinsep at Little Holland House in Kensington, London. In 1864, Watts would also become the recipient of the first (known) album of photographs that Cameron made with her own camera. ‘Signor’ was the name that Sophia Dalrymple, another of Cameron’s sisters, gave to the artist. Turning the album upside down, there was a second sequence of photographic portraits. Some of the photographs in this ‘back to front’ sequence were unique to this album. These included two photographs which were almost certainly by Earl Somers, an important figure in the history of photography, to whom no photographs have, until now, been firmly attributed.

The expert adviser stated that the Signor 1857 album was a hugely important piece of evidence in explaining how Cameron, a middle-aged woman with no previous experience of visual art-making, became one of the most celebrated of photographers. By connecting her life and her fascination with photography to the social circles and artistic practice of GF Watts, it illuminated the historical moment when originality became the defining hallmark of Cameron’s art.

The applicant had stated in a written submission that they did not believe that the album was of national importance under the Waverley criteria. They stated that while the photographs themselves were undoubtedly aesthetically pleasing, the great majority were by commercial studio photographers and they did not believe that they were of outstanding aesthetic importance. Additionally, the photographic reproductions of drawings by Watts and unique images of Cameron and her children were similarly, in their view, of limited importance. While they accepted that the album provided opportunities for the study of Julia Margaret Cameron’s developing interest and understanding of photography, they questioned whether the term ‘outstanding significance’ could be applied when her role had been no more that the secondary creative one of compiler. Furthermore, scholars in the UK already had ready access to considerable primary material relating to Cameron’s early interest in photographic albums.

We heard this case in April 2013 when the photograph was shown to us. We found that it met the third Waverley criterion, on the grounds that it was of outstanding significance for the study of nineteenth-century photography and in particular of Julia Margaret Cameron. We recommended that the decision on the export licence application should be deferred for an initial period of two months to allow an offer to purchase to be made at the fair matching price of £121,250. We further recommended that if, by the end of the initial deferral period, a potential purchaser had shown a serious intention to raise funds with a view to making an offer to purchase the photo album, the deferral period should be extended by a further three months.

During the initial deferral period, we were informed of a serious intention by the National Media Museum to raise funds to purchase the photo album. Although the expression of interest came from the Secretary of State’s expert adviser confirmation was obtained that at the time of the objection, and at the meeting, that the institution with which they were connected was not making enquiries with a view to purchasing or in the process of purchasing the item. A decision on the export licence application was deferred for a further three months. No offer to purchase the album was received. An export license was therefore issued.

Case 22

A mural by Hans Coper, Swinton School Mural

On 6 March 2013 the Reviewing Committee considered an application to export Swinton School Mural by Hans Coper. The Committee concluded that the mural satisfied the first, second and third Waverley criteria. The application for an export licence was withdrawn the following week. Consequently, no decision on the application has been made by the Secretary of State.
Plate II A Dutch and silver ewer and basin by Christian van Vianen

Plate III An officer’s embroidered grenadier cap
Plate IV *Child with a Dove* by Pablo Picasso
Plate V An atlas of estate maps of Hampton Court, Herefordshire
Plate VI A George II silver-gilt ewer and basin, the ‘Bristol ewer and basin’
Plate VII A George II ivory-mounted padouk medal cabinet, the ‘Brand cabinet’
Plate VIII A south German marquetry table top
Plate IX A Regence ormolu-mounted Chinese porcelain casket
Plate X Christ between Saints Paul and Peter by Pietro Lorenzetti
Plate XI Kongouro, from New Holland (The Kangaroo) and Portrait of a Large Dog (The Dingo) by George Stubbs
Plate XII Richmond Hill in the Summer of 1862 by Jasper Francis Cropsey
Plate XIV Louis de Gruthuse’s copy of the Deeds of Sir Gillion de Trazegnies in the Middle East
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Plate XV Head of a Young Apostle by Raphael
Plate XVI  A peridot and gold suite of jewellery by Rundell, Bridge and Rundell
Plate XVII An amber games board attributed to Georg Schreiber
Plate VIII Four scenes from the Passion of the Christ by Niccolò di Pietro Gerini: Peter Protesting at Christ washing the Feet of the Disciples; The Betrayal of Christ in the Garden of Gethsemane; The Mocking of Christ; and The Flagellation
Plate XIX Photographs from Julia Margaret Cameron’s photo album, the ‘Signor 1857’
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Appendices
History of export controls in the UK
The reasons for controlling the export of what are now known as cultural goods were first recognised in the UK at the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the 20th centuries. Private collections in the United Kingdom had become the prey of American and German collectors and it was apparent that many were being depleted and important works of art sold abroad at prices in excess of anything that UK public collections or private buyers could afford. It was against this background the National Art Collections Fund was established in 1903, to help UK national and provincial public collections to acquire objects that they could not afford by themselves.

Until 1939 the United Kingdom had no legal controls on the export of works of art, books, manuscripts and other antiques. The outbreak of the Second World War made it necessary to impose controls on exports generally in order to conserve national resources. As part of the war effort, Parliament enacted the Import, Export and Customs Powers (Defence) Act 1939, and in addition the Defence (Finance) Regulations, which were intended not to restrict exports but to ensure that, when goods were exported outside the Sterling Area, they earned their proper quota of foreign exchange. In 1940, antiques and works of art were brought under this system of licensing.

It was in 1950 that the then Labour Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Stafford Cripps, established a committee under the Chairmanship of the First Viscount Waverley ‘to consider and advise on the policy to be adopted by His Majesty’s Government in controlling the export of works of art, books, manuscripts, armour and antiques and to recommend what arrangements should be made for the practical operation of policy’. The Committee reported in 1952 to RA Butler, Chancellor in the subsequent Conservative administration, and its conclusions still form the basis of the arrangements in place today.

Current export controls
The export controls are derived from both UK and EU legislation. The UK statutory powers are exercised by the Secretary of State under the Export Control Act 2002. Under the Act, the Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport has made the Export of Objects of Cultural Interest (Control) Order 2003. Export Controls are also imposed by Council Regulation (EEC) No 116/2009 on the export of cultural goods. The control is enforced by HM Revenue and Customs on behalf of DCMS. If an item within the scope of the legislation is exported without an appropriate licence, the exporter and any other party concerned with the unlicensed export of the object concerned may be subject to penalties, including criminal prosecution, under the Customs and Excise Management Act 1979.

The Reviewing Committee on the Export of Works of Art and Objects of Cultural Interest
An independent Reviewing Committee on the Export of Works of Art was first appointed in 1952 following the recommendations of the Waverley Committee. It succeeded an earlier Committee of the same name established in 1949, comprising museum directors and officials, which heard appeals against refusals and, from 1950, all cases where refusals were recommended. The Committee’s terms of reference, as set out in the Waverley Report, were:

i) to advise on the principles which should govern the control of export of works of art and antiques under the Import, Export and Customs Powers (Defence) Act 1939;

ii) to consider all the cases where refusal of an export licence for a work of art or antique is suggested on grounds of national importance;

iii) to advise in cases where a Special Exchequer Grant is needed towards the purchase of an object that would otherwise be exported;

iv) to supervise the operation of the export control system generally.

These were subsequently revised following the recommendations of the Quinquennial Review, which also recommended that the Committee’s name be expanded by adding ‘and Objects of Cultural Interest’. (See Annex B for revised terms of reference.)
The Committee is a non-statutory independent body whose role is to advise the Secretary of State whether a cultural object which is the subject of an application for an export licence is of national importance under the Waverley criteria (so named after Viscount Waverley), which were spelt out in the conclusions of the Waverley Report. The Committee consists of eight full members, appointed by the Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport, seven of whom have particular expertise in one or more relevant fields (paintings, furniture, manuscripts etc), and a Chairman. A list of members during the year covered by this report is at the front of this report and brief details of members are included at Appendix C.

The Waverley criteria
The Waverley criteria are applied to each object the Committee considers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>History</th>
<th>Aesthetics</th>
<th>Scholarship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is it so closely connected with our history and national life that its departure would be a misfortune?</td>
<td>Is it of outstanding aesthetic importance?</td>
<td>Is it of outstanding significance for the study of some particular branch of art, learning or history?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Waverley 1  Waverley 2  Waverley 3

These categories are not mutually exclusive and an object can, depending on its character, meet one, two, or three of the criteria.

The Committee reaches a decision on the merits of any object which the relevant expert adviser draws to its attention.

A meeting is held at which both the expert adviser and the applicant submit a case and can question the other party. The permanent committee members are joined for each hearing by independent assessors (usually three), who are acknowledged experts in the field of the object under consideration. They temporarily become full members of the Committee for the duration of the consideration of the item in question.

If the Committee concludes that an item meets at least one of the Waverley criteria, its recommendation is passed on to the Secretary of State. The Committee also passes on an assessment of the item’s qualities and a recommendation as to the length of time for which the decision on the export licence should be deferred, to provide UK institutions and private individuals with a chance to raise the money to purchase the item to enable it to remain in this country. It is the Secretary of State who decides whether an export licence should be granted or whether it should be deferred, pending the possible receipt of a suitable matching offer from within the UK which will lead to the refusal of the licence if it is turned down.

Since the Committee was set up in 1952, many important works of art have been retained in the UK as a result of its intervention. These embrace many different categories and, to take an illustrative selection, include Titian’s The Death of Actaeon (1971), Raphael’s Madonna of the Pinks (2004), Manet’s Portrait of Madeleine Claus (2012) and, from the British school, Reynolds’ The Archers (2005). Not only paintings but sculpture, including The Three Graces by Canova (1993); antiquities, for example a ‘jadeite’ Neolithic axe-head brought into Britain circa 4000 BC (2007); porcelain – a 102-piece Sevres dinner service presented to the Duke of Wellington (1979); furniture – a lady’s secretaire by Thomas Chippendale (1998); a pair of Italian console tables with marquetry tops by Lucio de Lucci and the bases attributed to Andrea Brustolon; silver – a Charles II two-handled silver porringer and cover, circa 1660, attributed to the workshop of Christian van Vianen (1999); textiles – a felt appliqué and patch-worked album coverlet made by Ann West in 1820 (2006) and manuscripts, for example the Foundation Charter of Westminster Abbey (1980) and the Macclesfield Psalter (2005). This shortlist shows quite clearly the immense cultural and historic value of what has been achieved.

Unfortunately, and perhaps almost inevitably, some have got away. Noteworthy examples include David Sacrificing before the Ark by Rubens (1961), A Portrait of Juan de Pareja by Velasquez (1971), Sunflowers by Van Gogh (1986), and Portrait of an Elderly Man by Rembrandt (1999). Among items other than pictures that were exported are The Burdett Psalter (1998), The World History of Rashid al-Din (1980), The Codex Leicester by Leonardo da Vinci (1980), the Jenkins or ‘Barberini’ Venus (2003) and Ordination by Nicolas Poussin (2011) which are all of the highest quality in their field. By any measure these are all losses to the UK of items of world significance.
Appendix B

Terms of reference of the Reviewing Committee on the Export of Works of Art and Objects of Cultural Interest

The Committee was established on 1952, following the recommendations of the Waverley Committee in its Report in September of that year. Its terms of reference are:

a) to advise on the principles which should govern the control of export of objects of cultural interest under the Export Control Act 2002 and on the operation of the export control system generally

b) to advise the Secretary of State on all cases where refusal of an export licence for an object of cultural interest is suggested on grounds of national importance

c) to advise in cases where a special Exchequer grant is needed towards the purchase of an object that would otherwise be exported.

Appendix C

Membership of the Reviewing Committee on the Export of Works of Art and Objects of Cultural Interest during 2012/13

Lord Inglewood (Chair)

Lord Inglewood, previously Richard Vane, has been called to the Bar and is also a Chartered Surveyor. Between 1989–94 and 1999–2004 he was Conservative Spokesman on Legal Affairs in the European Parliament. He has chaired the Development Control Committee of the Lake District Planning Board and is Chairman of Cumbrian Newspaper Group and of Carr’s Milling Industries plc. He was Parliamentary Under Secretary of State in the Department of National Heritage 1995–7. In 1999 he was elected an hereditary member of the House of Lords, and a fellow of the Society of Antiquaries (FSA) in 2003. He owns and lives at Hutton-in-the-Forest, his family’s historic house in Cumbria.

Appointed 1 December 2003; appointment expired 30 November 2013

Richard Calvocoressi

Richard Calvocoressi, Director of The Henry Moore Foundation since 2007 and former Keeper, and then Director, of the Scottish National Gallery of Modern Art (1987–2007), was originally a curator at the Tate Gallery (1979–87), where he was responsible for building up the collections of pre- and post-war European art. He also organised major exhibitions of Jean Tinguely (1982) and Oskar Kokoschka (1986). In Scotland he acquired important international collections of dada and surrealist art from the estates of Roland Penrose and Gabrielle Keiller and was instrumental in attracting the Anthony d’Offay gift to Edinburgh and London. In 2004 the SNGMA was awarded the Gulbenkian Museum of the Year Award (now the Art Fund Prize) for its commissioning of Charles Jencks’s *Landform*. Richard Calvocoressi has also published on various artists including Francis Bacon, Georg Baselitz, Reg Butler, Lucian Freud, Anselm Kiefer, Paul Klee, René Magritte, Lee Miller and Henry Moore. He is an Expert Member of the Comité Magritte, a Member of the Francis Bacon Catalogue Raisonné Committee and a Trustee of The Art Fund. In 2008 he was awarded a CBE for services to the arts, particularly in Scotland.

Appointed 13 November 2012; appointment expires 12 November 2016
Professor David Ekserdjian

Professor of the History of Art and Film, University of Leicester. He is an expert on Italian renaissance paintings and drawings and the author of Correggio (1997) and Parmigianino (2006). Formerly a Fellow of Balliol College Oxford (1983-86) and Corpus Christi College Oxford (1987-91), he worked in the Old Master Paintings and Master Drawings departments at Christie’s in London from 1991 to 1997. In addition, from 1992 was Head of European Sculpture and Works of Art Department there. He was editor of Apollo magazine 1997-2004. He has organised and contributed to the catalogues of numerous exhibitions, including Old Master Paintings from the Thyssen-Bornemisza Collection, Royal Academy 1988) and Andrea Mantegna (Royal Academy, London and Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, 1992). In 2004 he was made an Honorary Citizen of the town of Correggio. In 2006 he became a Trustee of the National Gallery, and since 2008 he has been the National Gallery’s Liaison Trustee on the Tate Board.

Appointed 14 November 2002; appointment expires 13 November 2012

Philippa Glanville

Philippa Glanville FSA is currently a trustee of the Geffrye Museum, a member of the Westminster Abbey Fabric Commission, Curatorial Adviser to the Harley Foundation and President of the Silver Society. An historian and curator at the London Museum, Museum of London and V&A, she was Keeper of Metalwork at the V&A from 1989 to 1999. From 1999 to 2003 she was Academic Director at Waddesdon Manor (the Rothschild Collection), and Associate Curator at the Gilbert Collection, Somerset House. She writes regularly on silver, social history and the history of collecting; her books include Silver in Tudor & Early Stuart England (V&A 1990), London in Maps (Connoisseur/Ebury Press 1972), Women Silversmiths 1697–1845 (with J Goldsborough, Thames & Hudson 1991), and for the V&A, Silver, Elegant Eating & The Art of Drinking (1996, 2002, 2007). She has contributed to many publications including City Merchants & the Arts 1670–1720 (Oblong/Corporation of London 2004), Feeding Desire (Cooper Hewitt 2006), Les tables royals en Europe & Quand Versailles était meuble en argent (RMN & Chateau de Versailles 1993 and 2001), Treasures of the English Church (Goldsmiths Company/Holberton 2008) and Baroque (V&A 2009). She serves on the Advisory Council of the Mellon Centre for British Art and on the editorial board of Apollo.

Appointed 2 April 2010; appointment expires 1 April 2014

Simon Swynfen Jervis

Currently a Director and Trustee of the Burlington Magazine, Chair of the Furniture History Society, Chair of the Walpole Society and Chair of the Leche Trust. He previously held the posts of Acting Keeper and then Curator of the Department of Furniture at the V&A, before becoming Director of the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge (1989–95). He then served as Director of Historic Buildings at the National Trust (1995–2002). He is also an Honorary Vice-President of the Society of Antiquaries of London, a Life Trustee and currently Chairman of the Trustees of Sir John Soane’s Museum and a member of the Advisory Council of the Art Fund.

Appointed 10 April 2007; appointment expires 9 April 2015

Dr Catherine Johns

Former curator of the Romano-British collections at the British Museum. She was trained in prehistoric and Roman Archaeology, and has published and lectured extensively, especially on Roman provincial art, jewellery and silver. Her publications include Sex or Symbol; erotic images of Greece and Rome (1982), The jewellery of Roman Britain (1996), Horses: History, Myth, Art (2006), Dogs: History, Myth, Art (2008), museum catalogues of Roman treasure finds, and more than a hundred articles in scholarly journals. She has served on the committees of the Society of Antiquaries, the Roman Society and the British Archaeological Association, and is a former Chair of the Society of Jewellery Historians.

Appointed 19 February 2003; appointment expires 18 February 2013

Aidan Weston-Lewis

Aidan Weston-Lewis has worked at the National Gallery of Scotland since 1992, where he is Chief Curator, with responsibility for the Italian and Spanish collections. Before that he was Assistant Librarian at the Witt Photographic Library at the Courtauld Institute in London. He has organised a series of major exhibitions and has published widely in his area of specialism, particularly on north Italian painting and drawing of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In 2005 he received from the Italian Republic the honour of Cavaliere dell’Ordine della Stella della Solidarietà Italiana in recognition of his contribution to the study of Italian art.

Appointed 10 May 2011; appointment expires 9 May 2015
Lowell Libson

Lowell Libson is an art dealer and Managing Director and Proprietor of Lowell Libson Ltd which specialises in British paintings, watercolours and drawings of the seventeenth to 20th centuries. His specialist area of expertise is the art market and British works of the seventeenth to 20th centuries.

Appointed 3 June 2011; appointment expires 2 June 2015

Leslie Webster

Formerly Keeper (Head) of the Department of Prehistory and Europe, Leslie Webster has spent her career as a senior curator at the British Museum, overseeing the early medieval collections and specialising in Anglo-Saxon and Viking material culture. She is currently an Honorary Visiting Professor at the Institute of Archaeology, UCL. She has co-curated four major exhibitions on early medieval themes at the British Museum, and also commissioned and co-ordinated a series of five thematically linked exhibitions in five major European museums, as part of the European Science Foundation’s Transformation of the Roman World AD 400-900 Project. Since her retirement from the British Museum in 2007, she has continued to publish and lecture on Anglo-Saxon art and archaeology, on which she is an internationally acknowledged authority. Her latest book, published in 2012, is *Anglo-Saxon Art: A New History*. She has served as a Trustee and in an advisory capacity on many academic and specialist bodies, including the Society of Antiquaries of London, of which she is currently a Trustee, and the Society for Medieval Archaeology, where she served as President from 2007–10. Other advisory work has included the Bede’s World Museological and Academic Advisory Committee, the English Heritage Museums and Archives Advisory Panel, and the Portable Antiquities Advisory Group. She is currently the Chair of the Staffordshire Hoard Research Advisory Panel, which has been set up to oversee the research and publication of this major Anglo-Saxon find, and has recently been appointed to the National Heritage Memorial Fund Advisory Panel.

Appointed 18 February 2013; appointment expires 17 February 2017

Dr Christopher Wright

Dr Christopher Wright joined the Department of Manuscripts, British Library, in 1974 and was Head of Manuscripts from 2003 until his retirement in October 2005. He is a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries (2002) and a Fellow of the Royal Historical Society (1982). His publications include *George III* (2005) and, as editor, *Sir Robert Cotton as Collector: Essays on an Early Stuart Courtier* (1997). From 1989 to 1999, he was editor of the *British Library Journal*. He served as a Trustee of the Sir Winston Churchill Archives Trust, Cambridge (2001–5) and was on the Council of the Friends of the National Libraries (2003–6). From August 2005 he has been a Trustee of ‘The Handwriting of Italian Humanists’. In October 2005, he was appointed to the Acceptance in Lieu Panel.

Appointed 20 November 2006; appointment expires on 19 November 2014
## Appendix D

List of independent assessors who attended meetings during 2012/13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title and Affiliation</th>
<th>Case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor Francis Ames-Lewis</td>
<td>Emeritus Professor, Birkbeck College</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigel Arch</td>
<td>former Director, Kensington Palace (retired)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Barnes</td>
<td>Senior Curator, Photographs, Word &amp; Image Department, V&amp;A</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rufus Bird</td>
<td>Deputy Surveyor of the Queen's Works of Art</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Adam Bowett</td>
<td>Furniture Historian and Writer</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison Britton, OBE</td>
<td>Ceramic Artist and Lecturer, Royal College of Art</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Joanna Cannon</td>
<td>Reader in History of Art, Courtauld Institute of Art</td>
<td>12, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zelda Cheatle</td>
<td>Photography Strategist</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Crouch</td>
<td>Partner, Daniel Crouch Rare Books LLP</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alastair Dickenson</td>
<td>Company Director, Alastair Dickenson Ltd</td>
<td>2, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony d’Offay</td>
<td>Chair, Anthony d’Offay Gallery</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrian Eeles</td>
<td>Private Art Consultant</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Irving Finkel</td>
<td>Assistant Keeper, Department of the Middle East, the British Museum</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francesca Galloway</td>
<td>Francesca Galloway Ltd</td>
<td>4, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Julian Gardner</td>
<td>Emeritus Professor, University of Warwick</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte Gere</td>
<td>Independent Jewellery Historian</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Gibbs</td>
<td>Assistant Curator, Guards Museum</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Sophie Gordon</td>
<td>Senior Curator of Photographs, the Royal Collection</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Hall</td>
<td>Director, Erskine, Hall and Coe</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Harris</td>
<td>former Director, Harris-Lindsay Ltd</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colin Harrison</td>
<td>Assistant Keeper, Ashmolean Museum</td>
<td>13, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Hartop</td>
<td>Independent Consultant</td>
<td>1, 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanna Hashagen</td>
<td>Keeper of Fashion and Textiles, The Bowes Museum</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Holden</td>
<td>Director, Robert Holden Ltd</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Helen Jacobsen</td>
<td>Curator, French 18th Century Decorative Arts, Wallace Collection</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Martin Kauffmann</td>
<td>Curator of Medieval Manuscripts, Bodleian Library</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Kearon</td>
<td>Independent Consultant</td>
<td>11 (2011/12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Lindsay</td>
<td>Director, Harris Lindsay Ltd</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Linenthal</td>
<td>Antiquarian Bookseller</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Errol Manners</td>
<td>Proprietor, E&amp;H Manners Ceramics and Works of Art</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Matthiesen</td>
<td>Director, Matthiesen Fine Art Ltd</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn McCully</td>
<td>Independent Scholar</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert McPherson</td>
<td>Proprietor, R&amp;G McPherson Antiques</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Mould</td>
<td>Managing Director, Anthony Mould Ltd</td>
<td>11, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title and Affiliation</td>
<td>Case Numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Naxton</td>
<td>Independent Consultant</td>
<td>Case 11 (2011/12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Simon Olding</td>
<td>Director, Crafts Study Centre, University for the Creative Arts</td>
<td>Case 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret O’Sullivan</td>
<td>former County Archivist of Derbyshire (retired)</td>
<td>Case 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia Peyton-Jones</td>
<td>Director, Serpentine Gallery</td>
<td>Case 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Carol Plazotta</td>
<td>Curator of Italian Paintings 1500–1600, the National Gallery</td>
<td>Case 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Martin Postle</td>
<td>Deputy Director, Paul Mellon Centre</td>
<td>Case 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan Robinson</td>
<td>Master, Magdalene College Cambridge</td>
<td>Case 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julian Rota</td>
<td>Director, Bertram Rota Ltd</td>
<td>Case 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Rowell</td>
<td>Furniture Curator, The National Trust</td>
<td>Case 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Rudoe</td>
<td>Assistant Keeper, Department of Prehistory and Europe, British Museum</td>
<td>Case 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leon Sassoon</td>
<td>Managing Director, C John (Rare Rugs) Ltd</td>
<td>Case 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy Schroeder</td>
<td>Independent Consultant</td>
<td>Case 6 and 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindsay Stainton</td>
<td>Independent Consultant</td>
<td>Case 11 and 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy Stevens</td>
<td>former Director of The Gilbert Collection Trust (retired)</td>
<td>Case 1, 2, 6 and 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Tanner</td>
<td>Director and Chief Executive, ss Great Britain Trust</td>
<td>Case 11 (2011/12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julian Treuherz</td>
<td>Art Historian and Curator, former Keeper of Art Galleries at National Museums Liverpool</td>
<td>Case 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Truman</td>
<td>Independent Consultant</td>
<td>Case 1, 2, 10 and 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Rowan Watson</td>
<td>Senior Curator, Word and Image Department, V&amp;A</td>
<td>Case 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Wells-Cole</td>
<td>former Senior Curator, Temple Newsam House</td>
<td>Case 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Alison Wright</td>
<td>Reader in Italian Late Medieval &amp; Renaissance Art, University College London</td>
<td>Case 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Value of items placed under deferral (July 2003/April 2004 to 2012/13) i) for which permanent licences were issued and ii) where items were purchased by UK institutions or individuals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) Year</th>
<th>(2) Value of items where a decision on the licence application was deferred (£m)</th>
<th>(3) Value (at deferral) of cases in (2) where items were licensed for permanent export (£m)</th>
<th>(4) Value of items in (3) as % of (2)</th>
<th>(5) Value of items in (2) that were not licensed for export (£m)</th>
<th>(6) Value (at deferral) of cases in (2) where items were purchased by UK institutions or individuals¹ (£m)</th>
<th>(7) Value of items in (6) as % of (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 2003/ April 2004</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>16.2²</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>10.7¹</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>10.7⁴</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>5.9⁵</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>114.8</td>
<td>103.5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>457.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>351.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>77</strong></td>
<td><strong>104.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>85.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ This only includes items purchased by individuals who agreed to guarantee satisfactory public access, conservation and security arrangements.

² Includes value of five cases (£10,422,776) where the application was withdrawn during the deferral period.

³ Excludes one case where the item was originally found to be Waverley but subsequently found to have been imported into the UK within the last 50 years.

⁴ Includes value of one case (£554,937.50) where the application was withdrawn during the deferral period.

⁵ Includes value of one case (£389,600) where a matching offer was refused and the Secretary of State therefore refused an export licence and value of two cases (£1,645,868) where the application was withdrawn during the deferral period.
## Appendix F

### Items licensed for export after reference to expert advisers for advice as to national importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Advising authority</th>
<th>No of Items</th>
<th>Total value (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arms and armour</td>
<td>Royal Armouries, Leeds, Associate Director</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>876,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books, maps etc</td>
<td>British Library, Keeper of Printed Books, Head of Map Collections</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>10,727,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books (natural history)</td>
<td>Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, Head of Library and Archives</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>273,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clocks and watches</td>
<td>British Museum, Keeper of Clocks and Watches</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5,313,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coins and medals</td>
<td>British Museum, Keeper of Coins and Medals</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>5,075,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawings: architectural, engineering and scientific</td>
<td>Victoria &amp; Albert Museum, Keeper of Word &amp; Image Department</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1,922,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawings, prints, watercolours</td>
<td>British Museum, Keeper of Prints and Drawings</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>187,283,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egyptian antiquities</td>
<td>British Museum, Keeper of Egyptian Antiquities</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10,647,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnography</td>
<td>British Museum, Keeper of Ethnography</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>460,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture and woodwork</td>
<td>Victoria &amp; Albert Museum, Keeper of Furniture and Textiles &amp; Fashion Department</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>18,767,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek and Roman antiquities</td>
<td>British Museum, Keeper of Greek and Roman Antiquities</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,006,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian furniture</td>
<td>Victoria &amp; Albert Museum, Senior Curator of Asian Department, South &amp; South East Asian Collection</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>844,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese antiquities</td>
<td>British Museum, Department of Asia</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,393,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuscripts, documents and archives</td>
<td>British Library, Curator, Department of Manuscripts</td>
<td>3,488</td>
<td>119,406,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maritime material, including paintings</td>
<td>National Maritime Museum, Director of Collections</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>280,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East antiquities</td>
<td>British Museum, Keeper of Middle East Antiquities</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>18,652,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical Instruments</td>
<td>Royal College of Music</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23,070,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriental antiquities (except Japanese)</td>
<td>British Museum, Department of Asia</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>20,925,989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriental furniture, porcelain and works of art</td>
<td>Victoria &amp; Albert Museum, Senior Curator of Asian Department, Chinese Collection</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>59,293,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paintings, British, modern</td>
<td>Tate Gallery</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>463,343,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paintings, foreign</td>
<td>National Gallery, Director</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>488,539,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paintings, miniature</td>
<td>Victoria &amp; Albert Museum, Senior Curator of Painting Section, Word &amp; Image Department</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,338,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Advising authority</th>
<th>No of Items</th>
<th>Total value (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paintings, portraits of British persons</td>
<td>National Portrait Gallery, Director</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>21,948,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photographs</td>
<td>National Media Museum, Head</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>12,911,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pottery</td>
<td>Victoria &amp; Albert Museum, Head of Ceramics &amp; Glass Department</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5,444,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prehistory &amp; Europe (inc. Archaeological material, Medieval and later antiquities &amp; Metal Detecting Finds)</td>
<td>British Museum, Keeper of Prehistory &amp; Europe Department of Portable Antiquities &amp; Treasure (Metal Detecting Finds)</td>
<td>28,303</td>
<td>18,251,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific and mechanical material</td>
<td>Science Museum, Head of Collections</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2,044,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific and mechanical material</td>
<td>Victoria &amp; Albert Museum, Senior Curator of Sculpture, Metalwork, Ceramic &amp; Glass Department Tate Gallery (20th century sculpture)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>48,431,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver and weapons, Scottish</td>
<td>National Museum of Scotland, Director</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver, metalwork and jewellery</td>
<td>Victoria &amp; Albert Museum, Senior Curator of Sculpture, Metalwork, Ceramic &amp; Glass Department</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>49,034,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapestries, carpets (and textiles)</td>
<td>Victoria &amp; Albert Museum, Senior Curator of Furniture, Textiles &amp; Fashion Department</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>9,775,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toys</td>
<td>Bethnal Green Museum of Childhood, Head</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>Heritage Motor Centre</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>57,942,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallpaper</td>
<td>Victoria &amp; Albert Museum, Senior Curator of Prints Section, Word &amp; Image Department</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Asiatic antiquities</td>
<td>British Museum, Keeper of Ethnography</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoology (stuffed specimens)</td>
<td>Natural History Museum, Director of Science</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>33,842</strong></td>
<td><strong>£1,665,255,992</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix G

Applications considered and deferred on the recommendation of the Reviewing Committee on the Export of Works of Art and Objects of Cultural Interest, July 2003/April 2004 to 2012/13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Waverley items granted a permanent export licence</th>
<th>Value of Waverley items granted a permanent export licence (£)</th>
<th>Number of Waverley items purchased during deferral</th>
<th>Total value of Waverley items purchased during deferral (£)</th>
<th>Number of Waverley items supported by HLF/NHMF</th>
<th>Support by HLF/NHMF (£)</th>
<th>Number of Waverley items supported by the Art Fund</th>
<th>Support by the Art Fund (£)</th>
<th>Number of Waverley items supported by V&amp;A Purchase Grant Fund</th>
<th>Support by V&amp;A Purchase Grant Fund (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 2003/April 2004</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,237,604</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>79,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30,193,090</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5,825,135</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2,577,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>975,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7,285,012</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8,278,510</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>855,200</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>308,330</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10,709,778</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7,009,075</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,944,032</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>700,275</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12,770,031</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,431,256</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>471,986</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>248,750</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14,186,010</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1,521,684</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>378,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>329,292</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>118,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60,813,750</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10,119,674</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>186,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>245,100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>65,837,016</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3,752,918</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,410,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>470,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44,830,190</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9,252,560</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6,025,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,100,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>103,543,500</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11,165,750</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,952,900</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>508,250</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2012/13 (detail) – Acquisitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Purchaser</th>
<th>Price (£)</th>
<th>Support by HLF/NHMF (£)</th>
<th>Support by The Art Fund (£)</th>
<th>Support by V&amp;A Purchase Grant Fund (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>An atlas of estate maps of Hampton Court, Herefordshire</td>
<td>Herefordshire Archive Service</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>Regency armolin-mounted Chinese porcelain casket</td>
<td>The Bowes Museum</td>
<td>193,250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>128,250</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>Painting by Pietro Lorenzetti, Christ between Saints Paul and Peter</td>
<td>The Ferens Gallery</td>
<td>5,197,500</td>
<td>758,500</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>Seven silk works</td>
<td>The Rothschild Foundation</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>A peridot and gold suite of jewellery by Rundell, Bridge and Rundell</td>
<td>The Victoria &amp; Albert Museum</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>Two paintings by George Stubbs, Kongouro, from New Holland (The Kangaroo) and Portrait of a Large Dog (The Dingo)</td>
<td>Royal Museums Greenwich, National Maritime Museum</td>
<td>5,500,000</td>
<td>3,194,400</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Includes one item where the licence was issued following receipt of satisfactory proof that it had been imported into the UK within the last 50 years
2. Includes one case where the applicant was informed that a licence could be issued but decided to continue negotiations with a UK purchaser. To date an export licence has not been issued
3. Deferral price, however, tax remission available total price £1,612,940
4. Deferral price, however, tax remission available total price £4,455,000
Appendix H

Composition of the Advisory Council on the Export of Works of Art and Objects of Cultural Interest

i) the independent members of the Reviewing Committee ex officio;

ii) the departmental assessors on the Reviewing Committee (that is representatives of the DCMS, Department for Business, Innovation and Skills, HM Treasury, Foreign and Commonwealth Office, HM Revenue and Customs, Scottish Executive Department for Culture, National Assembly for Wales Department for Culture and Northern Ireland Department for Culture;

iii) the Directors of the English and Scottish national collections, the National Museum Wales, and the Librarians of the National Libraries of Wales and Scotland;

iv) the expert advisers to the DCMS, to whom applications for export licences are referred, other than those who are members by virtue of iii) above;

v) eight representatives of non-grant-aided museums and galleries in England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, nominated by the Museums Association;

vi) representatives of: Arts Council England; Arts Council of Northern Ireland; Arts Council of Wales; Association of Independent Museums; Conference of Directors of the National Museums and Galleries; Friends of the National Libraries; Heritage Lottery Fund; The National Archives; National Archives of Scotland; The Art Fund; National Fund for Acquisitions; National Heritage Memorial Fund; National Trust; National Trust for Scotland; Pilgrim Trust; V&A Purchase Grant Fund; the PRISM Grant Fund for the Preservation of Scientific and Industrial Material;

vii) representatives of: British Academy; British Records Association; Canadian Cultural Property Export Review Board (observer status); Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals (CILIP); Council for British Archaeology; Historic Houses Association; Historical Manuscripts Commission; Royal Academy of Arts; Royal Historical Society; Royal Scottish Academy; Scottish Records Association; Society of Antiquaries of London; Society of Archivists; Society of College, National and University Libraries;

viii) representatives of the trade nominated by the: Antiquarian Booksellers’ Association (two); Antiquities Dealers’ Association (two); Association of Art and Antique Dealers (two); Bonhams; British Antique Dealers’ Association (three); British Art Market Federation; British Numismatic Trade Association (two); Christie’s; Fine Art Trade Guild; Society of London Art Dealers (two); Society of Fine Art Auctioneers; Sotheby’s.
Appendix J

Further reading
The Export of Works of Art etc. Report of a Committee appointed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer (HMSO, 1952)
Export Control Act 2002 (HMSO)
The Export of Objects of Cultural Interest (Control) Order 2003 (SI 2003 No. 2759)
Export Controls on Objects of Cultural Interest: Statutory guidance on the criteria to be taken into consideration when making a decision about whether or not to grant an export licence (DCMS, November 2005)
Response to the Quinquennial Review of the Reviewing Committee on the Export of Works of Art (DCMS, December 2004)
Dealing in Cultural Objects (Offences) Act 2003 (HMSO)
Combating Illicit Trade: Due diligence guidelines for museums, libraries and archives on collecting and borrowing cultural material (DCMS, October 2005)
Contracting Out (Functions in Relation to Cultural Objects) Order 2005 – Statutory Instrument 2005 No. 1103
Saved! 100 Years of the National Art Collections Fund (Richard Verdi, Scala Publishers Ltd, 1999)

Appendix K

Membership of the Working Party on Manuscripts, Documents and Archives during 2012/13
Dr Christopher Wright, Chairman
Peter Rowlands, Secretary Reviewing Committee, Acquisitions, Exports, Loans and Collections Unit, Arts Council England
Julia Brettell, V&A Purchase Grant Fund
Paula Brikci, PRISM Grant Fund Manager, Acquisitions, Exports, Loans and Collections Unit, Arts Council England
Norman James, The National Archives
Nick Kingsley, The National Archives
Mark Caldon, Cultural Property Unit, DCMS
Brian Lake, Antiquarian Booksellers Association
Anastasia Tennant, Policy Adviser, Acquisitions, Exports, Loans and Collections Unit, Arts Council England
John Wilson, John Wilson Manuscripts Limited
Margaret O’Sullivan, Former County Archivist, Derbyshire Record Office
Sam Johnston, County Archivist, Dorset History Centre
William Frame, British Library
Fiona Talbott, Head of Museums, Libraries and Archives, Heritage Lottery Fund
Peter Beal, Senior Research Fellow, Institute of English Studies
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