

Subject: Dead Sea Scrolls controversy at your museum -- press dossier

From: "Jonathan Seidel" <seidel.jonathan@gmail.com>

Date: Sat, 22 Nov 2008 19:45:21 -0500

To: board@rom.on.ca

BCC: bccicc@rom.on.ca, falvarez@rom.on.ca, library@rom.on.ca, marketing@rom.on.ca, nmr@rom.on.ca, media@rom.on.ca, naturalhistory@rom.on.ca, programs@rom.on.ca, publicaffairs@rom.on.ca, publications@rom.on.ca, renaissance@rom.on.ca, governors@rom.on.ca, schoolv@rom.on.ca, travellingexhibitions@rom.on.ca, info@rom.on.ca, worldcultures@rom.on.ca, conservation@rom.on.ca, dmv@rom.on.ca

Ladies and Gentlemen of the Board of Trustees,

I wish to call the following items to your attention:

<http://www.nationalpost.com/arts/story.html?id=953450> (*National Post* article on upcoming Royal Ontario Museum exhibit)

http://oi.uchicago.edu/pdf/dss_review_sandiego_catalogue_2007.pdf (University of Chicago historian Norman Golb's critique of San Diego exhibit catalogue, prepared by Risa Levitt Kohn who will also be curating the ROM exhibit)

<http://www.nationalpost.com/story.html?id=970819> (Letter to *National Post* by San Diego museum director Michael Hager, attacking Norman Golb and defending San Diego exhibit and Risa Levitt Kohn)

http://www.nationalpost.com/todays_paper/story.html?id=983256 (Letter to *National Post* by Norman Golb, responding to Mr. Hager)

https://oi.uchicago.edu/pdf/dds_new_york_exhibit_2008.pdf (Norman Golb's review of current New York Jewish Museum exhibit of scrolls)

A dossier of at least five news items and other material (*New York Times*, *Le Monde*, *Wall Street Journal*, *National Post*, *USA Today/Associated Press*, *Jewish Week*, New York Jewish Museum press release) is now also circulating, which substantially confirms that there are currently two principal theories of Dead Sea Scroll origins. In addition, the *Cambridge History of Judaism* contains precisely two essays on scroll origins, one by Norman Golb, the other by a defender of the Essene theory.

Yet, the *Los Angeles Times* reported that Risa Levitt Kohn (ROM's "guest curator"), in San Diego, intentionally stuck to a "low-key presentation" of the Essene theory, because "you don't want to confuse people with so many competing theories." The San Diego exhibit said nothing of two principal theories, but focused on the Essene theory while briefly mentioning the existence of "many competing theories."

In other words, the San Diego exhibitors set out to confuse the public, in part by belittling the views of University of Chicago professor Norman Golb, the author of a well-known 450-page book on the scrolls, who is interviewed or quoted as the main authority on the "second theory" in all the above-mentioned newspaper articles. Here are links to the articles, with details:

Wall Street Journal, September 26, 2008:

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB122238636935776931.html?mod=googlenews_wsj ("There are two competing theories about the scrolls," etc.)

Jewish Week, October 20, 2008:

http://www.thejewishweek.com/viewArticle/c347_a13745/The_Arts/Museums.html (The Jewish Museum's exhibit "highlights a roiling scholarly debate that continues to hound the scrolls," etc.)

The Jewish Museum in New York's press release of September 12, 2008:

<http://www.thejewishmuseum.org/site/pages/press.php?id=140> ("Scholars have two basic theories about who used the scrolls," etc.)

New York Times, August 15, 2006:

<http://www.nytimes.com/2006/08/15/science/15scroll.html?n=Top/Reference/Times%20Topics/People/W/Wilford,%20John%20Noble> ("Despite the rising tide of revisionist thinking, other scholars of the Dead Sea scrolls continue to defend the Essene hypothesis, though with some modifications and diminishing conviction.")

USA Today (Associated Press), January 2, 2007:

http://www.usatoday.com/tech/science/discoveries/2007-01-02-qumram-latrine_x.htm ("The nature of the settlement at Qumran is the subject of a lively academic debate. The traditional view ... is [etc.]. The second school says," etc.)

Le Monde, November 5, 2008:

<http://www.lemonde.fr/culture/article/2008/11/05/les-manuscrits-de-la-mer-morte-viennent-d-etre-traduits-> ("The ties between the Essenes and Qumran have now been reduced to nothing, just as the major American historian and paleographer Norman Golb had already written." -- cf. last sentence of article for original French.)

To which we can now add the above-linked *National Post* article of November 12, 2008:

<http://www.nationalpost.com/arts/story.html?id=953450> ("Academics are divided between two principal theories regarding the origin of the scrolls," etc.)

See, however, *Los Angeles Times*, June 26, 2007:

<http://articles.latimes.com/2007/jun/26/entertainment/et-scrolls26> ("Wall texts and the exhibition catalog by the show's curator ... Risa Levitt Kohn, acknowledge that competing *theories* [note the plural] exist but stick mainly to a low-keyed assertion of the mainstream view. "You don't want to confuse people with so many competing theories, so they walk away, saying, 'Well, nobody really knows anything!'" Kohn said, smiling.")

Given Mr. Hager's attack on Norman Golb in the pages of the *National Post*, and the above-quote statement by Risa Levitt Kohn (a statement which is shockingly obscurantist, I might add, for someone involved in creating a museum exhibit at the ROM), I believe the public has the right to know whether the ROM exhibit will indeed present the two basic theories in a scientifically neutral manner, as is being done at the Jewish Museum in New York, or if it will rather stick to a "low-keyed assertion of the mainstream view." Furthermore, the public has a right to know if University of Chicago historian Norman Golb, who is widely considered to have debunked the traditional theory of the Dead Sea Scrolls in his book, will be excluded from participating in the museum's lecture series, as is reported to have been the case in San Diego.

With best regards,

Jonathan Seidel

Subject: Le Monde article (the question that confronts the Royal Ontario Museum)

From: "Jonathan Seidel" <seidel.jonathan@gmail.com>

Date: Mon, 24 Nov 2008 18:10:21 -0500

To: board@rom.on.ca

BCC: bccicc@rom.on.ca, falvarez@rom.on.ca, library@rom.on.ca, marketing@rom.on.ca, nmr@rom.on.ca, media@rom.on.ca, naturalhistory@rom.on.ca, programs@rom.on.ca, publicaffairs@rom.on.ca, publications@rom.on.ca, renaissance@rom.on.ca, governors@rom.on.ca, schoolv@rom.on.ca, travellingexhibitions@rom.on.ca, info@rom.on.ca, worldcultures@rom.on.ca, conservation@rom.on.ca, dmv@rom.on.ca

Gentlemen,

In addition to what I have said in my previous messages (to which no one at your museum had the courtesy to respond), it has now also been brought to my attention that Mr. Beuve-Méry, the author of the *Le Monde* article that I attached, is a well-known figure in France who is the son of *Le Monde's* founder, Hubert Beuve-Méry.

In light of everything that has been said, I think it should be pointed out that Mr. Beuve-Méry and other major journalists will undoubtedly be contacted by critics of Dr. Kohn in an effort to help focus attention on the *National Post* controversy over your upcoming exhibit.

Because I have been unable to find out any information on how the Royal Ontario Museum plans to handle this matter (one would think there would be a frank and explicit statement on it by now, and not simply vague public relations junk), I must reiterate the question. It is simple. It comes in three parts:

(1) Will your museum, like the Jewish Museum in New York, highlight the debate over the "two basic theories" of scroll origins, or will it follow the path of mendacity and obfuscation ("you don't want to confuse people with all those competing theories") embarked upon by Dr. Kohn in San Diego and defended by Mr. Hager in his offensive letter?

(2) Will your museum put together a balanced lecture series, featuring Dr. Golb and other major proponents of the second basic theory alongside defenders of the Qumran-sectarian theory, or will you continue the vindictive policy of exclusion implemented by Dr. Kohn in San Diego? Has a sum of money been offered to your museum by the Dorot Foundation under the condition that you continue to implement that policy?

(3) Will your museum put together a serious, balanced exhibit based on the scientific analysis of archaeological, historical and palaeographical data, or will it dish out the same kind of misleading, religiously motivated garbage that was foisted upon the public by a team of "biblical scholars" (Mr. Hager's term) assembled by Dr. Kohn in San Diego?

See again: <http://michaelhagerspeaks.wordpress.com/>

With best wishes,

Jonathan Seidel

Subject: Dead Sea Scroll exhibits

From: "Jonathan Seidel" <seidel.jonathan@gmail.com>

Date: Mon, 24 Nov 2008 19:56:55 -0500

To: rkohn@mail.sdsu.edu

BCC: mbolthou@mail.sdsu.edu, pboni@mail.sdsu.edu, pamfox@juno.com, jlgillma@mail.sdsu.edu, whansen2@mail.sdsu.edu, lholler@mail.sdsu.edu, mkelly@mail.sdsu.edu, bkirkega@mail.sdsu.edu, scottymeltz@hotmail.com, khaleel.mohammed@sdsu.edu, remoore@mail.sdsu.edu, yshabata@mail.sdsu.edu, lstewar@mail.sdsu.edu, sswayd@mail.sdsu.edu, jthomas@mail.sdsu.edu, timalsin@mail.sdsu.edu, jtsai@mail.sdsu.edu, kvaldivi@san.rr.com, roywhitaker@post.harvard.edu, crsrvr@mail.orcasonline.com, friedma3@mail.sdsu.edu, gefter@mail.sdsu.edu, iasparks@sciences.sdsu.edu, Turn53122@aol.com, hrm1@cox.net

Dear Dr. Kohn,

I believe you may find this item of interest: <http://michaelhagerspeaks.wordpress.com/>

and, in particular, the article from *Le Monde* linked at the bottom of the page, which concludes with the sentence: "The ties between the Essenes ... and Qumran have now been reduced to nothing, just as the major American historian and paleographer Norman Golb had already written."

I would be curious to know your opinion: did the Jewish Museum in New York get it wrong about the "two basic theories"? Are all these news items about the "two principal theories" simply wrong?

I would also be interested in knowing if you are planning to answer Golb's critique of your catalogue, which I read last night. See his review of the Jewish Museum exhibit too. It's all linked there on that page. Hoping to hear from you,

With best wishes,

Jonathan Seidel

Subject: Misinformation on Dead Sea Scrolls

From: "Jonathan Seidel" <seidel.jonathan@gmail.com>

Date: Mon, 24 Nov 2008 23:05:44 -0500

To: seidel.jonathan@gmail.com

BCC: maeira@mail.biu.ac.il, manupfoh@yahoo.com, mbj11@juno.com, medve1942@yahoo.de, meso@sbcglobal.net, mfg_valerio@yahoo.com, mflane@umbc.edu, michael.brass@uclmail.net, Michelt@pacbell.net, miroslaw_olbrys@yahoo.co.uk, nbtscdp@nsu.ru, npl@teol.ku.dk, office@curtisvillechristian.org, orel@truman.edu, packedmaniac@gmail.com, palbenda@yahoo.com, paolaraffetta@gmail.com, Peter.Bienstman@ugent.be, peter.fischer@ptj.se, Peter@pjames.freemove.co.uk, philngabi@msn.com, pr_arce_pa@yahoo.com, pwesth@hum.ku.dk, r.brianroberts@yahoo.com, RFaussette@aol.com, richardhbeal@yahoo.com, romiller@msmary.edu, RSTERN@khhte.com, rtschaub74@yahoo.com, RUSSELLGMIRKIN@aol.com, rwallenfels@verizon.net, rwhiteke@calvin.edu, rwklein@wowway.com, ryanbyrne66@yahoo.com, haGalil@gmx.net, ianir@israntique.org.il, j.jonesey@yahoo.ca, j.wevers@utoronto.ca, jblakely@wisc.edu, jkilmon@historian.net, jm4906@amaonline.com, jmtebes@yahoo.com, jnardellis36@numericable.fr, joezias@yahoo.com, john_j_wall@bigfoot.com, josephlauer@hotmail.com, joshua.reznick@yahoo.com, jpw@sasktel.net, jsn_colorado@comcast.net, jspinti@eisenbrauns.com, jwest@highland.net, karinacroucher@yahoo.co.uk, kat111153@hotmail.com, kent_sparks@verizon.net, kevin@bombaxo.com, kimasita@bloomington.in.us, KL.Noll@mts.net, knashef@yahoo.com, kolinskiiniraq@yahoo.co.uk, leftcoastpress@sbcglobal.net, lehavy@yahoo.com, lehmann@uni-mainz.de, lesterne@hotmai.com, leviny1@mail.biu.ac.il, lizfried@umich.edu, DAVID.STACEY63@ntlworld.com, davidlorton@earthlink.net, despinne@gmail.com, dgrolin@yahoo.com, dhirsch@library.ucla.edu, dhyphenf@yahoo.com, dieleman@humnet.ucla.edu, diwonusoio@yahoo.co.uk, donaldrance@mac.com, dopderbeck@gmail.com, dqhall59@yahoo.com, driver40386@yahoo.ca, dwashbur@nyx.net, mail@robert-deutsch.com

Hello,

I'm wondering if perhaps you could help prepare a response to misinformation which is being spread around the internet. See <http://michaelhagerspeaks.wordpress.com/>, with the list of propoganda at the end, including this article in Le Monde,

http://www.lemonde.fr/culture/article/2008/11/05/les-manuscrits-de-la-mer-morte-viennent-d-etre-traduits-en-francais_1115194_3246.html

which outrageously states (pardon my French): "The connection between the Essenes, who were thought to have written the scrolls, and Qumran has been reduced to nothing, just as the major American historian and paleographer N. Golb had already written."

These lies about the Chicago "historian" filth must be answered as quickly as possible, so please let me know if you're willing to help out on ANE or otherwise.

Best,

Jonathan S.

Subject: Re: Misinformation on Dead Sea Scrolls
From: eliot braun <eliotbraun@yahoo.com>
Date: Tue, 25 Nov 2008 11:22:36 -0800 (PST)
To: Jonathan Seidel <seidel.jonathan@gmail.com>

Damnit no, its not filth, you are some kind of fanatic. Other people have different ideas. Your non-scholarly approach to the subject is anathema to me. Don't write to me again, please, on any subject.

Eliot Braun, Ph D
Sr. Fellow WF Albright Institute of Archaeological Research, Jerusalem
Associate Researcher Centre de Recherche Français de Jérusalem
PO Box 21, Har Adar 90836 Israel
Tel 972-2-5345687, Cell 972-50-2231096

--- On Tue, 11/25/08, Jonathan Seidel <seidel.jonathan@gmail.com> wrote:

From: Jonathan Seidel <seidel.jonathan@gmail.com>
Subject: Misinformation on Dead Sea Scrolls
To: seidel.jonathan@gmail.com
Date: Tuesday, November 25, 2008, 6:00 AM
Hello,

I'm wondering if perhaps you could help prepare a response to misinformation which is being spread around the internet. See <http://michaelhagerspeaks.wordpress.com/>, with the list of propoganda at the end, including this article in Le Monde,

http://www.lemonde.fr/culture/article/2008/11/05/les-manuscrits-de-la-mer-morte-viennent-d-etre-traduits-en-francais_1115194_3246.html

which outrageously states (pardon my French): "The connection between the Essenes, who were thought to have written the scrolls, and Qumran has been reduced to nothing, just as the major American historian and paleographer N. Golb had already written."

These lies about the Chicago filth must be answered as quickly as possible, so please let me know if you're willing to help out on ANE or otherwise.

Best,

Jonathan S.

1211

Subject: Re: Misinformation on Dead Sea Scrolls
From: David Hall <dghall59@yahoo.com>
Date: Tue, 25 Nov 2008 13:19:07 -0800 (PST)
To: Jonathan Seidel <seidel.jonathan@gmail.com>

In the scrolls found in the Qumran cave there were some references that might have been attributed to Christian or reformed influence other than devout Jewish Orthodox, thus some have speculated that the scrolls were deposited by some other group or persons and not written by the Essenes who were presumed to be more Jewish in their philosophy. Some of the statements in the sectarian scrolls did not appear to be Orthodox Jewish to those who were Orthodox Jewish is my general take on the argument after hearing someone else speak about the situation. Most people including the Israel Antiquities authority who have prepared a museum, film, and signage at Qumran accept that it was probably Essene, not that it was probably anything other than Essene. Some in ANE have vigorously opposed those who would want Qumran as recorded as not Essene nor connected with the scrolls deposited there.

David Stacey stated the site was a small industrial complex and was not associated with the scrolls. He found some difficulty accepting DeVaux's statements and has tried to take out every argument that it was Essene, including the inkwells, bench, and table found in the scriptorium. I have already offered opposing arguments when possible.

The argument has gone back and forth in ANE for years.

The Moslems have a statement in the Quran that Arabia is flat, they did not know the world was round at the time, nor did their god who they said gave the book to them via an angel have any idea that Arabia was curvilinear. Islam has no plans to revise the Koran, nor do they acknowledge the book is imperfect.

Neither can some accept that a Jewish sect wrote the scrolls at Qumran; most likely an all male celibate sect, the Essenes.

If you do an exhaustive study of the matter, you might give thanks for arguments to support the truth about Qumran.

Sincerely:

David Q. Hall

--- On Mon, 11/24/08, Jonathan Seidel <seidel.jonathan@gmail.com> wrote:

From: Jonathan Seidel <seidel.jonathan@gmail.com>
 Subject: Misinformation on Dead Sea Scrolls
 To: seidel.jonathan@gmail.com
 Date: Monday, November 24, 2008, 11:05 PM

Hello,

I'm wondering if perhaps you could help prepare a response to misinformation which is being spread around the internet. See <http://michaelhagerspeaks.wordpress.com/>, with the list of propoganda at the end, including this article in Le Monde,

http://www.lemonde.fr/culture/article/2008/11/05/les-manuscrits-de-la-mer-morte-viennent-d-etre-traduits-en-francais_1115194_3246.html

which outrageously states (pardon my French): "The connection between the Essenes, who were thought to have written the scrolls, and Qumran has been reduced to nothing, just as the major American historian and paleographer N. Golb had already written."

These lies about the Chicago "historian" filth must be answered as quickly as possible, so please let me know if you're willing to help out on ANE or otherwise.

Best,

Jonathan S.

Subject: Your Gmail account, leonard.schiffman@gmail.com, has been created
From: "Gmail Team" <mail-noreply@gmail.com>
Date: Fri, 11 Apr 2008 16:20:44 -0700
To: "Leonard Schiffman" <harold.finnis@gmail.com>

A/c 16 A

Congratulations on creating your brand new Gmail account,
leonard.schiffman@gmail.com.

Please keep this email for your records, as it contains an important verification code that you may need should you ever encounter problems or forget your password.

You can login to your account at <http://mail.google.com/>

Enjoy!

The Gmail Team

Verification code: b7995077-695a160b-93ec181c9c

If you didn't create this Gmail account and don't recognize this email, please visit: <http://mail.google.com/support/bin/answer.py?answer=62400>

Subject: Activate larryschiffman.wordpress.com
From: "WordPress.com" <donotreply@wordpress.com>
Date: Sun, 3 Aug 2008 01:13:00 +0000
To: larry.schiffman@gmail.com

10E

Howdy,

Thank you for signing up with WordPress.com. You are one step away from blogging at larryschiffman.wordpress.com. Please click this link to activate your blog:

<http://wordpress.com/activate/d64f25292c29ca98>

--The WordPress.com Team

Subject: New Wordpress.com Blog: Plagiarism and the Dead Sea Scrolls
From: "WordPress.com" <donotreply@wordpress.com>
Date: Sun, 3 Aug 2008 01:13:12 +0000
To: larry.schiffman@gmail.com

NOF

Your new Wordpress.com blog has been successfully set up.

You can log in with the following information:

Username: larryschiffman
Password: goranson33
at <http://wordpress.com>

Some useful links:

Write a new post: <http://larryschiffman.wordpress.com/wp-admin/post-new.php>
Change your blog's settings: <http://larryschiffman.wordpress.com/wp-admin/options-general.php>
Choose another theme: <http://larryschiffman.wordpress.com/wp-admin/themes.php>
See what others are writing about: <http://larryschiffman.wordpress.com/wp-admin/index.php>

If you're just getting started, there are tons of helpful resources available and easily searched for on our FAQs and forums.

<http://faq.wordpress.com/2007/08/16/im-new-to-blogging-where-do-i-start/>
<http://faq.wordpress.com/new-here/>

More Frequently Asked Questions: <http://faq.wordpress.com>

We hope you dig your new weblog. If you have any questions or comments, please let us know!

Your WordPress.com API key allows you to use services like Akismet @ <http://akismet.com/>
API Key: 22dacd8d7b01

--The WordPress.com Team
Wordpress.com

1061

Subject: plagiarism charges

From: "Larry Schiffman" <larry.schiffman@gmail.com>

Date: Mon, 4 Aug 2008 22:08:20 -0400

To: mtb281@nyu.edu, sdl237@nyu.edu, ckp212@nyu.edu, ays200@nyu.edu

Miryam, Sara, Cory, Ariel,

Apparently, someone is intent on exposing a minor failing of mine that dates back almost fifteen years ago.

You are not to mention the name of the scholar in question to any of our students, and every effort must be made to prevent this article from coming to their attention. This is my career at stake. I hope you will all understand.

<http://www.nowpublic.com/culture/plagiarism-and-dead-sea-scrolls-did-nyu-professor-snitch-chicago-historians-work>

Lawrence Schiffman

164

Subject: NYU department chairman plagiarizes and misrepresents scholar's work, goes uninvestigated for 15 years

From: Peter Kaufman <peter.kaufman2@yahoo.com>

Date: Mon, 4 Aug 2008 14:45:24 -0700 (PDT)

To: robert.roach@nyu.edu

CC: rebecca.holland@nyu.edu, diane.delaney@nyu.edu

Dear Mr. Roach,

I am writing to ask why it is that the outrageous misconduct of Dr. Lawrence Schiffman, chairman of the Skirball Department of Hebrew and Judaic Studies at NYU, has never been investigated.

This man has in large measure based his career on the plagiarism and misrepresentation of another scholar's work. For the basic facts, see:

<http://larryschiffman.wordpress.com/2008/08/03/charges-of-impropriety-surface-against-new-york-university-professor-lawrence-schiffman/>

I would appreciate it if you could write back to me with any information on steps you may or may not wish to take concerning this egregious, widely known, and discreetly ignored violation of NYU's code of academic conduct.

With best wishes,

Peter Kaufman

(I am frankly using an alias to write to you, as my own career at NYU could be ruined if it became known that I finally had the nerve to rat on Dr. Schiffman concerning facts that have been generally known to researchers for the past fifteen years, but which everyone has always calmly passed over in silence because of the man's popularity.)

Subject: Please forward to Pierre Hohenberg
From: Peter Kaufman <peter.kaufman2@yahoo.com>
Date: Tue, 5 Aug 2008 19:50:16 -0700 (PDT)
To: provost@nyu.edu

WOT

Dear Dr. Hohenberg,

In case you have already looked at the material I sent to Robert Roach (see the link below), I want you to know that I have updated it with specific information on Dr. Schiffman's misrepresentations (see the fourth section), including the exact words he used on p. 413 of his book and the obviously deliberate omission, in his list of works by Dr. Golb, of the two articles that he had plagiarized.

Peter Kaufman

--- On Tue, 8/5/08, Robert Roach <robert.roach@nyu.edu> wrote:

From: Robert Roach <robert.roach@nyu.edu>
Subject: RE: NYU department chairman plagiarizes and misrepresents scholar's work, goes uninvestigated for 15 years
To: peter.kaufman2@yahoo.com
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2008, 9:07 PM

Dear Mr. Kaufman: I have received your complaint regarding Dr. Schiffman. At NYU, we have a research misconduct policy that governs the review, investigation, and adjudication of complaints of plagiarism and other research misconduct. I have forwarded your compliance to the Senior Vice Provost for Research for resolution.

Thank you

From: Peter Kaufman [mailto:peter.kaufman2@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, August 04, 2008 5:45 PM
To: robert.roach@nyu.edu
Cc: rebecca.holland@nyu.edu; diane.delaney@nyu.edu
Subject: NYU department chairman plagiarizes and misrepresents scholar's work, goes uninvestigated for 15 years

Dear Mr. Roach,

I am writing to ask why it is that the outrageous misconduct of Dr. Lawrence Schiffman, chairman of the Skirball Department of Hebrew and Judaic Studies at NYU, has never been investigated.

This man has in large measure based his career on the plagiarism and misrepresentation of another

scholar's work. For the basic facts, see:

<http://larryschiffman.wordpress.com/2008/08/03/charges-of-impropriety-surface-against-new-york-university-professor-lawrence-schiffman/>

I would appreciate it if you could write back to me with any information on steps you may or may not wish to take concerning this egregious, widely known, and discreetly ignored violation of NYU's code of academic conduct.

With best wishes,

Peter Kaufman

(I am frankly using an alias to write to you, as my own career at NYU could be ruined if it became known that I finally had the nerve to rat on Dr. Schiffman concerning facts that have been generally known to researchers for the past fifteen years, but which everyone has always calmly passed over in silence because of the man's popularity.)

165

Subject: Charges of plagiarism raised against a lecturer at your museum: please forward to Director Bennett
From: "Albert White" <albert.white3@gmail.com>
Date: Tue, 5 Aug 2008 22:39:34 -0400
To: lori.jones@ncmail.net
BCC: yshimron@newsobserver.com, dcrabtree@wral.com

Dear Director Bennett,

As you may or may not know, allegations of plagiarism that were first raised against Dr. Lawrence Schiffman by a prominent Israeli journalist in 1993 have emerged again, this time on a variety of websites.

See, e.g., <http://www.nowpublic.com/culture/plagiarism-and-dead-sea-scrolls-did-nyu-department-chairman-pilfer-chicago-historian-s-work>.

Since Dr. Schiffman is scheduled to lecture on the Dead Sea Scrolls at your museum, I believe it is your duty to conduct an independent investigation of these allegations and to act upon your conclusions in accordance with basic scientific principles. Certainly, you cannot knowingly allow any of the content of a lecture delivered at your museum to be plagiarized.

Especially troubling is the evidence (see the fourth section of the linked article) that Dr. Schiffman repeatedly misrepresented the views of the scholar whose ideas he had appropriated, apparently so as to conceal the nature of what he had done. My understanding is that Dr. Schiffman has continued with these misrepresentations over the years (he has certainly never corrected them), and that this matter is now being looked into by the Senior Vice Provost for Research at New York University.

Wishing you the best of luck with your current exhibit,

Al White

1612

Subject: RE: NYU department chairman plagiarizes and misrepresents scholar's work, goes uninvestigated for 15 years
From: "Robert Roach" <robert.roach@nyu.edu>
Date: Tue, 5 Aug 2008 17:07:19 -0400
To: <peter.kaufman2@yahoo.com>

Dear Mr. Kaufman: I have received your complaint regarding Dr. Schiffman. At NYU, we have a research misconduct policy that governs the review, investigation, and adjudication of complaints of plagiarism and other research misconduct. I have forwarded your compliance to the Senior Vice Provost for Research for resolution.

Thank you

From: Peter Kaufman [mailto:peter.kaufman2@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, August 04, 2008 5:45 PM
To: robert.roach@nyu.edu
Cc: rebecca.holland@nyu.edu; diane.delaney@nyu.edu
Subject: NYU department chairman plagiarizes and misrepresents scholar's work, goes uninvestigated for 15 years

Dear Mr. Roach,

I am writing to ask why it is that the outrageous misconduct of Dr. Lawrence Schiffman, chairman of the Skirball Department of Hebrew and Judaic Studies at NYU, has never been investigated.

This man has in large measure based his career on the plagiarism and misrepresentation of another scholar's work. For the basic facts, see:

<http://larryschiffman.wordpress.com/2008/08/03/charges-of-impropriety-surface-against-new-york-university-professor-lawrence-schiffman/>

I would appreciate it if you could write back to me with any information on steps you may or may not wish to take concerning this egregious, widely known, and discreetly ignored violation of NYU's code of academic conduct.

With best wishes,

Peter Kaufman

(I am frankly using an alias to write to you, as my own career at NYU could be ruined if it became known that I finally had the nerve to rat on Dr. Schiffman concerning facts that have been generally known to researchers for the past fifteen years, but which everyone has always calmly passed over in silence because of the man's popularity.)

Subject: RE: NYU department chairman plagiarizes and misrepresents scholar's work, goes uninvestigated for 15 years
From: Peter Kaufman <peter.kaufman2@yahoo.com>
Date: Tue, 5 Aug 2008 18:38:54 -0700 (PDT)
To: Robert Roach <robert.roach@nyu.edu>

Thank you. I would be grateful if you could let the Senior Vice Provost know that the linked information has now been updated with further specific evidence (in the fourth section, towards the end) on the precise language that Dr. Schiffman employed to misrepresent Golb's views on p. 413 of his book, and on how he hid the traces of his plagiarism by citing, on that page, only articles by Golb that appeared in 1987, 1989, and 1990, i.e., *after* the plagiarism had been committed, when anyone in the field is fully aware of the existence of the important 1980 and 1985 articles from which Schiffman pilfered.

--- On Tue, 8/5/08, Robert Roach <robert.roach@nyu.edu> wrote:

From: Robert Roach <robert.roach@nyu.edu>
Subject: RE: NYU department chairman plagiarizes and misrepresents scholar's work, goes uninvestigated for 15 years
To: peter.kaufman2@yahoo.com
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2008, 9:07 PM

Dear Mr. Kaufman: I have received your complaint regarding Dr. Schiffman. At NYU, we have a research misconduct policy that governs the review, investigation, and adjudication of complaints of plagiarism and other research misconduct. I have forwarded your compliance to the Senior Vice Provost for Research for resolution.

Thank you

From: Peter Kaufman [mailto:peter.kaufman2@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, August 04, 2008 5:45 PM
To: robert.roach@nyu.edu
Cc: rebecca.holland@nyu.edu; diane.delaney@nyu.edu
Subject: NYU department chairman plagiarizes and misrepresents scholar's work, goes uninvestigated for 15 years

Dear Mr. Roach,

I am writing to ask why it is that the outrageous misconduct of Dr. Lawrence Schiffman, chairman of the Skirball Department of Hebrew and Judaic Studies at NYU, has never been investigated.

This man has in large measure based his career on the plagiarism and misrepresentation of another scholar's work. For the basic facts, see:

<http://larryschiffman.wordpress.com/2008/08/03/charges-of-impropriety-surface-against-new-york-university-professor-lawrence-schiffman/>

I would appreciate it if you could write back to me with any information on steps you may or may not wish to take concerning this egregious, widely known, and discreetly ignored violation of NYU's code of academic conduct.

With best wishes,

Peter Kaufman

(I am frankly using an alias to write to you, as my own career at NYU could be ruined if it became known that I finally had the nerve to rat on Dr. Schiffman concerning facts that have been generally known to researchers for the past fifteen years, but which everyone has always calmly passed over in silence because of the man's popularity.)

16N

Subject: Please forward to Pierre Hohenberg
From: Peter Kaufman <peter.kaufman2@yahoo.com>
Date: Tue, 5 Aug 2008 19:50:16 -0700 (PDT)
To: provost@nyu.edu

Dear Dr. Hohenberg,

In case you have already looked at the material I sent to Robert Roach (see the link below), I want you to know that I have updated it with specific information on Dr. Schiffman's misrepresentations (see the fourth section), including the exact words he used on p. 413 of his book and the obviously deliberate omission, in his list of works by Dr. Golb, of the two articles that he had plagiarized.

Peter Kaufman

--- On Tue, 8/5/08, Robert Roach <robert.roach@nyu.edu> wrote:

From: Robert Roach <robert.roach@nyu.edu>
Subject: RE: NYU department chairman plagiarizes and misrepresents scholar's work, goes uninvestigated for 15 years
To: peter.kaufman2@yahoo.com
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2008, 9:07 PM

Dear Mr. Kaufman: I have received your complaint regarding Dr. Schiffman. At NYU, we have a research misconduct policy that governs the review, investigation, and adjudication of complaints of plagiarism and other research misconduct. I have forwarded your compliance to the Senior Vice Provost for Research for resolution.

Thank you

From: Peter Kaufman [mailto:peter.kaufman2@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, August 04, 2008 5:45 PM
To: robert.roach@nyu.edu
Cc: rebecca.holland@nyu.edu; diahe.delaney@nyu.edu
Subject: NYU department chairman plagiarizes and misrepresents scholar's work, goes uninvestigated for 15 years

Dear Mr. Roach,

I am writing to ask why it is that the outrageous misconduct of Dr. Lawrence Schiffman, chairman of the Skirball Department of Hebrew and Judaic Studies at NYU, has never been investigated.

This man has in large measure based his career on the plagiarism and misrepresentation of another

scholar's work. For the basic facts, see:

<http://larryschiffman.wordpress.com/2008/08/03/charges-of-impropriety-surface-against-new-york-university-professor-lawrence-schiffman/>

I would appreciate it if you could write back to me with any information on steps you may or may not wish to take concerning this egregious, widely known, and discreetly ignored violation of NYU's code of academic conduct.

With best wishes,

Peter Kaufman

(I am frankly using an alias to write to you, as my own career at NYU could be ruined if it became known that I finally had the nerve to rat on Dr. Schiffman concerning facts that have been generally known to researchers for the past fifteen years, but which everyone has always calmly passed over in silence because of the man's popularity.)

Subject: Re: Plagiarism charges

From: "Larry Schiffman" <larry.schiffman@gmail.com>

Date: Tue, 5 Aug 2008 18:24:33 -0400

To: editor@nyunews.com, university@nyunews.com, managing@nyunews.com, campus@nyunews.com, editorial@nyunews.com

The following is self-explanatory. I must ask you not to publish a word about this in the Washington Square News, should it be brought to your attention. -- Lawrence Schiffman

Dear Dean Stimpson,

I would like to know what action I can take to counter charges of plagiarism that have been raised against me.

Apparently, someone is intent on exposing conduct of mine that dates back almost fifteen years ago. It is true that I should have cited Dr. Golb's articles when using his arguments, and it is true that I misrepresented his ideas. But this is simply the politics of Dead Sea Scrolls studies. If I had given credit to this man I would have been banned from conferences around the world.

I am especially concerned that this affair may come to students' attention. My career is at stake. I hope you will understand.

<http://www.nowpublic.com/culture/plagiarism-and-dead-sea-scrolls-did-nyu-department-chairman-pilfer-chicago-historian-s-work>

Lawrence Schiffman, professor

16P

Subject: Plagiarism charges
From: "larry schiffman" <larry.schiffman@gmail.com>
Date: Tue, 5 Aug 2008 18:15:29 -0400
To: catharine.stimpson@nyu.edu

Dear Dean Stimpson,

I would like to know what action I can take to counter charges of plagiarism that have been raised against me.

Apparently, someone is intent on exposing a failing of mine that dates back almost fifteen years ago. It is true that I should have cited Dr. Golb's articles when using his arguments, and it is true that I misrepresented his ideas. But this is simply the politics of Dead Sea Scrolls studies. If I had given credit to this man I would have been banned from conferences around the world.

I am especially concerned that this affair may come to students' attention. My career is at stake. I hope you will understand.

<http://www.nowpublic.com/culture/plagiarism-and-dead-sea-scrolls-did-nyu-department-chairman-pilfer-chicago-historian-s-work>

Lawrence Schiffman, professor

166

Subject: Re: Plagiarism charges
From: "larry schiffman" <larry.schiffman@gmail.com>
Date: Tue, 5 Aug 2008 18:11:28 -0400
To: provost@nyu.edu

Dear Provost McLaughlin,

I would like to know what action I can take to counter charges of plagiarism that have been raised against me.

Apparently, someone is intent on exposing a failing of mine that dates back almost fifteen years ago. It is true that I should have cited Dr. Golb's articles, and it is true that I misrepresented his ideas. But this is simply the politics of Dead Sea Scrolls studies. If I had given credit to this man I would have been banned from conferences around the world.

I am especially concerned that this affair may come to students' attention. My career is at stake. I hope you will understand.

<http://www.nowpublic.com/culture/plagiarism-and-dead-sea-scrolls-did-nyu-department-chairman-pilfer-chicago-historian-s-work>

Lawrence Schiffman, professor

Subject: Plagiarism charges

From: "larry schiffman" <larry.schiffman@gmail.com>

Date: Tue, 5 Aug 2008 17:59:54 -0400

To: rc2@nyu.edu, hrd1@nyu.edu, de2@nyu.edu, ge293@nyu.edu, yf1@nyu.edu, df2@nyu.edu, michah.gottlieb@nyu.edu, rk4@nyu.edu, marionkaplan@yahoo.com, bkg@nyu.edu, am96@nyu.edu, evan.rapport@nyu.edu, jr6@nyu.edu, mssl1@nyu.edu, erwl@nyu.edu, rz17@nyu.edu, rz11@nyu.edu

10R

Dear colleagues,

Apparently, someone is intent on exposing a minor failing of mine that dates back almost fifteen years ago.

Every effort must be made to prevent this article from coming to students' attention. This is my career at stake. I hope you will all understand.

<http://www.nowpublic.com/culture/plagiarism-and-dead-sea-scrolls-did-nyu-department-chairman-pilfer-chicago-historian-s-work>

Lawrence Schiffman

Subject: Re: plagiarism charges
From: "Larry Schiffman" <larry.schiffman@gmail.com>
Date: Wed, 6 Aug 2008 00:01:42 -0400
To: "Cory Peacock" <ckp212@nyu.edu>

P.s. He has now attacked me in a truly outrageous way, in the fourth section of his damn article.

Lawrence Schiffman

On Tue, Aug 5, 2008 at 2:54 PM, Larry Schiffman <larry.schiffman@gmail.com> wrote:
Cory, thanks for your kind words.

This is definitely ruining my week. I don't know if you can understand how I feel, but it is as if someone had set fire to my beard. The last thing I need now is to be investigated by the dean.

Best,

Lawrence Schiffman

On 8/4/08, Cory Peacock <ckp212@nyu.edu> wrote:
Dear Professor, Miryam, Sara, Ariel,

Wow. That's a character assassination piece if I ever read one. No mistake justifies this young man's piece here - it seems personal. He was clearly in the class this spring. Did he receive a poor grade? The author is clearly very skilled at stacking the deck prior to any evidence even being considered. I foresee a future in politics for him. Professor, I am sorry that this has happened.

Two thoughts: 1) he posted the syllabus online which contains the contact information of the professor and all four preceptors without our permission. While he is linking to a url on NYU's website, there is a difference between an obscure url for student usage and a public forum where the preceptors are indirectly linked to this hatchet job. I take offense to him putting our contact information out there without our permission. This is a minor point, but this could be one point of order regarding flagging (perhaps notifying the site's owners/editors) the article due to inappropriate content. 2) More importantly, is there / will there be a response? I don't know that we should, but I don't like seeing this go unanswered. I know we could tear that piece apart, but it would seem tendentious to do so.

Lastly: Miryam, Sara, Ariel - I'm including the full text of the article in this email so that you don't have to take the link. On sites like these, lots of hits raise the "importance" of the article which in turn generates more traffic. So, let's not give him what he wants. Here's the article.

Cory

///

Plagiarism and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Did NYU professor snitch Chicago historian's work?

by Peter Kaufman | August 4, 2008 at 06:35 pm | 58 views | add comment

"Plagiarism ... whether intended or not, is academic fraud... You plagiarize when, without proper attribution, you ... paraphrase or restate someone else's facts, analysis and/or conclusions." — Statement on Academic Integrity, New York University (Steinhardt

"Every member of the University ... is expected to conform to the highest standards of honesty and integrity. Activities such as *plagiarism* [and] *misrepresentation*... are expressly prohibited.... Plagiarism [is] the appropriation of another's ideas, processes, results, or words without giving appropriate credit." — New York University Faculty Handbook

A little-known case of apparent academic quackery has recently surfaced again, which deserves, perhaps, renewed attention in light of the media's ongoing celebration of Dead Sea Scrolls "scholarship" and the dogged exposure of corruption in this field by Charles Gadda, an author writing on this site.

Many scrolls fans, especially in the New York area, will be familiar with the name and appearance of Lawrence Schiffman, Chairman of the Skirball Department of Hebrew and Judaic Studies at New York University. It would, in fact, be difficult to mistake Dr. Schiffman for anyone else: the big beard, the booming voice that soars out over lecture halls and into living rooms during televised documentaries — there is, in a word, an unmistakable charisma associated with this man, who seems to know exactly how things stand with the scrolls and is not afraid to say it.

To be sure, among scholars Dr. Schiffman is also known for his perplexing attempts to demonstrate that the Dead Sea Scrolls belonged to and, in part, were written by a Sadducee sect living at Khirbet Qumran, even though, by his own admission, they contain the writings of many different Jewish groups of the period.

And, among his students, he is known for the stern severity with which he opposes any inappropriate conduct, such as plagiarizing papers: see the syllabus for one of his courses, where he warns that "**papers must be fully footnoted... Students must learn the difference between the documented use of the work of others, and copying or plagiarism. Plagiarism will not be tolerated under any circumstances.**"

But behind his complicated arguments, academic severity and booming veneer, is Schiffman himself actually a *plagiarist*? Here are the facts, well known among academics since they were exposed by an Israeli journalist in 1993 (see below), but always discreetly ignored in the United States:

1. "Fine words! I wonder where you stole 'em." — Jonathan Swift

In an article entitled "The Problem of Origin and Identification of the Dead Sea Scrolls," published in *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 124 (1980) [available on JSTOR], University of Chicago scrolls scholar Norman Golb wrote as follows:

"In the ruins of [Masada] were discovered fragments of fourteen ... scrolls, including ... remarkably, a portion of the so-called "**Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice**" — a duplicate of a text found in Qumran Cave IV... The cogent inference to be drawn from the presence of Hebrew manuscripts at Masada is that Jewish *sicarii* inhabiting the site possessed scrolls which they had brought there after taking the fortress in A.D. 66, while other Jews, of Jerusalem, took scrolls with them in addition to basic possessions needed for survival, in withdrawing to that site."

Golb wrote that the Qumran and Masada manuscripts were writings of Palestinian Jews and were remnants of a literature showing a "wide variety of practices, beliefs and opinions."

The scrolls, Golb suggested, were best to be interpreted "not by pressing them into the single sectarian bed of Essenism, but by separating them out from one another, through internal analysis, into **various spiritual currents** which appear to have characterized Palestinian Judaism of the intertestamental period."

In the same article, Golb also wrote that the apocalyptic texts found among the Dead Sea Scrolls showed that the mentality of various Palestinian Jewish groups prior to 70 A.D. were "factors which may ... help to explain **the zeal which led to the Jewish War.**"

Then, in 1985, Golb published another article (in *Biblical Archaeologist* 48, also available on JSTOR), in which he said (pp. 81-82) that the content of the scrolls was "more than sufficient to show the mentality and religious outlook of **various groups within Palestinian Judaism**" before 70 A.D., and that they "cast **important new light** on aspects of that period's history, particularly on the question of the influence of the beliefs and practices then current in Palestine on **both the nascent rabbinic Judaism and the earliest forms of Palestinian Christianity.**"

So much for Golb's 1980 and 1985 articles which, of course, on account of their detailed and fundamentally novel analysis of the evidence — emphasizing the wide variety of ideas in the scrolls where others had attempted to fit them into a single "sectarian" current — were rightly seen as posing a severe threat to the traditional Qumran-Essene theory.

2. "Those literary cooks Who skim the cream of others' books..." — Hannah More

Enter Lawrence Schiffman who, in 1990, published an article entitled "The Significance of the Scrolls." The article, similar to other writings that also came out under his name, appeared in a journal entitled *Bible Review*, and was later (in 1992) reprinted in Hershel Shanks,

ed., *Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Schiffman argued (using a rationale which British scrolls scholar Philip Davies has described as "not merely difficult to accept, but difficult to understand") that the scrolls belonged to a Sadducee sect living at Qumran.

Here, however, are some of the other things he said in the article:

"Very recently several fragmentary texts were published from Masada . . . , occupied by rebels during the . . . Revolt against Rome. In addition, a manuscript of the **Sabbath Songs** (angelic liturgy), **known in several manuscripts from Qumran**, was found at Masada. Thus, Jewish defenders of Masada possessed books of the same kind as those in the Qumran collection; but that were not directly associated with the sect itself. In other words, many of the works found at Qumran were the **common heritage of Second Temple Judaism** and did not originate in, and were not confined to, Qumran sectarian circles."

Schiffman did not mention or cite Golb's practically identical argument made ten years previously. On the next page, Schiffman wrote:

"It is now becoming increasingly clear that the Scrolls are the primary source for the study of **Judaism in all its varieties** in the last centuries before the Common Era. In short, this corpus does not simply give us an entry into the sect that inhabited the nearby settlement, but also has an enormous amount to tell us about the **widely varying Judaisms** of the Hasmonaean and Herodian periods . . . these documents are providing a critical background for the study of the **later emergence both of rabbinic Judaism and of the early Christian Church.**"

Compare Golb's earlier statements about the "religious outlook of **various groups within Palestinian Judaism**" which "cast important new light . . . on both the **nascent rabbinic Judaism and the earliest forms of Palestinian Christianity.**"

Schiffman, however, again did not mention or cite Golb's articles.

Instead, on the next page of his article, he went on to state that the influence of the apocalyptic Dead Sea Scrolls could be seen "in the messianic pressures for Jewish resistance against Roman rule that were **factors in fueling the two Jewish revolts**, the First Revolt of 66-70 C.E., and the Second Revolt, the so-called Bar Kokhba revolt, of 132-135 C.E., both of which had messianic overtones." Compare Golb's earlier statement about the "factors which may . . . help to explain the zeal which led to the Jewish War."

Schiffman did not mention or cite this statement of Golb's either.

Note how Schiffman changed the wording a bit but kept the basic ideas (including some of the vocabulary, such as "factors"): "various groups within Palestinian Judaism" becomes "widely varying Judaisms"; "cast important new light" becomes "has an enormous amount to tell us"; "the question of the influence . . . on both the nascent rabbinic Judaism and the earliest forms of Palestinian Christianity" becomes the "background for the study of . . . the emergence both of rabbinic Judaism and of the early Christian Church"; etc.

Schiffman, of course, like anyone else, had every right in the world to argue the case for variety in the scrolls; but it was his duty to say where he got his arguments from. According to New York University's statement on academic integrity (linked at the top of this page), if a student paraphrases without proper attribution, he stands a good chance of getting called before a committee on charges of plagiarism and even of getting expelled.

Schiffman, however, is not a college student, and so he apparently thought he could straddle both sides of the Dead Sea Scrolls debate and get away with stealing Golb's credit for emphasizing the diversity of ideas found among the scrolls (including ones related with rabbinic Judaism), the Masada connection, and the influence of the apocalyptic ideas of some of the scrolls on the Jewish revolt.

3. "Their writings are thoughts stolen from us by anticipation." — Alexis Piron

Well, Israeli journalist Avi Katzman had a different point of view and so, in an interview published in *Haaretz* (Jan. 29, 1993), he asked Schiffman why "in different articles you have published, you have not hesitated to take over portions of Golb's theory without acknowledging as much, and without giving him appropriate credit?"

Interesting question! Given the circumstances, one might have expected Schiffman to give some kind of explanation. He could have said, for example, that the failure to credit Golb was unintended and that he planned to correct it in his next book. Instead, this is what he said:

"This isn't the issue. *There's no innovation in Golb's theory.* He can say what he wants. The idea that we're not dealing with a sect is self-evident. Does he think that he wrote the Bible?"

Well, let's take a closer look at this, folks: "There's no innovation in Golb's theory."

As is well known, Golb, starting in 1980, published a series of articles arguing that the Dead Sea Scrolls were the remains of libraries from the Jerusalem area, containing the writings of multiple Jewish groups. At the very end of his 1980 article (see footnote 80 on p. 24), he carefully distinguished his theory from the "overly specific" view of Karl Rengstorff, who in the early 1960's had argued that the scrolls were the library of

the Jerusalem Temple. Golb wrote:

"While it is true that a number of the scrolls give prominence to the sons of Zadok and the priestly order, most of them do not, so that [Rengstorff's] assignment of all of the scrolls to the single library of the Temple becomes a matter of arbitrary choice ... narrowing down the conception of intellectual and spiritual life prevailing within Jerusalem before the war." Golb's own, broader conclusion was that the scrolls were "remnants of a literature showing a wide variety of practices, beliefs and opinions which was removed from Jerusalem before and during the siege...."

Then, in 1985 (*Biblical Archaeologist*, p. 80), Golb wrote of "collections of literary scrolls – that is, libraries – removed far from their original home," and concluded that the scrolls stemmed "not merely from sectarians but from first-century Palestinian Jews in general," and that they were "removed from Jerusalem by inhabitants of the city before and during the siege on the city."

Let's look at that statement of Schiffman's again: "*There's no innovation in Golb's theory.*" The statement is obviously untrue, because no one, until Golb came along, had argued that the scrolls were the remnants of Jerusalem-area literary collections. Was Schiffman incapable of comprehending the articles which he himself had apparently chosen to make use of without crediting their author? Or was he attempting to confuse the issue? I mean, what better response to someone who suggests that you have committed plagiarism, than to assert that the plagiarized ideas are themselves not original? After all, they're self-evident. They could have occurred to anyone, so why include a reference to the person who actually came up with them?

4. "That's not a lie, it's a terminological inexactitude." — Alexander Haig

Whatever the answer to this question may be, Schiffman, not content with using Golb's ideas, also began publishing misinformation about Golb's theory. According to Schiffman's above-cited Bible Review article, Golb had argued that the scrolls were the "library of the Jerusalem Temple." Schiffman then repeated this false assertion in his 1995 book *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls*.

As I recall this episode in light of the recent allegations about continuing misconduct in this field of studies, I'm obliged to ask which is worse, the act of plagiarism itself or the decision to misrepresent the theory of the scholar whose ideas one has decided to filch. Apparently, it has become normal procedure in academic circles to play vicious games with one's scholarly adversaries, disseminating falsehoods about their views and stealing from them at the same time without proper attribution. Those who base their careers on such conduct cleverly illustrate Hugh Kingsmill's words, "A charlatan makes obscure what is clear; a thinker makes clear what is obscure."

And who, in the end, elevates such individuals to the status of popular authorities? To some of us the answer is quite clear: it's a sick system that glorifies an academic thief.

////

On Mon, Aug 4, 2008 at 9:08 PM, larry schiffman <larry.schiffman@gmail.com> wrote:

Miryam, Sara, Cory, Ariel,

Apparently, someone is intent on exposing a minor failing of mine that dates back almost fifteen years ago.

You are not to mention the name of the scholar in question to any of our students, and every effort must be made to prevent this article from coming to their attention. This is my career at stake. I hope you will all understand.

<http://www.nowpublic.com/culture/plagiarism-and-dead-sea-scrolls-did-nyu-professor-snitch-chicago-historians-work>

Lawrence Schiffman

Subject: Nowpublic allegations concerning your work
From: "Steven Fishbane" <steven.fishbane@gmail.com>
Date: Wed, 6 Aug 2008 17:15:27 -0400
To: lawrence.schiffman@nyu.edu

1601

Dear Dr. Schiffman,

I have read the "plagiarism and misrepresentation" allegations concerning you on the Nowpublic site, at <http://www.nowpublic.com/culture/plagiarism-and-dead-sea-scrolls-did-nyu-department-chairman-pilfer-chicago-historian-s-work>.

If, as I suspect, the author of this outrageous piece is Jeffrey Gibson of Chicago, then you are dealing with an *agent provocateur* driven by his own academic failure, whose basic motivation is hatred of Golb, and whose aim is simply to stir further resentment among scholars.

As someone who has had a certain amount of experience with such matters in the past, may I offer a word of advice? You may wish to register with the Nowpublic site (it's free, takes just a few minutes and you can use any alias you like) and contact the author by private email, proposing to issue a statement of some sort if he is willing to take down the article and discontinue his efforts.

This type of suggestion often does the trick, because those who produce such pieces are usually frustrated individuals looking for some type of personal recognition.

You may wish to propose saying, for example, that these are times of great developments in scrolls research; that the time has come for scholars to put their quarrels behind them; that you yourself, in the heat of great polemics, said certain things that you regret; that we must recognize the contribution of all scholars, etc.

I know this may be an unpalatable suggestion, but I recommend it nonetheless because I have seen these things start with a few hundred readers and boomerang all over the internet until they are picked up by mainstream news sources. If you are indeed dealing with Gibson, this is even more likely, given the man's skill at using aliases, the contacts he seems to have around the country, and his in-depth knowledge of the internet.

With best wishes,

Steven Fishbane

Subject: Fwd: [Fwd: FW: Plagiarism charges]
From: "Larry Schiffman" <larry.schiffman@gmail.com>
Date: Wed, 6 Aug 2008 17:20:45 -0400
To: editor@nyunews.com, university@nyunews.com, managing@nyunews.com, campus@nyunews.com, editorial@nyunews.com

16V

As I said, you are not to mention this matter. My career is at stake.

Lawrence Schiffman

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Pierre Hohenberg <pierre.hohenberg@nyu.edu>
Date: Aug 6, 2008 5:09 PM
Subject: [Fwd: FW: Plagiarism charges]
To: larry schiffman <larry.schiffman@gmail.com>
Cc: Richard Foley <dick.foley@nyu.edu>

Dear Professor Schiffman,

The allegation against you has been referred to me in my capacity as Senior Vice Provost for Research. According to NYU's policy on research misconduct, (<http://www.nyu.edu/oaa/policies.html#misconduct>) I have in turn referred the matter to Dean Richard Foley for further disposition. You should hear from the dean or his staff in due time.

Pierre Hohenberg

----- Original Message -----

Subject: FW: Plagiarism charges
Date: Wed, 06 Aug 2008 10:20:49 -0400
From: Amanda Neczypor <amanda.neczypor@nyu.edu>
To: David McLaughlin <david.mclaughlin@nyu.edu>
CC: Pierre Hohenberg <pierre.hohenberg@nyu.edu>

Hi Dave,

This came to the provost alias last night.

-Amanda

----- Forwarded Message

From: larry schiffman <larry.schiffman@gmail.com>
Date: Tue, 05 Aug 2008 18:11:28 -0400
To: <provost@nyu.edu>
Subject: Re: Plagiarism charges

Dear Provost McLaughlin,

I would like to know what action I can take to counter charges of plagiarism that have been raised against me.

Apparently, someone is intent on exposing a failing of mine that dates back almost fifteen years ago. It is true that I should have cited Dr. Golb's articles, and it is true that I misrepresented his ideas. But this is simply the politics of Dead Sea Scrolls studies. If I had given credit to this man I would have been banned from conferences around the

world.

I am especially concerned that this affair may come to students' attention. My career is at stake. I hope you will understand.

<http://www.nowpublic.com/culture/plagiarism-and-dead-sea-scrolls-did-nyu-department-chairman-pilfer-chicago-historian-s-work>

Lawrence Schiffman, professor

----- End of Forwarded Message

Subject: Re: [Fwd: FW: Plagiarism charges]
From: "Larry Schiffman" <larry.schiffman@gmail.com>
Date: Wed, 6 Aug 2008 17:34:48 -0400
To: angela.baker-james@ncmail.net

16W

I must beg you not to mention this matter if it should be brought to your attention. My career is at stake.

Lawrence Schiffman

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Pierre Hohenberg <pierre.hohenberg@nyu.edu>
Date: Aug 6, 2008 5:09 PM
Subject: [Fwd: FW: Plagiarism charges]
To: larry schiffman <larry.schiffman@gmail.com>
Cc: Richard Foley <dick.foley@nyu.edu>

Dear Professor Schiffman,

The allegation against you has been referred to me in my capacity as Senior Vice Provost for Research. According to NYU's policy on research misconduct, (<http://www.nyu.edu/oa/policies.html#misconduct>) I have in turn referred the matter to Dean Richard Foley for further disposition. You should hear from the dean or his staff in due time.

Pierre Hohenberg

----- Original Message -----

Subject: FW: Plagiarism charges
Date: Wed, 06 Aug 2008 10:20:49 -0400
From: Amanda Neczypor <amanda.neczypor@nyu.edu>
To: David McLaughlin <david.mclaughlin@nyu.edu>
CC: Pierre Hohenberg <pierre.hohenberg@nyu.edu>

Hi Dave,

This came to the provost last night.

-Amanda

----- Forwarded Message

From: Lawrence Schiffman <larry.schiffman@gmail.com>
Date: Tue, 05 Aug 2008 18:11:28 -0400
To: <provost@nyu.edu>
Subject: Re: Plagiarism charges

Dear Provost McLaughlin,

I would like to know what action I can take to counter charges of plagiarism that have been raised against me.

Apparently, someone is intent on exposing a failing of mine that dates back almost fifteen years ago. It is true that I should have cited Dr. Golb's articles, and it is true that I misrepresented his ideas. But this is simply the politics of Dead Sea Scrolls studies. If I had given credit to this man I would have been banned from conferences around the world.

I am especially concerned that this affair may come to students' attention. My career is at stake. I hope you will understand.

<http://www.nowpublic.com/culture/plagiarism-and-dead-sea-scrolls-did-nyu-department-chairman-pilfer-chicago-historian-s-work>

Lawrence Schiffman, professor

----- End of Forwarded Message

Subject: Lawrence Schiffman; plagiarism
From: Peter Kaufman <peter.kaufman2@yahoo.com>
Date: Wed, 6 Aug 2008 19:38:35 -0700 (PDT)
To: dick.foley@nyu.edu

10X

Dear Dean Foley,

As the allegations I have raised against Dr. Schiffman have undoubtedly been referred to you by now, I am writing to succinctly summarize the facts. They are as follows:

(1) Schiffman appropriated Golb's highly original 1980 and 1985 arguments concerning Masada, the variegated nature of the Dead Sea Scrolls and their (previously neglected) relationship with rabbinical Judaism and the Jewish revolt, all of this on three consecutive pages of his own article and without crediting Golb;

(2) When questioned about his plagiarism by a prominent Israeli journalist in 1993, Schiffman responded: "There's no innovation in Golb's theory."

(3) Schiffman, in his article, falsely stated that Golb had argued that the scrolls were the "library of the Jerusalem Temple," a view defended by a German scholar (K. Rengstorf) in the early 60's and explicitly rejected by Golb on numerous occasions;

(4) In his 1994 book, Schiffman repeated the same misrepresentation, citing three articles by Golb (from 1987, 1989 and 1990) each of which shows instead that Golb never argued the scrolls were the Temple library.

(5) In his book, Schiffman carefully omitted any mention of Golb's 1980 and 1985 articles, thereby covering his tracks and making it seem that he and Golb came up with the multiple-Jewish-groups view around the same time. By falsely attributing Rengstorf's theory to Golb, Schiffman again implied that there was no "innovation" in Golb's theory.

The facts set forth in the first three paragraphs above are all examined by Golb himself in his 1995 book *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls?* (see pp. 213-215). The last two paragraphs contain information that was presumably not available to Golb when his book went to press, since Schiffman's book appeared shortly before.

We are, in sum, dealing with a classic case of combined plagiarism and misrepresentation, which would have been immediately denounced in virtually any other field of studies. I decided to bring this to your attention because I am sick and tired of seeing a different, and utterly unethical, standard applied to Dead Sea Scrolls scholarship, both here at NYU and elsewhere.

In this field, anyone who, like Golb, does not belong to the inner sanctum of Qumran-sectarian theorists may apparently expect to be smeared, misrepresented, and plagiarized by one or another member of the Qumran clique, without any accountability whatsoever vis-a-vis the larger academic community. That the facts set forth in Golb's widely read book were not previously brought to your attention is itself indicative of the general lack of concern for ethical standards in this field.

I have set forth the facts summarized above in a detailed manner at <http://www.nowpublic.com/culture/plagiarism-and-dead-sea-scrolls-did-nyu-department-chairman-pilfer-chicago-historian-s-work>. Golb's 1980 and 1985 articles are both linked there, as is his 1990 article where again he states that the scrolls are the remains of various libraries (and not: the Temple library) from the Jerusalem area. As soon as I can get my

hands on the 1987 and 1989 articles, I will update you with the precise quotations from those articles as well, so as to leave no doubt whatsoever as to the extent of Schiffman's misrepresentation.

P.s. angry emails about Golb are now being sent around the department. I wish to make it clear to you that I have nothing to do with Golb -- nor would it matter if I did. I knew this would happen, and this is why I prefer to remain anonymous.

Yours sincerely,

Peter Kaufman

16y

Subject: Plagiarism allegations raised against NYU department chair specialized in Dead Sea Scrolls research
From: "Sammy Edelstein" <sam.edelstein2@gmail.com>
Date: Thu, 7 Aug 2008 17:22:24 -0400
To: murray.weiss@nypost.com, yoav.gonen@nypost.com

Dear esteemed journalists,

Having reported on the Madonna Constantine plagiarism case, you may be interested in these articles:

<http://plagiarist-schiffman.blogspot.com/>

<http://www.nowpublic.com/culture/plagiarism-and-dead-sea-scrolls-did-nyu-department-chairman-pilfer-chicago-historian-s-work>

I know from internal sources that a formal investigation of this matter has been opened by the dean at NYU.

See also <http://chronicle.com/free/v51/i17/17a00802.htm>.

With best wishes,

Sam Edelstein (frankly, this is an alias, as my own career at NYU would be jeopardized if anyone found out that I had the nerve to bring this to your attention).

Subject: Allegations of plagiarism resurface against NYU professor

From: "Sammy Edelstein" <sam.edelstein2@gmail.com>

Date: Thu, 7 Aug 2008 22:37:49 -0400

To: wagner.alumni@nyu.edu, wagner.officeofthedeans@nyu.edu, robert.polner@nyu.edu, dalton.conley@nyu.edu

16Z

Dear Colleagues,

The NYU-Wagner academic code has an excellent description of plagiarism.

Nonetheless, there's a bit of hypocrisy in this, isn't there, given that an NYU department chair has himself been a known plagiarist for the past fifteen years? Or does the Wagner school hold its faculty to a higher standard than the rest of the university?

See:

<http://www.nowpublic.com/culture/plagiarism-and-dead-sea-scrolls-did-nyu-department-chairman-pilfer-chicago-historian-s-work>

With best wishes to all of you,

Sam Edelstein

Subject: NowPublic News Story - Plagiarism and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Did NYU department chairman pilfer from Chicago historian's work?
From: NowPublic <noreply@NowPublic.com>
Date: Fri, 8 Aug 2008 16:55:46 -0500
To: sam.edelstein2@gmail.com

The News is NowPublic.com

Sam Edelstein (sam.edelstein2@gmail.com) has sent you a news story from NowPublic.com. (E-mail address has not been verified.)

Message from Sender:

Some of you may be interested in this: it turns out that Dr. Lawrence Schiffman, the next scheduled lecturer at the Dead Sea Scrolls exhibit in Raleigh, is a plagiarist. A formal investigation of the allegations, which had always been "discreetly ignored," has now been opened at New York University. Isn't the Natural Sciences museum obliged to open its own independent inquiry? Will members of the public attending the lecture be informed of the allegations? Can the museum knowingly allow a lecture to be given which is possibly plagiarized, in whole or in part?

Plagiarism and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Did NYU department chairman pilfer from Chicago historian's work?

by Peter Kaufman

A little-known case of apparent academic quackery has recently surfaced again, which deserves, perhaps, renewed attention in light of the media's ongoing celebration of Dead Sea Scrolls "schola

[Click here to read more on our site](#)

1030

Subject: NowPublic News Story - Plagiarism and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Did NYU department chairman pilfer from Chicago historian's work?

From: NowPublic <noreply@NowPublic.com>

Date: Fri, 8 Aug 2008 17:15:53 -0500

To: sam.edelstein2@gmail.com

The News is NowPublic.com

Sam Edelstein (sam.edelstein2@gmail.com) has sent you a news story from NowPublic.com. (E-mail address has not been verified.)

Message from Sender:

Some of you may be interested in this, particularly if you are planning on attending (or promoting) Dr. Lawrence Schiffman's upcoming lecture on the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Plagiarism and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Did NYU department chairman pilfer from Chicago historian's work?

by Peter Kaufman

A little-known case of apparent academic quackery has recently surfaced again, which deserves, perhaps, renewed attention in light of the media's ongoing celebration of Dead Sea Scrolls "scholarship."

[Click here to read more on our site](#)

Subject: Fwd: Plagiarism allegations resurface against Lawrence Schiffman
From: "Steven Fishbane" <steven.fishbane@gmail.com>
Date: Fri, 8 Aug 2008 16:30:47 -0400
To: mss11@nyu.edu

10CC

You may be interested in this.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Flescher, Andrew <AFlescher@csuchico.edu>
Date: Thu, Aug 7, 2008 at 10:26 PM
Subject: RE: Plagiarism allegations resurface against Lawrence Schiffman
To: Steven Fishbane <steven.fishbane@gmail.com>

no question he crossed the line (in my view). I'd heard about this but thanks for sharing, Steven.

Best,

Andy Flescher

From: Steven Fishbane [mailto:steven.fishbane@gmail.com]
Sent: Thu 8/7/2008 2:04 PM
To: Flescher, Andrew
Subject: Plagiarism allegations resurface against Lawrence Schiffman

Dear Professor Flescher,

You may be interested in these articles:

<http://plagiarist-schiffman.blogspot.com/>

<http://www.nowpublic.com/culture/plagiarism-and-dead-sea-scrolls-did-nyu-department-chairman-pilfer-chicago-historian-s-work>

Best,

Steven Fishbane

Subject: Fwd: Plagiarism allegations resurface against Lawrence Schiffman
From: "larry schiffman" <larry.schiffman@gmail.com>
Date: Fri, 8 Aug 2008 16:23:27 -0400
To: marionkaplan@yahoo.com

1600

Thanks for your kind words Marion, but unfortunately it's getting worse.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Steven Fishbane <steven.fishbane@gmail.com>
Date: Fri, Aug 8, 2008 at 4:19 PM
Subject: Fwd: Plagiarism allegations resurface against Lawrence Schiffman
To: larry.schiffman@gmail.com

You see, Dr. Schiffman? You thought you could get away with it, but people in the field are aware of what you have done.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Flescher, Andrew <AFlescher@csuchico.edu>
Date: Thu, Aug 7, 2008 at 10:26 PM
Subject: RE: Plagiarism allegations resurface against Lawrence Schiffman
To: Steven Fishbane <steven.fishbane@gmail.com>

no question he crossed the line (in my view). I'd heard about this but thanks for sharing, Steven.

Best,

Andy Flescher

From: Steven Fishbane [mailto:steven.fishbane@gmail.com]
Sent: Thu 8/7/2008 2:04 PM
To: Flescher, Andrew
Subject: Plagiarism allegations resurface against Lawrence Schiffman

Dear Dr. Flescher,

You may be interested in these articles:

<http://plagiarist-schiffman.blogspot.com/>

<http://www.nowpublic.com/culture/plagiarism-and-dead-sea-scrolls-did-nyu-department-chairman-pilfer-chicago-historian-s-work>

Best,

Steven Fishbane

WEE

Subject: Blogger Account Information
From: Blogger Support <no-reply@blogger.com>
Date: Wed, 13 Aug 2008 19:39:41 -0700 (PDT)
To: steve.goranson@gmail.com

Hi there,

Your blog, <http://plagiarist-schiffman.blogspot.com/>, is associated with the Google Account username steve.goranson@gmail.com. Please use this Google Account username to log in to Blogger and access your blog.

If you've forgotten your password, you can reset it by clicking this link:

<http://www.blogger.com/forgot.g?r=steve.goranson%40gmail.com>

This account is a member of the following blogs:

- <http://plagiarist-schiffman.blogspot.com/>

If you experience any problems or have further questions, please visit our help site at <http://help.blogger.com/>

Sincerely,
The Blogger Team

10FF

Subject: Fwd: Plagiarism charges
From: "larry schiffman" <larry.schiffman@gmail.com>
Date: Wed, 20 Aug 2008 23:21:36 -0400
To: marion.gottlieb@gmail.com

----- Forwarded message -----
From: Mark S Smith <mss11@nyu.edu>
Date: Wed, Aug 6, 2008 at 12:43 PM
Subject: Re: Plagiarism charges
To: Larry Schiffman

I do, Larry. And I am concerned about any wider impact that this might potentially have.

It is also curious about how this person has come to be writing about this.

Hang in there.

Regards,
Mark

Mark, what an interesting perspective!

Subject: Fwd: Plagiarism charges

From: "Marion Gottlieb" <marion.gottlieb@gmail.com>

Date: Thu, 21 Aug 2008 00:00:35 -0400

To: rc2@nyu.edu, hrd1@nyu.edu, de2@nyu.edu, ge293@nyu.edu, yf1@nyu.edu, df2@nyu.edu, michah.gottlieb@nyu.edu, rk4@nyu.edu, marionkaplan@yahoo.com, bkg@nyu.edu, am96@nyu.edu, evan.rapport@nyu.edu, jr6@nyu.edu, mss11@nyu.edu, erw1@nyu.edu, rz17@nyu.edu, rz11@nyu.edu

1669

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Mark S Smith <mss11@nyu.edu>

Date: Wed, Aug 6, 2008 at 12:43 PM

Subject: Re: Plagiarism charges against Larry Schiffman

I am concerned about any wider impact that this might potentially have.

I am also curious about how this person has come to be writing about this.

Hang in there [Larry].

Regards, Mark

Mark, what an interesting perspective! What form of "wider impact" do you have in mind?

Could it be that some of us might come to feel a bit uncomfortable with the way Larry is handling our affairs? Or that others might be exposed? Or that Larry's influence at NYU might be a bit curtailed, when word gets out about his little situation?

Let's hope Mark explains what he meant!

[http://www.nowpublic.com/world/plagiarism-and-dead-sea-scrolls-did-nyu-department-chairman-pilfer-chicago-historian-s-work!](http://www.nowpublic.com/world/plagiarism-and-dead-sea-scrolls-did-nyu-department-chairman-pilfer-chicago-historian-s-work)

Subject: Fwd: Plagiarism charges

From: "Marion Gottlieb" <marion.gottlieb@gmail.com>

Date: Thu, 21 Aug 2008 00:00:35 -0400

To: rc2@nyu.edu, hrd1@nyu.edu, de2@nyu.edu, ge293@nyu.edu, yf1@nyu.edu, df2@nyu.edu, michah.gottlieb@nyu.edu, rk4@nyu.edu, marionkaplan@yahoo.com, bkg@nyu.edu, am96@nyu.edu, evan.rapport@nyu.edu, jr6@nyu.edu, mss11@nyu.edu, erw1@nyu.edu, rz17@nyu.edu, rz11@nyu.edu

10HH

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Mark S Smith <mss11@nyu.edu>

Date: Wed, Aug 6, 2008 at 12:43 PM

Subject: Re: Plagiarism charges against Larry Schiffman

I am concerned about any wider impact that this might potentially have.

I am also curious about how this person has come to be writing about this.

Hang in there [Larry].

Regards, Mark

Mark, what an interesting perspective! What form of "wider impact" do you have in mind?

Could it be that some of us might come to feel a bit uncomfortable with the way Larry is handling our affairs? Or that others might be exposed? Or that Larry's influence at NYU might be a bit curtailed, when word gets out about his little situation?

Let's hope Mark explains what he meant!

[http://www.nowpublic.com/world/plagiarism-and-dead-sea-scrolls-did-nyu-department-chairman-pilfer-chicago-historian-s-work!](http://www.nowpublic.com/world/plagiarism-and-dead-sea-scrolls-did-nyu-department-chairman-pilfer-chicago-historian-s-work)

10/11

Subject: Re: Fw: Re: NowPublic News Story - Plagiarism and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Did NYU department chairman pilfer from Chicago historian's work?
From: "Sammy Edelstein" <sam.edelstein2@gmail.com>
Date: Sat, 30 Aug 2008 23:47:23 -0400
To: sfine2@yu.edu

Larry has been asked, and remains oddly silent. Why do you think that might be? Hopefully he will respond to this "gibberish" soon, because the History News Network (i.e., George Mason University) seems to be taking the matter quite seriously.

Incidentally, I feel obliged to express my astonishment that you would categorize such an article as "gibberish." I usually take that word to refer to something that doesn't make sense (and there's a lot of it going around), but this article is quite clear and specific about what it's saying. If you have some grounds for defending Larry against Mr. Kaufman's allegations of plagiarism and misrepresentation, please say what they are. In the meantime, rest assured that I don't keep any "list"; otherwise I would gladly remove you.

Have an excellent weekend.

Sam Edelstein

On Sat, Aug 30, 2008 at 8:30 PM, Steven Fine <leahsteven@yahoo.com> wrote:

Mr. Edelstein: If you have a question for Prof. Schiffman, as him yourself. Please do remove me from your list. -_SF

Steven Fine,
Professor of Jewish History, Yeshiva University
Director, YU Center for Israel Studies, www.yu.edu/cis
Chair, Department of Jewish History, Yeshiva College

Belfer Hall 524, 500 West 185th Street, New York, NY 10033.
Cell: 646-508-6603. Webpage: www.cojs.org/stevenfine

--- On Sat, 8/30/08, Sammy Edelstein <sam.edelstein2@gmail.com> wrote:

From: Sammy Edelstein <sam.edelstein2@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: NowPublic News Story - Plagiarism and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Did NYU department chairman pilfer from Chicago historian's work?
To: sfine2@yu.edu, leahsteven@yahoo.com
Date: Saturday, August 30, 2008, 5:18 PM

And on what basis do you defend Larry's conduct? Personally I find the misrepresentation (which I have verified for myself in Larry's book) even more disturbing than the unattributed borrowings. At any rate, I have sent this article to several colleagues. One responded that Larry "did cross the line, in my view." Another forwarded a message to me from a close colleague of Larry's who said he was worried about the "wider impact" this could have, which is a very interesting perspective when you come to think of it.

On Fri, Aug 29, 2008 at 6:32 PM, Steven Fine <leahsteven@yahoo.com> wrote:
gibberish. Shabbat shalom, SF

Steven Fine,
Professor of Jewish History, Yeshiva University
Director, YU Center for Israel Studies, www.yu.edu/cis
Chair, Department of Jewish History, Yeshiva College

Belfer Hall 524, 500 West 185th Street, New York, NY 10033.
Cell: 646-508-6603. Webpage: www.cojs.org/stevenfine

--- On Fri, 8/29/08, sam.edelstein2@gmail.com <sam.edelstein2@gmail.com> wrote:

From: sam.edelstein2@gmail.com <sam.edelstein2@gmail.com>
Subject: NowPublic News Story - Plagiarism and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Did NYU
department chairman pilfer from Chicago historian's work?
To: Israelstudies@yu.edu
Date: Friday, August 29, 2008, 3:44 PM

The News is NowPublic.com

Sam Edelstein (sam.edelstein2@gmail.com) has sent you a news story from
NowPublic.com. (E-mail address has not been verified.)

Message from Sender:

Judaica chair at NYU exposed as plagiarist

**Plagiarism and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Did NYU department chairman pilfer from
Chicago historian's work?**

by Peter Kaufman

A little-known case of apparent academic quackery has recently surfaced again,
which deserves

[Click here to read more on our site](#)

16 JJ
Subject: Fwd: Plagiarism allegations against Lawrence Schiffman
From: "Steven Fishbane" <steven.fishbane@gmail.com>
Date: Sun, 31 Aug 2008 16:18:42 -0400
To: dick.foley@nyu.edu

Re: Plagiarism allegations against Dr. Schiffman
From: Dr. Andrew Flescher (co-author of California State University's academic integrity policy)

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Flescher, Andrew <AFlescher@csuchico.edu>
Date: Aug 7, 2008 10:26 PM
Subject: RE: Plagiarism allegations resurface against Lawrence Schiffman

no question he crossed the line (in my view). I'd heard about this but thanks for sharing.

Best,

Andy Flescher
Professor of Religious Studies; Director, Center for Applied and Professional Ethics, California State University at Chico

From: Steven Fishbane
Sent: Thu 8/7/2008 2:04 PM
To: Flescher, Andrew
Subject: Plagiarism allegations resurface against Lawrence Schiffman

Dear Dr. Flescher,

You may be interested in these articles:

<http://plagiarist-schiffman.blogspot.com/>

<http://www.nowpublic.com/culture/plagiarism-and-dead-sea-scrolls-did-nyu-department-chairman-pilfer-chicago-historian-s-work>

Best,

Steven Fishbane

Subject: Re: Lawrence Schiffman
From: Peter Kaufman <peter.kaufman2@yahoo.com>
Date: Sun, 7 Sep 2008 20:57:18 -0700 (PDT)
To: dick.foley@nyu.edu

1622

Dear Dean Foley,

I hope you had a good vacation. Now that you are back, I must once again call your attention to the plagiarism and misrepresentation of historian Norman Golb's work by Dr. Lawrence Schiffman, chairman of the Skirball Department of Judaica at NYU.

In case any further proof is needed in addition to what you have, please be aware that Schiffman attended the 1987 Dead Sea Scrolls conference in Mogilany, Poland, which focused at great length on Golb's multiple-libraries, Jerusalem theory of scroll origins. Golb lectured at the conference, Schiffman attended the lecture and surrounding discussions, and nothing was said to create any ambiguity as to the nature of Golb's theory, as any of the other participants can testify.

Thus, even if he did not read Golb's articles (despite plagiarizing their ideas), Schiffman's misrepresentation of Golb's theory can only have been intentional, and if he tells you anything else he is simply not telling the truth. Furthermore, even if Schiffman had not read Golb's articles before the conference, would he have attended such a conference and then used Golb's ideas in his own articles, without reading Golb's articles to verify whether they contained those ideas? There was a huge controversy at the time around Golb's theory. Would anyone who traveled all the way to Poland to attend a conference on the topic have failed to read Golb's articles?

Best,

Peter Kaufman

--- On Thu, 8/7/08, dick.foley@nyu.edu <dick.foley@nyu.edu> wrote:

From: dick.foley@nyu.edu <dick.foley@nyu.edu>
Subject: Auto: Lawrence Schiffman; plagiarism
To: peter.kaufman2@yahoo.com
Date: Thursday, August 7, 2008, 2:38 AM

I will be out of the office until August 23 with intermittent access to email.
If you have pressing business, please contact Amber Min Lee
(amber.minlee@nyu.edu) or Sherri Katz (sherri.katz@nyu.edu).

--
Richard Foley
Dean, Faculty of Arts and Science
New York University
5 Washington Square North
New York, NY 10003
212 998 8000
FAX 212 995 4010

1066

Subject: the criminal complaint NYU (or Dr. Schiffman) has apparently filed against me
From: Peter Kaufman <peter.kaufman2@yahoo.com>
Date: Tue, 16 Sep 2008 18:43:21 -0700 (PDT)
To: dick.foley@nyu.edu
CC: robert.roach@nyu.edu

Dear Dr. Foley,

It appears, from the letter below and the "legal notice" it describes, that instead of investigating Dr. Schiffman's conduct, you and/or Dr. Schiffman have filed some kind of a criminal complaint against me.

I would like to know what "crime" I am accused of committing by exposing -- as a prominent Israeli journalist first did fifteen years ago -- Dr. Schiffman's repeated plagiarisms and misrepresentation of another scholar. Or is the freedom of speech no longer protected in this country?

Now that I have been informed by a third party that I am the "subject of a criminal investigation in New York," if I do not receive a written assurance that NYU and Dr. Schiffman are not involved in this fascist procedure, or that it has been discontinued, I will do whatever I need to do to preserve my integrity -- at a minimum, by forwarding the letter I have received to journalists, and to the entire faculty of New York University.

I hope you do not think you can make this problem go away by ignoring it or by using terror tactics to try and prevent me from telling the simple truth about a topic of interest to thousands of people, both here in New York and around the world.

Peter Kaufman

--- On Fri, 9/12/08, Tina Kells <tkells@nowpublic.com> wrote:

From: Tina Kells <tkells@nowpublic.com>
Subject: Your Now Public Account
To: peter.kaufman2@yahoo.com
Date: Friday, September 12, 2008, 4:55 PM

Hello,

We have received a legal notice regarding you and your account at Now Public. As a response to that notice we have suspended your account until we hear back from you with your side of the events. We will make a decision about any further action or a suspension reversal only after we have received a reply from you.

The notice received states that you are the subject of a criminal investigation in New York, and that there may be civil litigation pending against you surrounding your actions toward the Dead Sea Scrolls study being conducted at the University of Chicago.

A further allegation has been made that you have more than one identity at Now Public, and that you have used these identities in a way that contravenes sections of our Code of Conduct in attempts to cause disruption to.

the Dead Sea study.

Please feel free to contact me directly regarding this matter. If any of these allegations are in error we would like to sort them out as soon as possible.

Tina Kells

Deputy News Director

NowPublic.com

Subject: Your article on the "Virtual Qumran" film
From: Carlo Gadda <carlogadda@yahoo.com>
Date: Tue, 19 Jun 2007 10:59:05 -0700 (PDT)
To: msullivan@support.ucla.edu

Dear Ms. Sullivan,

I have read your article on the "Virtual Qumran" film, and I regret to inform you that it gives a seriously misleading impression to anyone who might not be familiar with the current state of scholarship on Qumran.

(1) To begin with, Norman Golb did not publish an "article" in 1996; he published a 400-page *book* entitled "Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls?"

(2) Your sources (no doubt Cargill and Schniedewind themselves) failed to inform you that the thesis they are defending has been rejected not only Golb, but by an entire series of major archaeologists since 1990. These include most notably the Donceel team (officially appointed by the Ecole Biblique to review and finish de Vaux's work); Yizhar Hirschfeld (see his book *Qumran in Context*); and the officially appointed Israel Antiquities Authority team led by Yizhak Magen and Yuval Peleg, who, after ten seasons of digs at Qumran, have published their conclusions that the site was never inhabited by any sect and that the Dead Sea Scrolls are the remnants of libraries from the Jerusalem region.

These facts are well known to Qumran scholars, and your article gives a distinctly misleading impression to the reader by not mentioning them. Dr. Schniedewind is known to be a radical defender of the disputed Qumran-Essene theory, and he has a right to defend his views, but it was highly inappropriate of him to use \$100,000 in grants to mislead the public in this film by failing to mention the conclusions of the Magen and Peleg team, and it was inappropriate for you to advertise the film without informing people of the actual facts.

(3) Your article also fails to mention that the film has already been subjected to biting criticism by Norman Golb (see his article "Fact and Fiction in Current Exhibitions of the Dead Sea Scrolls--A Critical Notebook for Viewers," available on the University of Chicago website at <http://oi.uchicago.edu/research/projects/scr/>). In the wake of Golb's criticism, one commentator has suggested that "the goal of this film is simply to indoctrinate visitors, before they see the rest of the [San Diego Scrolls] exhibit, into believing in the old, Qumran-Essene theory, despite the fact that it has now been rejected by virtually all of the major archaeologists in the field."

I have left aside the clear manipulation of evidence in the film itself, e.g., the way it argues that Qumran was inhabited by a group of male Essenes, despite the fact that the remains of women were found in the cemetery--since Pliny states that the Essenes of the Dead Sea were celibate, the makers of the film were obliged to distort, ignore or explain away the actual evidence to support their view. And so on and so forth with the other claims they make.

In the hope these observations will have given you fruit for thought, I am

Yours sincerely,

Charles Gadda

Sick sense of humor? Visit Yahoo! TV's Comedy with an Edge to see what's on, when.

Subject: NYU students accuse UCLA teacher/student duo of unethical conduct
From: <d_matthews52@yahoo.com>
Date: Sat, 6 Oct 2007 14:51:57 -0700 (PDT)
To: news@media.ucla.edu

Dear News Editor,

There is a fight raging on wikipedia between a bunch of anonymous New York University students and a UCLA graduate student, Robert Cargill, who published a wikipedia article about his professor, Bible scholar William Schniedewind.

Here is what the NYU students are saying:

"At least at NYU we learn to be critical of our professors, rather than write encyclopedia articles about them--probably one of the most unethical things a graduate student can do." Cargill has "debased the academic community," etc.

In addition, the NYU students have pointed out that Professor Schniedewind has been working as advisor to a Christian fundamentalist organization called the "University of the Holy Land." They accuse Cargill and Schniedewind of covering this up by having Schniedewind's name removed from the personnel page of that organization:

"[I]n the United States, church and state are separated, and ... state-run educational institutions don't hire theologians or theologically minded individuals to teach the Bible. Schiedewind's affiliation with UHL (the "University of the Holy Land") raises a serious issue with respect to the University of California and academic culture in general... Now they have concealed the facts by having [Schniedewind's] name removed from the UHL personnel page...."

Subject: NYU students accuse UCLA teacher/student duo of unethical conduct

From: Don Matthews <d_matthews52@yahoo.com>

Date: Mon, 22 Oct 2007 18:52:04 -0700 (PDT)

To: news@media.ucla.edu

Dear News Editor,

Did UCLA graduate student Robert Cargill, author of a \$100,000 "virtual reality" film being shown at the exhibit of the Dead Sea Scrolls taking place at the San Diego Natural History Museum, recently publish an angry attack on a critic of the exhibit using a pseudonym? See here for the vicious public exchange, in which Cargill is alleged to have misled the public in the film, and to have engaged in unethical conduct relating to the promotion of the career of his professor William Schniedewind:

<http://www.nowpublic.com/culture/did-christian-agenda-lead-biased-dead-sea-scrolls-exhibit-san-diego>

Best,

D. Matthews

Do You Yahoo!?

Tired of spam? Yahoo! Mail has the best spam protection around

<http://mail.yahoo.com>

Subject: Film produced by UCLA team criticized by U of Chicago historian

From: "robert dworkin" <robertdworkin@gmail.com>

Date: Sat, 17 Nov 2007 16:30:01 -0500

To: apesce@media.ucla.edu, news@media.ucla.edu

Dear Mr. Pesce,

A film entitled "Virtual Qumran," prepared by Professor William Schniedewind of UCLA and his student Robert Cargill (who received \$100,000 from Steven Spielberg's Righteous Persons Foundation to make the film), is being projected to thousands of people daily in a Dead Sea Scrolls exhibit taking place in a "natural history" museum in San Diego.

The University of Chicago's Oriental Institute website is carrying an article by historian Norman Golb, in which he exposes a series of blatantly false and misleading claims made in the film.

[http://oi.uchicago.edu/pdf/san diego virtual reality 2007.pdf](http://oi.uchicago.edu/pdf/san_diego_virtual_reality_2007.pdf)

Of particular note is a passage towards the end (pp. 6-7), concerning marginal comments in the film script that apparently were not intended for publication, and in which the principal author of the film refers to a "reason" that he "never writes down." Given the demonstrably false claims made throughout the film, the attitude of secrecy and concealment signaled in such a statement clearly raises ethical concerns regarding the intersection between religion, academics and science museum exhibits.

With best wishes,

Robert Dworkin

17-10

6/1/2009 11:32 AM

Subject: Robert Cargill's work
From: "robert dworkin" <robertdworkin@gmail.com>
Date: Fri, 23 Nov 2007 21:24:02 +0000
To: MStar@morningstarentertainment.com

Gentlemen,

I write to you regarding a troubling matter that should be of concern to you.

I read (<http://www.bobcargill.com/news.htm>) that UCLA graduate student Robert Cargill has "signed a television contract" with your company, and "has begun work with Morningstar shooting footage to promote a yet-to-be-named new series on archaeology and history."

On your website, you state that your company has "the goal of producing high-quality non-fiction and alternative programming."

Given this laudable goal, I thought you would want to know that the University of Chicago website is featuring an article by Dr. Norman Golb, a prominent historian of Jewish antiquity, in which a series of claims made in the "Virtual Qumran" film recently produced by Mr. Cargill are, in a word, shown to be false and misleading. It must be emphasized that we do not appear to be dealing here with mere differences of opinion, but with a dismaying endeavour, throughout Mr. Cargill's film, to misinform the public as to the current state of research in this field (see Golb's article and the bibliography contained in it for details).

[http://oi.uchicago.edu/pdf/san diego virtual reality 2007.pdf](http://oi.uchicago.edu/pdf/san_diego_virtual_reality_2007.pdf)

Of particular concern is a passage towards the end (pp. 6-7), where Golb discusses a marginal comment in Mr. Cargill's film script that apparently was not intended for publication, and in which Mr. Cargill appears to be referring to a secret policy of the film's makers ("there is a third reason," says Mr. Cargill, "but I never write it down"). Given the demonstrably false claims made throughout the film, the attitude of secrecy and concealment that appears to be signaled in such a statement clearly raises significant ethical concerns.

Golb's books and articles have been published by distinguished presses and encyclopaedic works such as the Cambridge History of Judaism; he is a distinguished figure in the field and one can hardly imagine that he would make such charges lightly. Mr. Cargill, however, has yet to answer any of the allegations made in the cited article.

Allow me to suggest that, in the interest of ensuring the highest quality of programming at Morningstar, you might wish to look into this matter, and perhaps have the scholarship (a category that certainly must include scientifically objective evaluation of data) of any further work produced by Mr. Cargill reviewed by a panel of independent, neutral experts in the field.

With best wishes,

Robert Dworkin

17-13

5/29/2009 6:47 PM

Subject: The recent conduct of Prof. William Schniedewind and his graduate student Robert Cargill
From: <d_matthews52@yahoo.com>
Date: Fri, 18 Jan 2008 15:45:41 -0800 (PST)
To: carter@humnet.ucla.edu
BCC: cbakhos@humnet.ucla.edu, banani@ucla.edu, band@humnet.ucla.edu, bodrogli@humnet.ucla.edu, boustan@history.ucla.edu, buccella@ucla.edu, burke@humnet.ucla.edu, cooperso@humnet.ucla.edu, cowe@humnet.ucla.edu, hdavidso@ucla.edu, dieleman@humnet.ucla.edu, englund@ucla.edu, nezer@humnet.ucla.edu, fishbein@humnet.ucla.edu, fitz@ucla.edu, hagigile@ucla.edu, hakak@humnet.ucla.edu, dhirsch@library.ucla.edu, jaeckel@humnet.ucla.edu, anahidk@humnet.ucla.edu, poonawal@humnet.ucla.edu, sabar@humnet.ucla.edu, hschmidt@ucla.edu, shayegan@humnet.ucla.edu, ssly@anthro.ucla.edu, wendrich@humnet.ucla.edu, nahid@humnet.ucla.edu, ziai@humnet.ucla.edu

Dear Professor Carter,

I write to you regarding an important, but delicate matter. It has come to my attention that Dr. William Schniedewind's graduate student Robert Cargill (of your department) recently produced a "virtual reality" film on Khirbet Qumran, which was shown to some 450,000 visitors to the San Diego Natural History Museum's controversial exhibit of the Dead Sea Scrolls. According to published accounts, this film (funded with \$100,000 from Stephen Spielberg's Holocaust fund) essentially presents Dr. Schniedewind's views on Qumran, and in doing so distorts the current state of research in this field of studies, treating various disputed interpretations as facts and defending the old Qumran-Essene theory without informing the public of the reasons why an entire series of major researchers, including the officially appointed Israel Antiquities Authority team led by Drs. Magen and Peleg, have now rejected that theory. This becomes abundantly clear in University of Chicago historian Norman Golb's review of the film, published on the Oriental Institute website (the link is [http://oi.uchicago.edu/pdf/san diego virtual reality 2007.pdf](http://oi.uchicago.edu/pdf/san_diego_virtual_reality_2007.pdf)).

My concern is as follows. To the best of my knowledge, neither Dr. Schniedewind nor Mr. Cargill have said a word in response to Dr. Golb's detailed critique of their film. But the making of the film has been the central part of Mr. Cargill's work towards his Ph.D. The accumulation of transparently erroneous and mendacious statements made throughout the film, documented in Dr. Golb's article and clearly designed to mislead the public, can hardly be called an example of ethical conduct on the part of a doctoral candidate. What is the Department of Near Eastern Languages and Cultures at UCLA going to do to ensure that Mr. Cargill provides a candid explanation of his behaviour in making this film? Will steps will be taken to ensure that he responds to Dr. Golb, corrects his false statements and issues a public apology for having misled 450,000 people? Will Mr. Cargill be allowed to receive a Ph.D. for work of this quality, in the face of unanswered criticisms?

I hope you will understand that my intent in writing to you has not been to harm Mr. Cargill's career prospects; but surely we are dealing with a very serious issue here that cannot be neglected in a Near Eastern studies department at a major university such as UCLA. It seems to me that Mr. Cargill has done great harm both to himself and others by making this film, and that your department should take steps to make sure that the damage is repaired.

With best regards,

D. Matthews

cbakhos@humnet.ucla.edu
banani@ucla.edu
band@humnet.ucla.edu
bodrogli@humnet.ucla.edu
boustan@history.ucla.edu
buccella@ucla.edu
burke@humnet.ucla.edu
cooperso@humnet.ucla.edu
[cove@humnet.ucla.edu](mailto:cowe@humnet.ucla.edu)
havidso@ucla.edu
dieleman@humnet.ucla.edu
englund@ucla.edu
nezer@humnet.ucla.edu
fishbein@humnet.ucla.edu
fitz@ucla.edu
hagigile@ucla.edu
hakak@humnet.ucla.edu
dhirsch@library.ucla.edu
jaeckel@humnet.ucla.edu
anahidk@humnet.ucla.edu
poonawal@humnet.ucla.edu
sabar@humnet.ucla.edu
hschmidt@ucla.edu
shayegan@humnet.ucla.edu
ssly@anthro.ucla.edu
wendrich@humnet.ucla.edu
nahid@humnet.ucla.edu
ziai@humnet.ucla.edu

Subject: The recent conduct of Dr. Schniedewind and his student Robert Cargill

From: Don Matthews <d_matthews52@yahoo.com>

Date: Tue, 22 Jan 2008 15:42:09 -0800 (PST)

To: carter@humnet.ucla.edu

BCC: cbakhos@humnet.ucla.edu, banani@ucla.edu, band@humnet.ucla.edu, bodrogli@humnet.ucla.edu, boustan@history.ucla.edu, buccella@ucla.edu, burke@humnet.ucla.edu, cooperso@humnet.ucla.edu, cowe@humnet.ucla.edu, hdavidso@ucla.edu, dieleman@humnet.ucla.edu, englund@ucla.edu, nezer@humnet.ucla.edu, fishbein@humnet.ucla.edu, fitz@ucla.edu, hagigile@ucla.edu, hakak@humnet.ucla.edu, dhirsch@library.ucla.edu, jaeckel@humnet.ucla.edu, anahidk@humnet.ucla.edu, poonawal@humnet.ucla.edu, sabar@humnet.ucla.edu, hschmidt@ucla.edu, shayegan@humnet.ucla.edu, ssly@anthro.ucla.edu, wendrich@humnet.ucla.edu, nahid@humnet.ucla.edu, ziai@humnet.ucla.edu

Dear Professor Carter,

As an alumnus of UCLA, I write to you concerning an important, but delicate matter.

It has come to my attention that Robert Cargill, a graduate student of Dr. William Schniedewind in your department, recently produced a "virtual reality" film on Khirbet Qumran, which was shown to some 450,000 visitors attending the San Diego Natural History Museum's controversial exhibit of the Dead Sea Scrolls.

According to published accounts, this film (funded with \$100,000 from Stephen Spielberg's Holocaust fund) presents Dr. Schniedewind's views on Qumran, and in doing so distorts the current state of research in this field of studies, making many demonstrably false claims, treating disputed interpretations as facts and defending the old "Qumran-Essene" theory without informing the public of the reasons why an entire series of major researchers, including the officially appointed Israel Antiquities Authority team led by Drs. Yitzhak Magen and Yuval Peleg; have now rejected that theory. This becomes abundantly clear in a review of the film by University of Chicago historian Norman Golb, published on the Oriental Institute website (see http://oi.uchicago.edu/pdf/san_diego_virtual_reality_2007.pdf).

My concern is as follows. I have scoured the internet in vain for any response by Dr. Schniedewind or Mr. Cargill to this detailed critique of their film. But I have read that the preparation of the film has been a key focal point of Mr. Cargill's work towards his Ph.D. The accumulation of transparently erroneous and mendacious statements made throughout the film, documented in Dr. Golb's article and clearly designed to mislead the public, can hardly be called an example of ethical conduct on the part of a doctoral candidate. If it were merely a question of Dr. Schniedewind failing to answer criticisms of his views, one could write it off as another example of a typical academic dispute, but in this case we are dealing with a graduate student, and with basic standards of scholarship that obviously must be met; questions that those who adhere to such standards would rightly expect to be raised at a dissertation defense; etc.

For example, in marginal correspondence that is apparently part of his unpublished film script, Mr. Cargill refers to a "reason" justifying one of his statements that he is careful "never to write down" (see Dr. Golb's review for details). One cannot but wonder whether those attending Mr. Cargill's dissertation defense will carefully question him as to precisely what this reason is that, in violation of all canons of scholarship, he never writes down.

Ultimately, I feel that I have no choice but to ask: What is UCLA going to do to ensure that Mr. Cargill provides a candid explanation of his behaviour with respect to this film? Will steps will be taken to ensure that he responds to Dr. Golb's criticisms, corrects his false statements and issues a public apology for having misled 450,000 people? Will Mr. Cargill be allowed to receive a Ph.D. for work of this quality, in the face of an unanswered refutation published for all to see by an influential historian teaching at the University of Chicago?

I conclude that we appear to be dealing with a serious issue here that should be dealt with forcefully and responsibly, to avoid the risk of its being raised by various parties at Mr. Cargill's dissertation defense, as well as the even more upsetting likelihood of hearing that it has been raised with the university administration and local newspapers.

With best regards,

Steve Frankel

Never miss a thing. [Make Yahoo your homepage.](#)

Subject: The recent conduct of Bill Schniedewind and his student Robert Cargill

From: "Steve Frankel" <steve.frankel2@gmail.com>

Date: Tue, 22 Jan 2008 18:55:47 -0500

To: cbakhos@humnet.ucla.edu, banani@ucla.edu, band@humnet.ucla.edu, bodrogli@humnet.ucla.edu, boustan@history.ucla.edu, buccella@ucla.edu, burke@humnet.ucla.edu, cooperso@humnet.ucla.edu, cowe@humnet.ucla.edu, hdavidso@ucla.edu, dieleman@humnet.ucla.edu, englund@ucla.edu, nezer@humnet.ucla.edu, fishbein@humnet.ucla.edu, fitz@ucla.edu, hagigile@ucla.edu, hakak@humnet.ucla.edu, dhirsch@library.ucla.edu, jaeckel@humnet.ucla.edu, anahidk@humnet.ucla.edu, poonawal@humnet.ucla.edu, sabar@humnet.ucla.edu, hschmidt@ucla.edu, shayegan@humnet.ucla.edu, ssly@anthro.ucla.edu, wendrich@humnet.ucla.edu, nahid@humnet.ucla.edu, ziai@humnet.ucla.edu

Gentlemen,

A short while ago, I mailed the following to the chairman of your department from a friend's email address, with a blind copy to all of you. Please address any correspondence to me at the above email. Now we will see if Dr. Carter takes any action on this matter or hushes it up.

Best,

S. Frankel

Dear Professor Carter,

As an alumnus of UCLA, I write to you concerning an important, but delicate matter.

It has come to my attention that Robert Cargill, a graduate student of Dr. William Schniedewind in your department, recently produced a "virtual reality" film on Khirbet Qumran, which was shown to some 450,000 visitors attending the San Diego Natural History Museum's controversial exhibit of the Dead Sea Scrolls.

According to published accounts, this film (funded with \$100,000 from Stephen Spielberg's Holocaust fund) presents Dr. Schniedewind's views on Qumran, and in doing so distorts the current state of research in this field of studies, making many demonstrably false claims, treating disputed interpretations as facts and defending an old, and widely disputed, theory of Dead Sea Scroll origins without informing the public of the reasons why an entire series of major researchers, including the officially appointed Israel Antiquities Authority team led by Drs. Yitzhak Magen and Yuval Peleg, have now rejected that theory. This becomes abundantly clear in a review of the film by University of Chicago historian Norman Golb, published on the Oriental Institute website (see [http://oi.uchicago.edu/pdf/san diego virtual reality 2007.pdf](http://oi.uchicago.edu/pdf/san%20diego%20virtual%20reality%202007.pdf)).

My concern is as follows. I have scoured the internet in vain for any response by Dr. Schniedewind or Mr. Cargill to this detailed critique of their film. But I have read that the preparation of the film has been a key focal point of Mr. Cargill's work towards his Ph.D. The accumulation of transparently erroneous and mendacious statements made throughout the film, documented in Dr. Golb's article and clearly designed to mislead the public, can hardly be called an example of ethical conduct on the part of a doctoral candidate. If it were merely a question of Dr. Schniedewind failing

to answer criticisms of his views, one could write it off as another example of a typical academic dispute, but in this case we are dealing with a graduate student, and with basic standards of scholarship that obviously must be met; questions that those who adhere to such standards would rightly expect to be raised at a dissertation defense; etc.

For example, in marginal correspondence that is apparently part of his unpublished film script, Mr. Cargill refers to a "reason" justifying one of his statements that he is careful "never to write down" (see Dr. Golb's article for details). One cannot but wonder whether those attending Mr. Cargill's dissertation defense will carefully question him as to precisely what this reason is that, in violation of all canons of scholarship, he never writes down.

Ultimately, I feel that I have no choice but to ask: What is UCLA going to do to ensure that Mr. Cargill provides a candid explanation of his behavior with respect to this film? Will steps will be taken to ensure that he responds to Dr. Golb's criticisms, corrects his false statements and issues a public apology for having misled 450,000 people? Will Mr. Cargill be allowed to receive a Ph.D. for work of this quality, in the face of an unanswered refutation published for all to see by an influential historian teaching at the University of Chicago?

I conclude that we appear to be dealing with a serious issue here that should be dealt with forcefully and responsibly, to avoid the risk of its being raised by various parties at Mr. Cargill's dissertation defense, as well as the even more upsetting likelihood of hearing that it has been raised with the university administration and local newspapers.

With best regards,

Steve Frankel

Subject: Fwd: The recent conduct of Bill Schniedewind and his student Robert Cargill
From: "Steve Frankel" <steve.frankel2@gmail.com>
Date: Tue, 22 Jan 2008 19:32:49 -0500
To: dean@saonet.ucla.edu, cmkernan@gdnet.ucla.edu, valerieb@humnet.ucla.edu, sssly@anthro.ucla.edu

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Steve Frankel <steve.frankel2@gmail.com>
Date: Jan 22, 2008 6:55 PM
Subject: The recent conduct of Bill Schniedewind and his student Robert Cargill
To: carter@humnet.ucla.edu

Dear Professor Carter,

As an alumnus of UCLA, I write to you concerning an important, but delicate matter.

It has come to my attention that Robert Cargill, a graduate student of Dr. William Schniedewind in your department, recently produced a "virtual reality" film on Khirbet Qumran, which was shown to some 450,000 visitors attending the San Diego Natural History Museum's controversial exhibit of the Dead Sea Scrolls.

According to published accounts, this film (funded with \$100,000 from Stephen Spielberg's Holocaust fund) presents Dr. Schniedewind's views on Qumran, and in doing so distorts the current state of research in this field of studies, making many demonstrably false claims, treating disputed interpretations as facts and defending an old, and widely disputed, theory of Dead Sea Scroll origins without informing the public of the reasons why an entire series of major researchers, including the officially appointed Israel Antiquities Authority team led by Drs. Yitzhak Magen and Yuval Peleg, have now rejected that theory. This becomes abundantly clear in a review of the film by University of Chicago historian Norman Golb, published on the Oriental Institute website (see [http://oi.uchicago.edu/pdf/san diego virtual reality 2007.pdf](http://oi.uchicago.edu/pdf/san_diego_virtual_reality_2007.pdf)).

My concern is as follows. I have scoured the internet in vain for any response by Dr. Schniedewind or Mr. Cargill to this detailed critique of their film. But I have read that the preparation of the film has been a key focal point of Mr. Cargill's work towards his Ph.D. The accumulation of transparently erroneous and mendacious statements made throughout the film, documented in Dr. Golb's article and clearly designed to mislead the public, can hardly be called an example of ethical conduct on the part of a doctoral candidate. If it were merely a question of Dr. Schniedewind failing to answer criticisms of his views, one could write it off as another example of a typical academic dispute, but in this case we are dealing with a graduate student, and with basic standards of scholarship that obviously must be met; questions that those who adhere to such standards would rightly expect to be raised at a dissertation defense; etc.

For example, in marginal correspondence that is apparently part of his unpublished film script, Mr. Cargill refers to a "reason" justifying one of his statements that he is careful "never to write down" (see Dr. Golb's article for details). One cannot but wonder whether those attending Mr. Cargill's dissertation defense will carefully question him as to precisely what this reason is that, in violation of all canons of scholarship, he never writes down.

Ultimately, I feel that I have no choice but to ask: What is UCLA going to do to ensure that Mr. Cargill provides a candid explanation of his behavior with respect to this film? Will steps will be taken to ensure that he responds to Dr. Golb's criticisms, corrects his false statements and issues a public apology for having misled 450,000 people? Will Mr. Cargill be allowed to receive a Ph.D. for work of this quality, in the face of an unanswered refutation published for all to see by an influential historian teaching at the University of Chicago?

I conclude that we appear to be dealing with a serious issue here that should be dealt with forcefully and responsibly, to avoid the risk of its being raised by various parties at Mr. Cargill's dissertation defense, as well as the even more upsetting likelihood of hearing that it has been raised with the university administration and local newspapers.

With best regards,

Steve Frankel

Subject: Recent UHL affiliations of UCLA personnel
From: "Steve Frankel" <steve.frankel2@gmail.com>
Date: Sat, 9 Feb 2008 00:04:50 -0500
To: carter@humnet.ucla.edu
BCC: dean@saonet.ucla.edu, cmkernan@gdnet.ucla.edu, valerieb@humnet.ucla.edu, sssly@anthro.ucla.edu

Dear Professor Carter,

As a follow-up to my recent letter, I must now write to point out that Dr. William Schniedewind, who is a member of your department, appears to have served on the board of advisers (and as adjunct professor) at the University of the Holy Land (UHL) until just a few months ago. See this web page and scroll down:

<http://cached-holy-land.blogspot.com/2007/10/did-william-schniedewind-serve-on-board.html>

Furthermore, while it appears that Dr. Schniedewind's name has now disappeared from UHL's website, the "Virtual Reality" film being promoted on your departmental website, co-authored by Dr. Schniedewind and his student Robert Cargill (who himself holds a ministerial degree from Pepperdine University), is still being promoted on the UHL site as well, see

<http://www.uhl.ac/Qumran3D/Qumran3D.html>

All of this obliges me to ask: was it appropriate for a UCLA faculty member to have such an affiliation with an Evangelical Christian educational institution? Is it appropriate for your department's auspices to be used for the promulgation of a fundamentalist Christian interpretation of historical data which is also being promulgated by UHL? After all, UCLA is a secular, state-run institution; doesn't this pose a problem with respect to the United States Constitution and UCLA's own policies? Has Dr. Schniedewind's affiliation with the University of the Holy Land been the subject of an investigation in your department?

With best wishes,

Steve Frankel

Subject: UCLA biblical scholar's affiliation with a Christian fundamentalist educational institution
From: "Steve Frankel" <steve.frankel2@gmail.com>
Date: Mon, 11 Feb 2008 23:26:24 -0500
To: dean@saonet.ucla.edu, cmkernan@gdnet.ucla.edu, valerieb@humnet.ucla.edu, sssly@anthro.ucla.edu, carter@humnet.ucla.edu

As a follow-up to my recent message:

I see that a series of four photographs from the personnel pages of the "University of the Holy Land" (UHL) have now been posted on the internet (<http://cached-holy-land.blogspot.com/>), in which one can clearly see that Dr. William Schniedewind of UCLA was, as of only a few months ago, listed as a UHL "advisor" and "adjunct professor." (I have copied and attached one of the photos; see the linked webpage for further details.)

Will UCLA continue to quietly ignore this situation, brushing it aside as an "ad hominem" issue, or will it investigate and formulate a response and, if necessary, a policy with respect to this type of external affiliation? After all, we seem here to be confronting a question of basic academic responsibility: Is it, or is it not, appropriate for a biblical scholar teaching at UCLA also to serve as advisor to a Christian fundamentalist educational institution?

To be sure, Dr. Schniedewind's name was recently deleted from UHL's website, but his "Virtual Qumran" film continues to be featured there as well as on the UCLA site. Is UCLA sheltering and cooperating with Evangelical scholars? Can the aims of such scholars properly be described as scientific, or are they not rather inherently apologetic?


Steve Frankel

Page 1 of 1

1. **Steve Frankel**
 2. **William Schniedewind**
 3. **William Schniedewind**
 4. **William Schniedewind**

Administration

1. **William Schniedewind**
 2. **William Schniedewind**



UHL2.jpg	Content-Type: image/jpeg Content-Encoding: base64
----------	--

Subject: My recent emails

From: "Steve Frankel" <steve.frankel2@gmail.com>

Date: Tue, 12 Feb 2008 00:02:57 -0500

To: wendrich@humnet.ucla.edu

Dear Dr. Wendrich,

Just a personal note to you: forgive me for writing to you again along with the others, but I was not convinced by your reply. That a scholar with ties to an Evangelical Christian educational institution, teaching at UCLA despite those ties, should be involved in the production of such a preposterous film and fail to respond when the false, misleading, and sensationalist statements disseminated in it are pointed out, is clearly significant. I urge you and your colleagues to carefully investigate this matter.

With best regards,

Steve Frankel

Subject: UCLA research team involved in new scandal?
From: Joshua Reznick <joshua.reznick@yahoo.com>
Date: Tue, 18 Mar 2008 21:03:11 -0700 (PDT)
To: carter@humnet.ucla.edu
BCC: amongelli@conet.ucla.edu, trice@conet.ucla.edu, dbrodahl@conet.ucla.edu,
rgoldstein@conet.ucla.edu, grants@righteouspersons.org, lori.jones@ncmail.net, mhager@sdrnm.org

To: Professor Elizabeth Carter, Chair, Dept. of Near Eastern Languages, UCLA

Dear Professor Carter,

I learned today, from a pair of postings on the ANE-2 site, as well as from an article posted on the IIDB site, that the members of a research team working out of your department have been using ideas and techniques initially developed by Ferdinand Rohrhirsch (Katholische Universität Eichstaett) without giving him credit, claiming instead that they have made "the world's first" computer-generated film on Khirbet Qumran. See the postings at <http://iidx.infidels.org/vbb/showthread.php?t=239497>, <http://groups.yahoo.com/group/ANE-2/message/7746> and <http://groups.yahoo.com/group/ANE-2/message/7749>.

This impression seems to be confirmed by UCLA's "Virtual Qumran" website (see <http://www.nelc.ucla.edu/qumran/about.html>) where Dr. Rohrhirsch's 2000/2001 film is not mentioned, and where William Schniedewind is clearly credited with having come up with the Virtual Qumran "idea."

As indicated on ANE-2, Dr. Schniedewind's student Robert Cargill received \$100,000 from the Righteous Persons foundation in 2006 to cover the production costs of the UCLA film. Given the way this film has been presented to the public, are we to assume that Mr. Spielberg, when he consented to the grant, was under the impression that the UCLA project would be the "world's first" of its type?

What is more, a similar film dated 2002 (four years before the Spielberg grant) is also available on the University of the Holy Land (UHL) site. This film, too, is not mentioned on the UCLA site, but it is not clear if it is the work product of someone at UHL or of some collaboration between UHL and Dr. Schniedewind, since the latter is known to have been affiliated with UHL (an affiliation which itself, I might add, appears to violate UCLA regulations).

Allow me to express my hope that your department will come forward with a candid statement on the appropriateness of the Schniedewind/Cargill presentation ("world's first", no mention of either of the previous films), providing, if necessary, details on the substance and dates of any correspondence that Dr. Schniedewind may have had with Dr. Rohrhirsch and/or anyone at the University of the Holy Land concerning these films, so that the public can form a proper understanding of the sequence of

events and claims being made.

With best wishes,

Josh Reznick

Never miss a thing. Make Yahoo your homepage.

Subject: Defender of UCLA research team accuses historian of copyright violation

From: steve Frankel <frankel.steve@yahoo.com>

Date: Thu, 27 Mar 2008 19:15:53 -0700 (PDT)

To: anahidk@humnet.ucla.edu, banani@ucla.edu, band@humnet.ucla.edu, bodrogli@humnet.ucla.edu, boustan@history.ucla.edu, buccella@ucla.edu, burke@humnet.ucla.edu, cbakhos@humnet.ucla.edu, cooperso@humnet.ucla.edu, cove@humnet.ucla.edu, dhirsch@library.ucla.edu, dieleman@humnet.ucla.edu, englund@ucla.edu, fishbein@humnet.ucla.edu, hagigile@ucla.edu, hakak@humnet.ucla.edu, h davidso@ucla.edu, hschmidt@ucla.edu, jaeckel@humnet.ucla.edu, nahid@humnet.ucla.edu, nezer@humnet.ucla.edu, poonawal@humnet.ucla.edu, sabar@humnet.ucla.edu, shayegan@humnet.ucla.edu, ssly@anthro.ucla.edu, wendrich@humnet.ucla.edu, ziai@humnet.ucla.edu
CC: ssly@anthro.ucla.edu

Dear Near Eastern Languages department members,

A University of Chicago historian has now been accused of copyright violation by one of your colleagues, in the course of defending a member of your department and his student with respect to their decision "never to write down" a secret, unidentified third reason, etc. I have also read a response, that there is no copyright violation due to a "fair use" principle. I urge you once again to look into this entire matter, as an extremely ugly fight about it has broken out on the internet. Surely UCLA should issue some kind of statement on this issue? Was it appropriate not to write down the reason? Will the reason be made public pursuant to departmental policy?

Start here and read down the page:

<http://iidb.infidels.org/vbb/showthread.php?p=5234236#post5234236>

Best,

S. Frankel

Be a better friend, newshound, and know-it-all with Yahoo! Mobile. [Try it now.](#)

Subject: Dr. Ehrman's statement
From: "Albert White" <albert.white3@gmail.com>
Date: Sun, 20 Jul 2008 22:20:06 -0400
To: dcampbell@div.duke.edu

It looks like Bart Ehrman over at UNC has gone and put his foot in his mouth again.

Are we going to have to take on filth from the Jewish Museum? I'm seeing this crop up everywhere on the web.

<http://biblicalraleigh.wordpress.com/2008/07/17/unc-professor-admits-hes-not-a-scrolls-expert-defends-biased-museum-exhibit/>

<http://tidb.infidels.org/vbb/showthread.php?t=248365> (scroll down)

Best,

Albert White, Ph.D.

On Sun, Feb 8, 2009 at 7:55 PM, Emily Kaufman <kaufman.emily1@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Professor Carter,

A student in your department, who prepared a film being shown in Dead Sea Scrolls exhibits, is now involved in deleting information about the controversy surrounding those exhibits from wikipedia articles. He uses the pen-name "XKV8R" to this end -- see his user-page at <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/User:IsraelXKV8R>, and compare his edits and statements at [http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Dead Sea scrolls&action=history](http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Dead_Sea Scrolls&action=history)

This activity is inappropriate for a Ph.D. candidate at UCLA. It is also inappropriate for the student in question, because he has a conflict of interest, having been personally involved in preparation of material used in the exhibits.

I hope you will take measures to stop "XKV8R" from inappropriately interfering in the contributions I and other authors have been making to the wikipedia article on the Dead Sea Scrolls. It is annoying to us to see our work suddenly disappear under one pretext or another, simply because "XKV8R" is trying to suppress any discussion of a controversy surrounding exhibits in whose preparation he has played a role.

Yours sincerely,

Emily Kaufman

Subject:

From: Simon Adler <simon.adler2@gmail.com>

Date: Tue, 3 Mar 2009 18:37:20 -0500

Dear Dean ,

As a Jewish alumnus of UCLA, I wish to draw your attention to a thinly veiled polemic directed against an eminent Jewish historian, posted on the internet by a certain Robert Cargill, a Christian minister and former senior manager at Christianity.com, who now presents himself as an adjunct professor at UCLA who recently received a Ph.D. from the Department of Near Eastern Languages.

Dr. Cargill's curriculum vitae, posted on his personal website, states that he currently teaches at UCLA and at Azuza Pacific, a "Christian college" located in Azuza, CA. The curriculum vitae explains that Dr. Cargill received a Ph.D. not for work of a philological, linguistic or historical nature (as one would expect in the NEL department), but for a computer-generated remodeling project dealing with the archaeological site of Qumran.

Now if you look at the polemic posted by Dr. Cargill, you will see that it presents itself as a serious investigation into a variety of internet postings, all of which -- or so Dr. Cargill claims, without any substantiating proof that I can see, apart from the mere fact that Dr. Cargill has assembled them -- are the writings of one individual. But when one begins to give this material a closer read, it quickly becomes apparent that Dr. Cargill's fundamental aim is to disparage a well-known Jewish historian.

Thus, we read that "the alias 'Charles Gadda' is one of over 60 anonymous internet aliases dedicated to the advocacy and defense of the academic theories of Dr. Norman Golb, the Ludwig Rosenberger Professor of Jewish History and Civilization at the University of Chicago's Oriental Institute." Then we read: "All of the material you see here is the product of one individual. This puppet master is highly knowledgeable of the theories, life, history, and publications ... of Dr. Norman Golb of the University of Chicago's distinguished Oriental Institute. This individual has created over 60 aliases that have all been employed in the defense and promotion of the views of Dr. Norman Golb. Additionally, this individual has spared no effort in attempting to defame, discredit, and attack any and all scholars that disagree with Dr. Golb."

The problem with these assertions, is that they are all quite visibly unsubstantiated and untrue. For example, I followed Mr. Cargill's links to the page of articles posted by "Charles Gadda," and I find there, for example, a discussion entitled "Antisemitism and the Dead Sea Scrolls." To be sure, the article briefly cites an editorial by Dr. Golb among other sources, but one can hardly say that it is "dedicated to the advocacy and defense of the academic theories of Dr. Norman Golb."

Another article by the same author is entitled "Full-page New York Times ad sneers at Jews," and does not appear to cite Dr. Golb at all or have anything to do with the Dead Sea Scrolls or indeed any other Jewish historical topics. Still other articles appear to be critical of a series of exhibitions dealing with the Dead Sea Scrolls; these articles again cite Golb among other sources, but the point the author is clearly seeking to make is that, in his view, the exhibitions have failed to accurately present current research in this field of studies, including the views of a variety of Israeli archaeologists and historians. How does the listing of Dr. Golb among other sources amount to a "defense and promotion" of this scholar's views? How does any of this demonstrate knowledge of the "life" and "history" of Dr. Golb?

Nor do the articles appear to "defame" anyone, let alone "all scholars that disagree with Dr. Golb." Rather, their author is apparently someone who is concerned with various manifestations of anti-semitism in our intellectual culture, and who (unsurprisingly) has read either some of Dr. Golb's publications, or else simply the various newspaper articles describing them which he cites.

Unfortunately, Dr. Cargill's distorted presentation of the "evidence" he has gathered makes it quite clear that his goal here is not to establish the truth, but specifically to impugn the reputation of one of our nation's principal Jewish scholars, by somehow associating him, through unproven innuendos and suggestions, with controversial internet postings.

I for one find it upsetting to read such material, coming from an individual who presents himself as a Christian scholar associated with UCLA and Azuza Pacific. Furthermore, since this attack against Dr. Golb is of a gratuitous, obsessive and indeed somewhat irrational nature, one must wonder whether the young man who saw fit to post it has not risked damaging his career in doing so. What were his motivations? In this regard, surely it must be hoped that Mr. Cargill did not post such an item at the behest of someone teaching at UCLA, and that his departmental advisors will counsel him on whether he should associate himself, and by consequence UCLA, with this type of personal polemic directed against a distinguished Hebraist.

Finally, I must point out to you that Azuza Pacific has issued a "faith statement" that contains language of this sort: "We believe in the ... total moral depravity of humanity, resulting in our exceeding sinfulness and lost estate, and necessitating our regeneration by the Holy Spirit." The statement says that Azuza "expects faculty and staff not only to believe in such tenets, but to practice them in daily living." Surely one must also hope that Dr. Cargill is not inculcating such tenets in his adjunct classes at UCLA.

With best regards,

Subject: material posted by UCLA adjunct professor
From: David Kaplan <david88kaplan@gmail.com>
Date: Tue, 3 Mar 2009 20:20:40 -0500
To: stowell@humnet.ucla.edu, tstowell@college.ucla.edu

Dear Dean Stowell,

As an alumnus of Berkely who has a great deal of respect for UCLA, I feel it is my duty to draw your attention to a polemic directed against a Jewish scholar, posted on the internet by one Robert Cargill, who presents himself as an adjunct professor and recent recipient of a Ph.D. from the UCLA Department of Near Eastern Languages.

Dr. Cargill's curriculum vitae, posted on his website, states that he is a Christian minister and former senior manager at Christianity.com, and that he currently teaches not only at UCLA, but also at a Christian college called Azuza Pacific. The curriculum explains that Dr. Cargill received his doctoral degree not for research of a philological, linguistic or historical nature (as one might perhaps expect in a department of Near Eastern Languages), but for a computer-generated modeling project presenting a reconstruction of the archaeological site of Qumran.

Now if you look at the polemic posted by Dr. Cargill, you will see that it presents itself as a serious investigation into a variety of internet postings, all of which -- or so Dr. Cargill claims, without any clear substantiating proof that I can make out, apart from the mere fact that he has assembled them -- are the writings of one individual. But when one begins to give this material a closer read, it quickly becomes apparent that Dr. Cargill's true aim is to attack, by association and innuendo, a well-known Jewish scholar.

Thus, Dr. Cargill's central claim is that "the alias 'Charles Gadda' is one of over 60 anonymous internet aliases dedicated to the advocacy and defense of the academic theories of Dr. Norman Golb, the Ludwig Rosenberger Professor of Jewish History and Civilization at the University of Chicago's Oriental Institute." Then he concludes that "all of the material you see here is the product of one individual. This puppet master is highly knowledgeable of the theories, life, history, and publications ... of Dr. Norman Golb of the University of Chicago's distinguished Oriental Institute. This individual has created over 60 aliases that have all been employed in the defense and promotion of the views of Dr. Norman Golb. Additionally, this individual has spared no effort in attempting to defame, discredit, and attack any and all scholars that disagree with Dr. Golb."

The problem with these assertions, is that they are nearly all quite visibly unsubstantiated and untrue. For example, follow Dr. Cargill's links to the page of articles posted by "Charles Gadda." This author is apparently concerned with various manifestations of anti-semitism in our intellectual culture. There is, for example, an article entitled Antisemitism and the Dead Sea Scrolls, which briefly cites an editorial by Dr. Golb among other sources, but can hardly be described as "dedicated to the advocacy and defense of the academic theories of Dr. Norman Golb."

Another article by the same author is entitled Full-page New York Times Ad Sneers at Jews, and does not appear to cite Dr. Golb at all. Idem for the Peddling of Religious Sensationalism in America. One article is critical of Sarah Palin. Still others appear to be critical of a series of exhibitions dealing with the Dead Sea Scrolls; the point the author is apparently seeking to make is that, in his view, the exhibitions have failed to accurately present "current research" -- not merely of Dr. Golb, but of all

kinds of Israeli scholars as well, who the author enumerates and to whose writings he provides links and references.

What is not clear, is how any of this amounts to a "dedication to the defense and promotion" of Dr. Golb's views, or how it demonstrates a knowledge of Dr. Golb's "life" and "history." Unfortunately, Dr. Cargill's distorted presentation of the information he has gathered makes it quite clear that his goal here is not to establish the truth, but specifically to smear the reputation of one of our nation's principal Jewish scholars, by somehow associating him, through unproven innuendos and suggestions, with controversial internet postings.

I for one find it peculiar and discomfiting to read material in such poor taste, coming from a person who presents himself as a Christian scholar associated with both UCLA and Azuza Pacific. Furthermore, since the attack is of a gratuitous, obsessive and indeed somewhat irrational nature, one must wonder whether the zealous young man who posted it has not risked damaging his career in doing so. What were his motivations? In this regard, it must be hoped that Dr. Cargill, the former senior manager at Christianity.com, did not post this information for a member of the Near Eastern Languages department at UCLA, and that his departmental advisers will counsel him on whether he should associate himself, and by consequence UCLA, with this type of hateful personal polemic.

Finally, I also feel obliged to point out to you that Azuza Pacific has issued a "faith statement," which you can read at the link I provided above. Here is a brief excerpt: "We believe in the ... total moral depravity of humanity, resulting in our exceeding sinfulness and lost estate, and necessitating our regeneration by the Holy Spirit." The statement says that Azuza "expects faculty and staff not only to believe in such tenets, but to practice them in daily living." I assume that UCLA takes steps to ensure that Christian ministers such as Dr. Cargill do not "practice" such tenets in their adjunct classes at UCLA, but you may wish to consider this as well.

Yours sincerely,

David Kaplan

Subject: The great Stephen Goranson, and your genizah theory
From: Carlo Gadda <carlogadda@yahoo.com>
Date: Tue, 22 Aug 2006 12:54:18 -0700 (PDT)
To: dastacey@tiscali.co.uk

Dear David Stacey,

I was amused to read that the great genius Stephen Goranson remains steadfast in his conviction that "several" Dead Sea scrolls were written by the Essenes -- ha-ha-ha-ha-ha!

I was also interested to read about your "genizah" theory. If so, this would be the only genizah ever discovered which consists virtually in its entirety of scribal copies of literary texts. See, e.g., N. Golb's detailed description of the contents of the Cairo Genizah in his book (which for some bizarre reason is missing from the bibliography in your article on the "Archaeological Context of Qumran"). Where, among the scrolls found in the caves near Qumran, is the correspondence? Where are the contracts? Where are the other historical documents that automatically end up in a genizah? Was (pre-Bar-Kokhba) Palestian Jewry so impoverished that it didn't possess such documents?

Your genizah theory, of course, is also obliged to treat the Copper Scroll as an unrelated case, having no connection with the other scrolls even though it describes "books" as being hidden alongside several of the other treasure deposits listed in its columns.

This is precisely why Golb's theory remains the most powerful explanation of these stunning finds -- it situates them in the context of the major historical events of that period. What is clear is that Goranson and others (including, I believe, yourself) are, forgive the term, squirming about trying to ~~find a way to preserve some remnant of the Qumran-sectarian theory -- what you have all failed to~~ realize is that once the idea of an organic connection between Qumran and the scrolls collapses, the sectarian hypothesis simply becomes unnecessary and will eventually be dumped. This, in my view, is the difference between serious scholarship and light-weight affirmations whose only claim to our attention is that they are not entirely implausible.

Charles Gadda (New York)

Talk is cheap. Use Yahoo! Messenger to make PC-to-Phone calls. Great rates starting at 1¢/min.

Subject: Stephen Goranson
From: <carlogadda@yahoo.com>
Date: Fri, 8 Jun 2007 15:26:01 -0700 (PDT)
To: blog@ntgateway.com

Dear Professor Goodacre,

I am wondering if you have ever met Stephen Goranson, who received a Ph.D. from the Duke University Department of Religion in 1990, but is said to work in "stacks maintenance" at the library there. Some people are saying that the fellow of that name working at the library doesn't "exist" or is merely a front for someone else. I don't feel that it's fair to make such an accusation unless it's true. Therefore, I would appreciate it if you could confirm that you have actually met him and that he does exist.

Charles Gadda

P.s. (Never heard from anyone on my response to Stephen Goranson)

Subject: P.s. (Never heard from anyone on my response to Stephen Goranson)
From: paul kessler <kessler_paul@yahoo.com>
Date: Tue, 12 Feb 2008 14:06:59 -0800 (PST)
To: Niels Peter Lemche <np13867@yahoo.co.uk>

Niels,

Incidentally, I assume that my response to Stephen Goranson's item on new publications by Puech, Yardeni, etc., was not approved because it reopened the Qumran discussion. Stephen, however, did not simply inform readers of new publications. Rather, he reopened the Qumran discussion himself by lacing his message with his own observations (ones that in my view were highly misleading) on the significance of those publications. Stephen's job as a librarian allows him to spot new publications before others do, so it's good to be notified about them by him. But it doesn't seem fair that he should be allowed to take advantage of his position by introducing comments at the expense of other people who don't share his opinions on Qumran.

Best,

Paul Kessler

Niels Peter Lemche <np13867@yahoo.co.uk> wrote:

Paul,

~~you cannot condemn a huge organization like SBL on the basis of one incident like this. It is a huge organization with a lot of branches and interests.~~ I see no reason to start a futile discussion about it here. Maybe Jim West's list will be more interested. To ANE people it is of less than peripheral interest.

Niels Peter Lemche

> After reading about what happened at the previous SBL meeting, I am
> a

> bit hesitant about attending a gathering of this organization. See

> <http://tinyurl.com/yptu8x>

>

> Paul Kessler (NY)

>

> --- In ANE-2@yahoogroups.com, "richardhbeal"

wrote:

>>

>> Colleagues,

>>

>> The program for the 2008 Midwest AOS/ASOR/SBL meeting (Feb. 15-17

at

>> Olivet Nazarene University, Bourbonnais, IL) is available for your

>> viewing pleasure on the Midwest SBL site (www.midwestsbl.org);
click
>> (twice, if need be) the program and abstracts button.
>>
>> Please post and distribute as appropriate, and pardon all cross-
> postings.
>>
>> Sincerely,
>>
>> JoAnn Scurlock
>> Secretary-Treasurer
>>

Be a better friend, newshound, and know-it-all with Yahoo! Mobile. Try it now.

statements posted by one of your staff members

Subject: statements posted by one of your staff members
From: Peter Kaufman <peter.kaufman2@yahoo.com>
Date: Tue, 1 Jul 2008 14:38:49 -0700 (PDT)
To: michael.finigan@duke.edu

Dear Dr. Finigan,

I am writing to express how dismayed I am to see, on a Raleigh-area newsite, that Stephen Goranson, one of your stacks maintenance employees, has begun to post offensive statements about historian Norman Golb (a Jewish historian teaching at the University of Chicago) and members of his family.

From what I understand, Dr. Goranson, who received a degree from the Duke University Department of Religion, has already been blocked from several internet forums on account of his personal attacks against various scholars.

Although I am loathe to recommend any course of action to you, perhaps you might consider whether it is appropriate for a Duke employee to engage in such conduct. I am particularly worried it will now be suggested that Dr. Goranson is acting at the behest of faculty members at Duke.

See http://www.newsobserver.com/front/story/1123440.html?addcomment=true;#recent_comm

With best wishes,

Peter Kaufman, Ph.D.

statements posted by a Duke employee

Subject: statements posted by a Duke employee
From: Peter Kaufman <peter.kaufman2@yahoo.com>
Date: Tue, 1 Jul 2008 14:53:12 -0700 (PDT)
To: peter.lange@duke.edu

Dear Provost Lange,

I am writing to express how dismayed I am to see, on a Raleigh-area newsite, that Stephen Goranson, an employee of the Duke University library, has begun to post offensive statements about historian Norman Golb (a Jewish historian teaching at the University of Chicago) and members of his family.

From what I understand, Dr. Goranson, who received a degree from the Duke University Department of Religion but does not hold a teaching position, has already been blocked from several internet forums on account of his personal attacks against various scholars.

Although I am loathe to recommend any course of action to you, perhaps you might wish to consider whether it is appropriate for a Duke employee to engage in such conduct. I am particularly worried it will now be suggested that Dr. Goranson is acting at the behest of faculty members at Duke.

See http://www.newsobserver.com/front/story/1123440.html?addcomment=true;#recent_comm

With best wishes,

Peter Kaufman, Ph.D.

Subject: Statements posted by a Duke employee
From: Peter Kaufman <peter.kaufman2@yahoo.com>
Date: Tue, 1 Jul 2008 14:57:20 -0700 (PDT)
To: president@duke.edu

Dear President Brodhead,

I am writing to express how dismayed I am to see, on a Raleigh-area newsite, that an employee of the Duke University library has begun to post offensive statements about historian Norman Golb (a Jewish historian teaching at the University of Chicago) and members of his family.

From what I understand, Stephen Goranson, who received a degree from the Duke University Department of Religion but does not hold a teaching position, has already been blocked from several internet forums on account of his personal attacks against various scholars.

Although I am loathe to recommend any course of action to you, perhaps you might wish to consider whether it is appropriate for a Duke employee to engage in such conduct. I am particularly worried it will now be suggested that Dr. Goranson is acting at the behest of faculty members at Duke.

See [http://www.newsobserver.com/front/story/1123440.html?addcomment=true;#recent comm](http://www.newsobserver.com/front/story/1123440.html?addcomment=true;#recent_comm)

With best wishes,

Peter Kaufman, Ph.D.

Subject: Statements posted by a Duke employee
From: Peter Kaufman <peter.kaufman2@yahoo.com>
Date: Tue, 1 Jul 2008 15:02:24 -0700 (PDT)
To: john.burness@duke.edu

Dear Dr. Burness,

I am writing to express how dismayed I am to see, on a Raleigh-area newsite, that an employee of the Duke University library has started to post offensive statements about historian Norman Golb (a Jewish historian teaching at the University of Chicago) and members of his family.

From what I understand, Stephen Goranson, who received a degree from the Duke University Department of Religion but does not hold a teaching position, has already been blocked from several internet forums on account of his personal attacks against various scholars.

Although I am loathe to recommend any course of action to you, perhaps you might wish to consider whether it is appropriate for a Duke employee to engage in such conduct without the University issuing a statement disassociating itself from the tenor of the remarks being made. I am particularly worried it will now be suggested that Dr. Goranson is acting at the behest of faculty members at Duke.

See [http://www.newsobserver.com/front/story/1123440.html?addcomment=true;#recent comm](http://www.newsobserver.com/front/story/1123440.html?addcomment=true;#recent_comm)

With best wishes,

Peter Kaufman, Ph.D.

Subject: Re: statements posted by a Duke employee.
From: Peter Kaufman <peter.kaufman2@yahoo.com>
Date: Tue, 8 Jul 2008 17:50:25 -0700 (PDT)
To: Peter Lange <Peter.Lange@duke.edu>

Dear Provost Lange,

As a purely legal matter, I'm sure what you say is true; but it would still undoubtedly be in Duke's best interests if Mr. Goranson could be prevailed upon to moderate his tone and avoid unseemly personal attacks on a respected historian of Jewish civilization.

At any rate, I certainly hope he will make it clear that he is speaking as a private citizen, because he keeps asserting his opinions in an authoritative tone and posting a link to his Duke University website which will lead many readers to erroneously conclude that he has an academic position at Duke. (It is a bit unsettling, I might add, to see that such a website has been granted to a stacks maintenance employee well known for his abusive conduct on the internet.)

Best,

Peter Kaufman, Ph.D.

----- Original Message -----

From: Peter Lange <Peter.Lange@duke.edu>
To: Peter Kaufman <peter.kaufman2@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 8, 2008 1:30:46 PM
Subject: Re: statements posted by a Duke employee

Dear Dr. Kaufman,

Thank you for your email regarding statements made by Dr. Goranson, an employee of the Duke Library system. I appreciate your bringing this matter to my attention and am grateful for your concern not only about the content of his speech, but of its possible effect on Duke as well.

As I hope you can understand, Duke does not restrict the speech of its employees as long as they make it clear that they are speaking as private citizens, not as spokespersons of the University. In this instance, it does not appear that Dr. Goranson has crossed that line.

Please know that while no action can be taken at this time, I do greatly appreciate your contacting me about this situation.

Peter Lange

Peter Lange
Provost
Duke University
919-684-2378 (phone)
919-684-4421 (fax)

Peter Kaufman
<peter.kaufman2@yahoo.com>

To peter.lange@duke.edu
cc

07/01/2008 05:53 PM

Subject statements posted by a Duke employee

Dear Provost Lange,

I am writing to express how dismayed I am to see, on a Raleigh-area newsite, that Stephen Goranson, an employee of the Duke University library, has begun to post offensive statements about historian Norman Golb (a Jewish historian teaching at the University of Chicago) and members of his family.

From what I understand, Dr. Goranson, who received a degree from the Duke University Department of Religion but does not hold a teaching position, has already been blocked from several internet forums on account of his personal attacks against various scholars.

Although I am loathe to recommend any course of action to you, perhaps you might wish to consider whether it is appropriate for a Duke employee to engage in such conduct. I am particularly worried it will now be suggested that Dr. Goranson is acting at the behest of faculty members at Duke.

See [http://www.newsobserver.com/front/story/1123440.html?addcomment=true;#recent comm](http://www.newsobserver.com/front/story/1123440.html?addcomment=true;#recent_comm)

With best wishes,

Peter Kaufman, Ph.D.

18 - 15

Fw: statements posted by a Duke employee

Subject: Fw: statements posted by a Duke employee
From: Peter Kaufman <peter.kaufman2@yahoo.com>
Date: Tue, 8 Jul 2008 19:59:25 -0700 (PDT)
To: j.golb@snaflu.de

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Peter Lange [Provost of Duke University]
To: Peter Kaufman <peter.kaufman2@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 8, 2008 8:54:19 PM
Subject: Re: statements posted by a Duke employee

Dr. Kaufman,

He is being spoken to by his supervisor and advised of his obligations and of the matters of which he should be aware.

Again, thanks for your interest and concern.

Peter Lange

Peter Lange
Provost
Duke University
919-684-2378 (phone)
919-684-4421 (fax)

Peter Kaufman
<peter.kaufman2@yahoo.com>

07/08/2008 08:50 PM

To Peter Lange <Peter.Lange@duke.edu>
cc

Subject Re: statements posted by a Duke employee

Dear Provost Lange,

As a purely legal matter, I'm sure what you say is true; but it would still undoubtedly be in Duke's best interests if Mr. Goranson could be prevailed upon to moderate his tone and avoid unseemly personal attacks on a respected historian of Jewish civilization.

At any rate, I certainly hope he will make it clear that he is speaking as a private citizen, because he keeps asserting his opinions in an authoritative tone and posting a link to his Duke University website which will lead many readers to erroneously conclude that he has an academic position at Duke. (It is a bit unsettling, I might add, to see that such a website has been granted to a stacks maintenance employee well known for his abusive conduct on the internet.)

Best,

Peter Kaufman, Ph.D.

----- Original Message -----

From: Peter Lange <Peter.Lange@duke.edu>
To: Peter Kaufman <peter.kaufman2@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 8, 2008 1:30:46 PM
Subject: Re: statements posted by a Duke employee

Dear Dr. Kaufman,

Thank you for your email regarding statements made by Dr. Goranson, an employee of the Duke Library system. I appreciate your bringing this matter to my attention and am grateful for your concern not only about the content of his speech, but of its possible effect on Duke as well.

As I hope you can understand, Duke does not restrict the speech of its employees as long as they make it clear that they are speaking as private citizens, not as spokespersons of the University. In this instance, it does not appear that Dr. Goranson has crossed that line.

Please know that while no action can be taken at this time, I do greatly appreciate your contacting me about this situation.

Peter Lange

Peter Lange
Provost
Duke University
919-684-2378 (phone)
919-684-4421 (fax)

Peter Kaufman <peter.kaufman2@yahoo.com>

07/01/2008 05:53 PM

To peter.lange@duke.edu

cc

Subject statements posted by a Duke employee

Dear Provost Lange,

I am writing to express how dismayed I am to see, on a Raleigh-area newsite, that Stephen Goranson, an employee of the Duke University library, has begun to post offensive statements about historian Norman Golb (a Jewish historian teaching at the University of Chicago) and members of his family.

From what I understand, Dr. Goranson, who received a degree from the Duke University Department

Subject: Dead Sea Scrolls
From: "Simon Adler" <simon.adler2@gmail.com>
Date: Tue, 2 Dec 2008 21:33:27 -0500
To: lloyd@duke.edu

Dear Professor Bailey,

I saw your web statement on the Essene theory being largely discredited, and my immediate reaction was: finally, a known American academic has had the courage and decency to speak out, instead of guarding a careful silence like everyone else.

In this regard, I would be interested to know if you are aware that for the past ten years, an employee at the Duke University library has been using the computer system there to publish demeaning and in part defamatory personal attacks against Norman Golb and members of his family -- e.g., "no evidence" but only "a sense of grievance" supports his view, those who support him are merely his "sock puppets," etc. These remarks have continued unchecked, and many of us have been under the impression that the individual in question, who always injects an offensive personal tone into his statements, is doing so at the behest of members of the department of religion at Duke.

A friend of mine wrote to someone at Duke about this, and received a response to the effect that Duke's employee is not speaking for Duke, but only for himself. Yet he is an employee, using the library system there to publish these offensive attacks against a perfectly decent person -- is it normal that such conduct is tolerated in an institution such as Duke?

Best

Simon Adler

Subject: Re: Jesus tomb
From: Carlo Gadda <carlogadda@yahoo.com>
Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2007 13:32:40 -0700 (PDT)
To: Brian Bethune <Brian.Bethune@macleans.rogers.com>

Dear Mr. Bethune,

Thanks for your response to my letter. Rest assured, to begin with, that I am a secular, scientific-minded person and have no interest in the typical "war-of-religions" slant being given to this issue by the media.

That being said, despite what you state, I do not believe you pressed the makers of this film hard enough on two fundamental questions:

(1) why did they not do DNA analyses on the other ossuaries. The explanation given by Jacobovici to the New York Times was: "Were not scientists. At the end of the day we can't wait till every ossuary is tested for DNA. We took the story that far. At some point you have to say, I've done my job as a journalist." Don't you see that there is something terribly wrong with this explanation? If they could test two, why could they not test five, six, or all of them? And if further DNA analyses had shown that none of the buried individuals were related, would there have been any film to make at all? Yes, perhaps they believe in what they are saying and in that sense the film is not a hoax; but nonetheless, surely you see my point.

(2) Both "Hunan" and "Yeshua" are merely guesses; one could even try and see the word "Shimeon" there, if the X-like marking to the right is read, not as a "cross," but as a shin with one of the vertical strokes missing (or eroded). The worst aspect of this, is the cavalier manner in which the claim is being made. Frank Cross, for example, thumbs through the various readings in the film, professorially assenting to all of them, but he does not explain this particular reading. They needed to do much more than that -- they needed to show which letter is which, i.e., exactly where they are trying to read each of the characters constituting the name "Yeshua" in the inscription.

My opinion is that it is all speculation, and you should have asked additional Hebrew paleographers if they think the inscription is legible, before giving credence to this claim. The catalogue contains many other illegible inscriptions of the sort which people have never been able to make sense of. This is, in fact, normal given the effects of weather over the centuries, and the various guesses of the original transcriber have never been considered important simply because historically significant, controversial claims like the one made in this film were not previously based on them.

Incidentally, I highly recommend that you read Norman Golb's most recent (2007) article on the University of Chicago web-site, I believe you may have a different opinion of Frank Cross (to say nothing of James Tabor) after you do so, given what that article reveals about his improper paleographical treatment of the famous Qumran ostrakon (the photographs are quite revealing).

Best,

Charles Gadda

Brian Bethune <Brian.Bethune@macleans.rogers.com> wrote:

Dear Mr. Gadda:

First, let me apologize if, as I suspect, I just sent you an empty email. I'm working from home right now, and haven't quite mastered the work-email-by-remote technology. My previous try simply disappeared from the screen moments ago, and may have headed to you.

That said, thank you for your email.

In response, I must reply that the tomb claim is no hoax. Its proponents may be—quite likely, are—dead wrong in their claims, but I have met and spoken to them and I have no doubt of their sincerity. They have spun, indeed torqued, the evidence that favours their side (as have their opponents), but no one has forged anything or snuck genuine items from other excavations into this one.

Secondly, the claim that the Yeshua reading is "at best remote" won't fly either. Amos Kloner did put a question mark after it in his 1996 site report because of its faint tracing, but Yeshua still represented his best, not wildest, conjecture—one supported by other inscription experts in the film and book (including Frank Moore Cross) and further supported, Kloner noted at the time, by the perfectly clear Juda son of Yeshua reading on that ossuary. Nor did Kloner dispute the reading in 1996, when it was first raised by the BBC.

In addition, the fact that the names in the tomb were utterly common in first-century Jerusalem is the best counter-argument against the filmmakers' claims; if we're going to follow the same sort "odds favour" argument on that one inscription, then it's far more likely it reads Yeshua (sixth most common name of the era) than the relatively rare Hunan.

Sincerely,

Brian Bethune

Don't be flakey. Get Yahoo! Mail for Mobile and always stay connected to friends.

Subject: More on San Diego exhibit
From: Carlo Gadda <carlogadda@yahoo.com>
Date: Sat, 22 Sep 2007 00:12:01 -0700 (PDT)
To: sdheritage@cox.net

Dear Mr. Harrison,

You may wish to have a look at the new version of my article (<http://www.nowpublic.com/culture/christian-fundamentalism-and-dead-sea-scrolls-san-diego>) on the Scrolls exhibit. I believe I have now presented the case in a more convincing manner.

I had forgotten to point out, for example, that David Noel Freedman, one of the "lunch trio" that led to the creation of the exhibit, has been a Presbyterian minister since 1944 (although his parents were Eastern European Jewish immigrants).

Thus, in terms of religious background and training, we now have:

- Freedman: Presbyterian minister, member of original Dead Sea Scrolls monopoly
- Fields: Th.D., Holy Land University network, also connected with monopoly
- Schniedewind: Holy Land University network
- Cargill: ministerial degree from Pepperdine (Churches of Christ)

these four being directly involved in the exhibit, to whom we may add their evangelical colleagues who have been involved in other recent exhibits:

- James Tabor (M.A. Pepperdine, "Jesus Tomb" and "Essene toilet" claims)
- Joe Zias (Holy Land network, "Essene toilet" claim)
- Randall Price (World of Bible Ministries)

With respect to Freedman, we must also mention his devout Christian collaborators:

- Father Roland de Vaux (Dominican priest, promoter of Qumran-Essene theory, member of original monopoly team)
- Frank Cross (Bachelor of Divinity from McCormick Theological Seminary, professor at Harvard Divinity School, member of original monopoly team)
- Pam Fox Kuhlken (ministerial degrees from Pepperdine and Bethel Seminary)

And this is only a partial list (among many others, one could add, e.g., the Dominicans of the Ecole Biblique in Jerusalem, or people like Stephen Pfann, David Bivin and Todd Bolen of the Holy Land network; see my article and the additional comments added to it for details).

All of these people appear to be religiously convinced that the "beliefs, literature and men of the Essene community" were a "vital part of the fabric of Jesus' world." In addition, at least some (and perhaps all) of them appear to believe that on account of "disobedience ... Israel was temporarily set aside ... but will again be awakened through repentance [i.e., conversion of the Jews to Christianity] to enter into the land of blessing." (See the additional comments added to my article for details).

At the same time, a series of major Jewish and Israeli historians and archaeologists who disagree with Freedman and his Christian colleagues have simply been excluded, the only explanation offered

being that "you don't want to confuse people with all these theories." The excluded scholars believe that no Essenes lived at Qumran, that the Scrolls came from the Jewish capital and, as Golb puts it, that the "complex history of the Palestinian Jews on the eve of the First Revolt is being pushed aside in favor of a bizarre, Christologically colored thesis."

The only Jewish person I can think of involved in creating the exhibit is Dr. Risa Levitt Kohn (I'm assuming that she is indeed Jewish), who only recently completed her Ph.D., has difficult career choices to make and is no doubt following advice given to her by Freedman and the others.

I believe these facts speak for themselves. While there is certainly no easy answer to the "why it matters" question, we are clearly dealing with an exhibition tainted, at the very least, by intellectual antisemitism, and with biased conduct that is abhorrent to our basic social sentiments and to the principle of freedom of inquiry which lies at the core of our system of values.

This has obviously been going on for many years, and for a variety of reasons ranging from general distaste to fear for one's career, everyone has always delicately passed it over in silence. I am glad to have offered the facts for anyone to see, and will continue (perhaps naively) to hope that from now on, there will always be a doubt in these people's minds as to how much longer they can get away with it without the little allegations dogging them finally blowing up into something that people take seriously.

With best regards,

Charles Gadda

Check out the hottest 2008 models today at Yahoo! Autos.

Subject: Re: Message not approved: Fw: [agade] NOTICES: Remembering D.N. Freedman
From: paul kessler <kessler_paul@yahoo.com>
Date: Sat, 12 Apr 2008 11:38:17 -0700 (PDT)
To: Niels Peter Lemche <np13867@yahoo.co.uk>

You're right, and I'm somewhat ashamed of having submitted the comment (although BAR also contributes nothing to scholarship).

Niels Peter Lemche <np13867@yahoo.co.uk> wrote:

It is personal, contributes nothing to scholarship and includes a number of allegations against a third part not here.

Niels Peter Lemche

> --- In ANE-2@yahoogroups.com, "Peter T. Daniels"
> wrote:
>>
>> If this does not seal Hershel Shanks's reputation as a fool,
> nothing will. How can any scholar of the ancient Near East, or of
> the
>> Bible, conscientiously publish with this fraud?
>>
>
> The answer is simple: amateurs with money are exploiting others,
> and
> being exploited themselves, in a sensationalist manner for
> particular
> ends.
>
> Take a look at the "Foundation for Biblical Archaeology":
>
> <http://www.tfba.org/contact.php#legal>
>
> and look at their preposterous treatment of the Qumran ostrakon:
>
> <http://www.tfba.org/articlespreview.php?articleid=3>
>
> (citing, as if by chance, Biblical Archaeology Review as their
> source, without giving any bibliographical references which would
> enable readers to judge whether what they are saying has any merit
> at
> all).
>
> It's a network, and it's all based on money.
>

- > It should also be said here that dishonest obituaries do credit
- > neither to their authors nor to the deceased. Dr. Freedman wrote
- and
- > co-wrote many works, but he had his failings too. He was part of
- the
- > original Dead Sea Scrolls monopoly, in which capacity, like his
- > colleague Frank Cross and a small coterie of other scholars (most
- of
- > them Christian), he was arbitrarily assigned publication "rights"
- and
- > sat on scrolls for many years (ultimately passing them out to
- > students) while respected scholars around the world were not
- > permitted to see them. Serious obituaries (see, e.g., the New York
- > Times piece on Strugnell) don't shy away from discussing such
- matters.
- >
- > Paul Kessler (NY)

Do You Yahoo!?

Tired of spam? Yahoo! Mail has the best spam protection around
<http://mail.yahoo.com>

Subject: Dr. Ehrman's announcement
From: "Frank Cross" <frank.cross2@gmail.com>
Date: Sun, 20 Jul 2008 21:55:07 -0400
To: tyson@email.unc.edu

It looks like Bart has gone and put his foot in his mouth again.

Are we going to have to take on the Jewish Museum? I'm seeing this crop up everywhere on the web.

<http://biblicalraleigh.wordpress.com/2008/07/17/unc-professor-admits-hes-not-a-scrolls-expert-defends-biased-museum-exhibit/>

<http://iidx.infidels.org/vbb/showthread.php?t=248365> (scroll down)

Best,

Frank Cross

Subject: Dr. Ehrman's announcement
From: "Frank Cross" <frank.cross2@gmail.com>
Date: Sun, 20 Jul 2008 21:56:37 -0400
To: tatweed@email.unc.edu

It looks like Bart has gone and put his foot in his mouth again.

Are we going to have to take on the Jewish Museum? I'm seeing this crop up everywhere on the web.

<http://biblicalraleigh.wordpress.com/2008/07/17/unc-professor-admits-hes-not-a-scrolls-expert-defends-biased-museum-exhibit/>

<http://iidx.infidels.org/vbb/showthread.php?t=248365> (scroll down)

Best,

Frank Cross

Subject: Dr. Ehrman's statement
From: "Frank Cross" <frank.cross2@gmail.com>
Date: Sun, 20 Jul 2008 21:58:03 -0400
To: rstyers@unc.edu

It looks like Bart has gone and put his foot in his mouth again.

Are we going to have to take on the Jewish Museum? I'm seeing this crop up everywhere on the web.

<http://biblicalraleigh.wordpress.com/2008/07/17/unc-professor-admits-hes-not-a-scrolls-expert-defends-biased-museum-exhibit/>

<http://iidb.infidels.org/vbb/showthread.php?t=248365> (scroll down)

Best,

Frank Cross

Dr. Ehrman's statement

Subject: Dr. Ehrman's statement
From: "Frank Cross" <frank.cross2@gmail.com>
Date: Sun, 20 Jul 2008 21:59:26 -0400
To: omid@email.unc.edu

It looks like Bart has gone and put his foot in his mouth again.

Are we going to have to take on the Jewish Museum? I'm seeing this crop up everywhere on the web.

<http://biblicalraleigh.wordpress.com/2008/07/17/unc-professor-admits-hes-not-a-scrolls-expert-defends-biased-museum-exhibit/>

<http://iidb.infidels.org/vbb/showthread.php?t=248365> (scroll down)

Best,

Frank Cross

Subject: Someone just responded to your comment
From: "New Raleigh Admin" <Admin@newraleigh.com>
Date: Sat, 2 Aug 2008 12:12:45 -0700
To: albert.white3@gmail.com

Someone just responded to the entry you subscribed to at:
Articles

The title of the entry is:
Dead Sea Scrolls

You can see the comment at the following URL:
<http://www.newraleigh.com/articles/archive/dead-sea-scrolls/>

Lamar,

Your claim that the museum is "not taking sides" is belied by its own website description of its exhibit, in which over and over again it associates the so-called Qumran "community" (jargon for sect) with authorship of the scrolls. If the museum doesn't want to take sides, why doesn't it change its website description?

As for the biased lecture series, it seems to me that you've come up with clever attempt to conceal the truth, possibly basing yourself on some description you picked up at the museum. Here are the actual facts on the seven remaining lecturers:

1. Emanuel Tov is the head of the Dead Sea scrolls monopoly group. Politely calling him (as you do) "editor in chief" cannot hide this fact. He is deeply involved in creating this biased scrolls exhibit that has been traveling around the country, and he has never allowed any opponents of the Qumran-sectarian theory to participate in his so-called "editorial team" that prepared the 39-volume set to which you refer. In other words, he used his authority to have one of the two basic theories [on which see again the Jewish Museum announcement] of scroll origins excluded from the so-called "definitive" Oxford edition of the scrolls. And he is now doing the same thing with museum exhibits.
2. Pnina Shor of the Israel Antiquities Authority has no scholarly expertise on Qumran or scroll origins, but is involved (like Emanuel Tov) in creating the biased and misleading scrolls exhibit. I'm happy to consider her "neutral" for the sake of the argument, in which case you would have a 6-1 count with one extra neutral party.
3. Eric Meyers, a past president of the American Schools of Oriental Research (ASOR), is an archaeologist and biblical scholar, but (just like Bart Ehrman) has never published anything of substance on Qumran or the Dead Sea scrolls. The question arises why the museum would invite a non-specialist to lecture at such an exhibit, while excluding (with the sole exception of Eilior) a range of major scholars who have rejected the Qumran-sectarian theory. Well, the answer is clear: you can bet your bottom dollar Meyers will be lending his influential name to support the Qumran-sectarian theory. How could he do otherwise? Would he want to risk the benefits he stands to derive from being friends with Emanuel Tov? Such benefits would include, for example, privileged access for Meyers and ASOR to archaeological sites in Israel.
4. Jodi Magness is a doctrinaire defender of the Qumran-sectarian theory, closely tied to the corrupt Dorot Foundation which funds the Shrine of the Book in Jerusalem (where the Qumran-Essene theory is presented to the public as a fact). Magness monopolized the two "archaeology of Qumran" talks at

last year's annual ASOR/SBL conference, and viciously attacked key Israeli archaeologists Yitzhak Magen and Yuval Peleg (opponents of the Qumran-sectarian theory) in at least one of them; there are several on-line accounts of this. Why did the museum invite her, and not Magen and Peleg, who are at the forefront of current archaeological research on Qumran? Is it because she is a member of ASOR's Board of Trustees? Is it because Magen and Peleg conclude, in their published reports, that no sect ever lived at Qumran and that the scrolls are the remains of libraries from the Jerusalem area, taken to the desert for hiding during the siege and sacking of the city by the Romans?

5. Bart Ehrman is a popularizer of New Testament and "Jesus" studies but, like Meyers, he appears to have published nothing on Qumran or the scrolls. Yet the description of his lecture states, ex cathedra, that the Essenes "probably" wrote the scrolls. What gives this non-specialist the right to issue such a statement, given that the question of scroll origins doesn't even fall within his field of studies? He knows Greek, but does he even have any knowledge of Hebrew, let alone a serious scholarly knowledge?

6. I will leave others to decide whether Lawrence Schiffman's conduct amounts to "plagiarism," but it is certainly unethical to use an argument first developed by another scholar without attributing it to him. I myself am more concerned by the fact that he has not been truthful: see the footnote in his book where he falsely attributes the "Jerusalem Temple library" theory to University of Chicago scrolls scholar Norman Golb (who, as is well known, has always carefully and explicitly distinguished his multiple-libraries theory from Rengstorf's Temple theory). Schiffman is known for his convoluted, self-contradictory attempts to demonstrate that the "Qumran sectarians," now thought never to have existed by all kinds of researchers, were Sadducees rather than Essenes. He has a big beard and speaks in a big booming voice as if he were absolutely certain of the truth of what he is saying. This charismatic approach to the Dead Sea Scrolls may appeal to popular audiences, but what's behind it other than a bunch of complicated half-truths?

As to your suggestion that Schiffman cannot be a plagiarist because they allow him to teach in a university, isn't this begging the question? There are many aspects to this scandal, and that is the least of them.

7. Finally, Sidnie White Crawford is a doctrinaire follower of the Qumran-Essene theory (she studied with Essene ideologue Frank Cross). Although a professor of biblical studies (she teaches in Nebraska), it is rumored that once, at one of her talks, she had difficulty pronouncing a non-vocalized Hebrew term that properly trained Hebrew scholars know how to pronounce. When asked to give the Hebrew term for a word from one of the scrolls that she was quoting in English, she is said to have read out the consonants one by one instead of pronouncing the word they represent.

Crawford's lecture description claims that the Damascus Document contains "evidence" that "women participated in the Essene movement." There is no evidence whatsoever, however, that the Damascus Document was written by Essenes. (Some, incidentally, have attempted to argue that the term "Damascus" in the text is a metaphor for Qumran, but this is an unsupported claim that has been rejected by numerous researchers.)

What Crawford has actually been doing in her popular lectures on the "mystery involved in finding women's remains at a supposedly all male Qumran community," is engaging in a misleading attempt to convince people that Pliny erred in saying the Essenes were celibate. While suggesting that the graves of women found at Qumran might actually contain bedouin remains, the main thrust of her lecture will be that since no doctrine of celibacy has been found in the scrolls, the Essenes at Qumran were not celibate. All of this fails to account for the basic problem arising from Pliny's description of the Essenes of the Dead Sea area as celibate. If Pliny is

unreliable, why use him as the source for Essenes at Qumran at all?

So what do we have, Lamar? Mind you, I wouldn't object to this lecture series if, in addition to these various individuals, they also invited their academic opponents; but as it stands the total picture is quite unethical, and I find it difficult to understand why a reasonable, neutral-minded person like you would wish to defend it.

To stop receiving notifications for this comment, click here:
<http://www.newraleigh.com//?ACT=2&id=3797>

Subject: Eileen Schuller's lecture

From: "larry schiffman" <larry.schiffman@gmail.com>

Date: Wed, 6 Aug 2008 18:09:36 -0400

To: pressoffice@thejm.org

Your announcement of Eileen Schuller's lecture on women in the Dead Sea Scrolls has disappeared from the museum's website. Has Dr. Schuller's lecture been cancelled?

Lawrence Schiffman

Subject: Dr. Schuller's lecture
From: "Steven Fishbane" <steven.fishbane@gmail.com>
Date: Wed, 6 Aug 2008 18:14:06 -0400
To: pressoffice@thejm.org

Your announcement of Eileen Schuller's lecture on women in the Dead Sea Scrolls has disappeared from the museum's website. Has Dr. Schuller's lecture been cancelled? Thanks for letting me know so I can make my plans accordingly, as my job requires me to travel a lot.

Steve Fishbane