

THE FIFTH COLUMN WITHIN THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL REALM: THE GREAT DIVIDE

Oscar White MUSCARELLA*

The issues discussed here have been on my mind for a long time, and some have surfaced in earlier publications.¹ Here I expand on them, believing they are appropriate for a Festschrift for Altan Çilingiroğlu, an excellent archaeologist, a fine and honest scholar and teacher, and a dear friend with whom I excavated for seven years at Ayanis on Lake Van. In his honor I address a significant archaeological condition, one regularly avoided or covered up: the contra-archaeological behavior of some archaeologists. Their professional and moral behavior has resulted in the multi-faceted, fractured, and unanchored nature of much of the discipline today.

The Plunder Culture

Most archaeologists are aware of the on-going plunder of sites and concomitant destruction of this planet's history, yet relatively few are actively concerned with terminating the destructions. Gradually more and more information is being published by archaeologists, and by non-professionals in the press or the Internet and in investigative reports and books, thus increasing attention to the topic. Archaeologists who over the years have consistently fought the fight include C. Coggins, E. Negahban – these two were the first archaeologists to call attention to the problem (they converted me), K. D. Vitelli, N. Brodie, R. Elia, E. Herscher, C. Renfrew, D. Graepler, D. Gill, and C. Chippendale. And the number of archaeologists who undertake similar actions in classrooms is increasing. Nevertheless, many archaeologists remain reticent about engaging in vigorous and long-term efforts to stop plundering and collecting activities that are contrary to the nature of their discipline. Their indifference is matched by archaeological organizations in Europe and the United States – viz. the Archeological Institute of America: manifested by the paucity of sponsored lectures and on-going professional and public discussions; the absence of active lobbying in the press and with government agencies to stop plundering; and then their President's recent pronouncement² that the movie character Indian Jones "has played a significant role in stimulating the public's interest in archaeological exploration," when

* Metropolitan Museum of Art, OscarBey@aol.com

1 viz. MUSCARELLA 1991; 2000: 22-29; 2008a: 613-614.

2 Internet, *Agade News*, 5/16/08.

any first year archaeology student knows that Jones is the very antithesis of an archaeologist. In fact, he *has* played “a significant role in stimulating the destroyers of sites, the plunderers who supply ‘antiquities’ to a museum.”

Once every few years a resolution to oppose plunder is unanimously voted at annual meetings: all those against plunder, raise your hands, now let’s listen to lectures and socialize. Archaeological organizations periodically offer session on plundering at annual meetings, but rarely proceed beyond revealing the problem, and concentrate on the speakers’ area of specialization. Unaddressed are long-term strategies in which they should be engaged.³ And seldom are attempts made by the small active anti-plunder archaeologists to maintain on-going contacts and coordinate actions; and the same names continuously appear. What is common are professors who occasionally mouth pious platitudes on plunder in their classrooms, or drop brief comments in print or in lectures that it is not nice to buy plundered antiquities, acts sufficient to demonstrate how archaeologically correct they are. Some may be “quite vocal”⁴ –but not quite active. This is why most people remain unaware that plunder and cultural destructions are sponsored and directed by a financially, culturally, and politically powerful interrelated alliance.

Citizens of the Plunder Culture are active throughout the “antiquities producing” and antiquities acquiring world, functioning in interlocking levels as mutually supporting aggressive columns attacking archaeology. At the lowest level are the on-site, professional plunderers of sites and tombs, those who carry out their customers’ orders. In Plunder Culture literature they are always labeled “poor farmers,” who non-stop accidentally discover antiquities “while plowing their fields”.⁵ The word *tombaroli*, used to describe organized Italian plunderers, can apply to all. Above this level are the local criminal and Mafioso column, consisting of local dealers, smugglers, corrupt officials, who facilitate the transfer of the plunder abroad where they are laundered before being shipped to international market destinations. The third column consists of antiquities dealers (all referring to themselves as reputable), who have standing orders from the level above to supply them with antiquities, and forged documents manifesting the antiquity derived from an Italian or German family that possessed it for generations.

The dealers sell their plunder to the upper level, the fourth column. It consists of wealthy private collectors, university, private and public museum directors and their curatorial staffs and trustees, and is supported by newspaper owners and by elected government officials. Plundered artifacts are referred to as “antiquities,” or “Art”.⁶

Collectively, Plunder Culture members are the *raison d’etre* for looting and destruction. The upper membership level, museums and collectors, purchase antiquities as an on going class-power-identity activity. They initiate the process by sponsoring and financing the purchase orders, which pay the

3 Also see BRODIE – RENFREW 2005: 357-358.

4 WINTER 1992: 32.

5 One example is GRIFFIN 1989: 109. For a report on the profit gained by these “plowers” in Jordan, see Rose – Burke 2004.

6 For newspaper owners and staffs suppressing information about plundering museums, see MEYER 1974: 11, HORSLEY 1997, ATWOOD 2007 (also below), and MUSCARELLA in MAZUR 2006: 2-3.

on-site looters to destroy (the power, the power!) ancient sites, the smugglers, the bribes, so that they can possess/save “Art.” For museum curators, some are archaeologists, others art historians see Muscarella 2000: 2-3, 13, 23-25, 27, footnotes 5, 7; the “acquisition” of antiquities is a major component of their job description, for which raises and promotions reward them. I once heard one of the very rich, and thereby very powerful curator-sponsors of plunder, Dietrich von Bothmer of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, sneer at corrupt Italian officials – all lower class of course, for accepting bribes: which he himself had paid!⁷ Courtesy of their social and financial status, upper-level members also have the power to conceal their roles effortlessly, for example keeping their activities out of newspapers and other media (this is gradually changing).

Although the Plunder Culture’s activities are becoming better known, primarily from non-archaeologist writers and reporters,⁸ and increasingly from professional archaeologists, the reports rarely present full details about the wealthy and upper-social class perpetrators. A recent volume with essays by scholars on plunder by scholars is Brodie et al 2006;⁹ earlier examples of collected articles on plunder include Brodie et al 2000 and 2001. David Gill’s internet blog is an important example of professional engagement; equally the McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research at Cambridge University (now non-functioning), via its journal *Culture Without Context* and monographs.¹⁰ In the past the *Journal of Field Archaeology* had a unique “Antiquities Market” section edited by K. D. Vitelli, and later Ellen Herscher; recently it has been revived. Very important is the public organization, Saving Antiquities For Everyone (SAFE), founded by lay people (Cindy Cho and Paul Kunkel), ordinary citizens. They do work that not many archaeologists and their organizations attempt: bring individuals of lay and professional backgrounds together, to monitor, expose and fight plunder and those who entail it, *wherever* encountered.¹¹ Maybe eventually (*inshallah*) professionals will wake up and use them as a model.¹²

The Fifth Column

Another noteworthy and powerful component of the Plunder Culture exists but remains unrecognized by most archaeologists and the public. In addition to the four visible columns attacking preservation

-
- 7 In an Internet interview I referred to DvB as a “son of a bitch.” I wish to make an apology for that stupid remark. I have been blessed by living with many female dogs, all loving, truthful, and loyal bitches, and I apologize to them all for my solecism.
 - 8 Two of the best recent books on this issue are works of Atwood 2004, and Watson 2006 (see also Watson 1977); also Nagin 1986. To date the only substantial public reports on the archaeological issues raised here occur on the Internet: see Mazur 2006. A work that presents –in a long and rambling manner– the arguments and positions of dealers, auction houses, museums, and legal issues (but little on archaeologists’ positions), is MacKenzie 1988.
 - 9 Brodie et al 2006; see also Muscarella 2008a.
 - 10 viz. Brodie et al 2000 and Brodie et al 2001.
 - 11 Muscarella 2008a: 615.
 - 12 I also want to single out Charles Koczka, a diligent and honest Customs agent, who continuously fought to prevent illegal antiquities arriving in the United States. He rarely succeeded, but he did play an important role in getting back to Turkey the Metropolitan Museum of Art’s plunder, “The Lydian Treasure” (see below; see also his article in Messenger 1989: 185-198; Muscarella 1991: 344).

of the world's history, an active undercover Fifth Column operates *within* the archaeological community and collaborates with the Plunder Culture citizens. I speak of archaeologists who willingly work as partners with the upper (wealthier) "acquisition" level. Two components exist. One, crucial, involves the ideological divide in the nature, methods, and goals of archaeological/academic scholarship that exists between the professional behavior of (most) museum-employed curators and that of (many; see below) university employed archaeologists.¹³ That most curators of ancient "art" –a number of whom have degrees in archaeology–function under entirely different job descriptions, scholarly and methodological agendas and ideological loyalties is unknown to the discipline at large. This ignorance exists notwithstanding that many curator/archaeologists sabotage archaeology in several ways. I present but a few examples of the archaeology/museum divide, the fifth-column sabotage or fellow traveler behavior involved.

I begin appropriately with a statement alleging the common goals of archaeologists and museum curators proclaimed by a professor of archaeology and President of the Archaeological Institute of America, C. Brian Rose.¹⁴ To him, the "divide" between these disciplines should be narrowed, because "*both* [italics mine] deplore the destruction of ancient sites," i.e., both are colleagues in the battle against plundering (a letter written to *Archaeology* challenging this was not published). The same belief in a "common ground" between archaeologists, collectors and museum curators, that all are "passionate" in their common interests, is argued by Kathryn Walker Tubb.¹⁵ The rhetoric that plunderers and archaeologists share the same passion is also presented by Griffin: "Collectors and scholars must work together...."¹⁶ (query: will the workshop venue be a dealer's shop?).

As for Rose's AIA Declaration, it is ironically juxtaposed to –and thereby exposes it as false– a photograph of the plundered Euphronios krater in the Metropolitan Museum of Art: an "antiquity" purchased by museum staff: who most surely did not deplore the destruction of the ancient Italian site –or others– whence the vase derived. Rose's declaration on what curators "deplore" is the very *opposite* of what archaeologists deplore. To equate the activities of the curators of ancient "art" of the Metropolitan Museum, the Getty Museum, the Cleveland Museum of Art, The Boston Museum of Art, the Los Angeles County Museum of Art, The Kimball Art Museum, The Saint Louis Art Museum, the MIHO museum, the British Museum, the Louvre, and many university museums, with archaeologists who painstakingly excavate to save artifacts for everyone, is embarrassing.¹⁷

An example of a museum curator (Princeton) gushing about his activities is that of Griffin,¹⁸ who exults about his purchases of plundered pre-Columbian artifacts –both for himself (he is also a private collector) and his university. Initial collecting soon turned "passionate," and "Collecting, in

13 For discussions and documentation of this ideological/professional divide see for example my articles: MUSCARELLA 1977; 2003; 2006; also SIMPSON 2005. I disagree with Winter's 1992: 31 challenge to what she calls the "oppositional stereotypes...such as museum curators vs. academics."

14 ROSE 2007: 6.

15 In BRODIE 2006: 289-90; see MUSCARELLA 2008a: 615-616 for discussion.

16 GRIFFIN 1986: 465.

17 See examples below; also MUSCARELLA 1991: 343.

18 GRIFFIN 1986, 1989.

some miraculous way, has helped to create my life and its directions";¹⁹ only "Purists would try to stop collecting..." for "Collecting can be positive and creative." Further, he is a "serious collector".²⁰ To him, it is archaeologists –not collectors– who are "self righteous".²¹

For Harvard's (one time) curator James Cuno's sophisticated homage to orphaned artifacts see Muscarella 2008a: 612. His museum purchases –182 Greek vessels in 1995 alone– prove he can deceive by transmogrifying plundered artifacts and destroyed sites into "Art" belonging to everyone. For similar beliefs we have a director of the St. Louis Museum in Missouri, James Burke, claiming "the world is a better place when world cultures are shared..."²² (also when the world's women are shared in the same manner?).

Planned dissimulation was orchestrated by the Metropolitan Museum of Art curator Dietrich von Bothmer, the museum's director Le Comte Guy-Philippe Lannes de Montebello, and Arthur Ochs Sulzberger, the owner of the *New York Times* and (conflict-of interest) museum Trustee, serving for decades on its Purchasing Committee. They purchased, exhibited and published purchased artifacts plundered from Turkey, and baptized "A Greek and Roman Treasury".²³ The Trustees and curatorial staff *knew* that the objects had been plundered from now-destroyed tombs in western Turkey, which was revealed many years later when the artifacts were returned to their correct archaeological and geographical locus: in western Turkey, not Greece.

The deceit has never been discussed openly within the museum, nor ever been reported in the *New York Times*; only one employee in the museum objected to the purchase.²⁴ Karl Meyer obliquely reported the conflict of interest behavior of Sulzberger when discussing the purchase of the plundered Euphronios vase: "for the paper to editorially reproach the Met would involve criticism of the publisher's friends."²⁵ The conflict of interest role was confirmed by Ken Auletta in *The New Yorker* (June 28, 1993: 4). He reported that Sulzberger's son Arthur refused to become a Trustee at the Metropolitan Museum "in order to avoid any appearance of conflict of interest with his duties as publisher." Another disturbing revelation of the behavior of *New York Times*' staff and editors is that of C. B. Horsley who documents their involvement in suppressing of any information of the Metropolitan Museum's purchase of major forgeries of Chinese paintings.²⁶ Roger Atwood provided yet more detail about the duplicity and dishonesty of the *Times*' staff, confronting their conflict of interest positions in suppressing the antiquities purchasing actions of Sulzberger and his position on his Museum's Acquisition Committee.²⁷ There he sits alongside Shelby White; together they purchased countless plundered artifacts.²⁸

19 GRIFFIN 1989: 106.

20 GRIFFIN 1989: 113, 114, read: "serial collector".

21 GRIFFIN 1986: 464-465; see MUSCARELLA 1989: 343.

22 In NAGIN 1986: 6.

23 MUSCARELLA 2008a: 607.

24 MUSCARELLA 2000: 25, footnote 7.

25 MEYER 1974: 11.

26 HORSLEY 1997.

27 ATWOOD 2007: 3-7.

28 See Muscarella on the Internet, December 12, 2005, February 9, 2006, via S. Mazur (2006), also BRODIE – RENFREW 2005:349-350; on the MMA Trustees, see NAGIN 1986: 6.

Years ago the Metropolitan Museum of Art hosted a lavish exhibition of borrowed plundered objects loaned by a foreign, major plunder-sponsoring museum accompanied by a sumptuous catalogue, all financed by the lending museum.²⁹ The borrowing museum's curators recognized that among the plundered artifacts were a number of probable modern forgeries—an opinion shared by me. Because museum employees obey a code that commands that one never inform a rich patron or lender that their antiquities are forgeries, the borrowing museum's head curator decided to exhibit and publish the forgeries as genuine ancient artifacts: casually deceiving scholars, students and the public. This curator invited a European scholar to write the catalogue entries for these forgeries and the genuine ones; a generous fee would be paid. The scholar declined, noting that some of the objects were forgeries. Following this un-museum behavior, the curator dispatched *two* curators abroad to request the European scholar to reconsider the rejection. Both emissaries are archaeologists, both knew that the challenged objects were forgeries, both accepted the assignment. They were instructed to convince the scholar to publish the forgeries as authentic artifacts, that the word forgery could *not* be mentioned, but allowed the scholar to use the term “unparalleled” when describing them. The recipient of this request to lie, delivered by two archaeologist-museum curators, was upset and embarrassed by the professional insult, and rejected the offer. Another individual was recruited to write the entries and readily complied.³⁰ Curators, dealers, auction houses, and collectors cite the reports of conservators to prove that their purchased antiquity is a genuine plundered artifact.³¹

One of the above-mentioned emissaries recommended a plundered artifact (not for the first time) for purchase to the museum's Trustees (Sulzberger, et al). A colleague, concerned that the object had been plundered and torn from its now-destroyed locus, objected to its purchase. The retort was: “If you don't like what we do here, you can leave”.³² The Trustees purchased the plundered artifact. And the archaeologist-curator was awarded a professorship at a major university (recommended by archaeologists associated with the awardee's museum). The protesting curator was subsequently dismissed.

Witness also the 180-degree professional and moral turnaround by an archaeologist who applied for the position of an art museum director. He was appointed and immediately accepted his job description duty, to actively purchase plundered artifacts, and employ all the museum-ritual language to justify such actions.³³ The metamorphosis from archaeologist to Fifth Column citizenship was accomplished with ease. As a reward for “building up” his art museum's antiquities collection, he was subsequently hired to direct a *university archaeological* museum.

Another serious problem is that many academics (and thus their students) unhesitatingly cite as reality the certification of curator/archaeologists that *purchased* or donated artifacts are genuine and *archaeological* evidence for cultural history. They also declare as archaeological fact a specific geographical provenience, a locus, for the purchased object, which information was furnished by a

29 MUSCARELLA 2000: 4.

30 For the objects see MUSCARELLA 2008b: 13-14.

31 For specific details of this still unrecognized problem see MUSCARELLA 2008b.

32 See also WINTER 1992: 34-5; WATSON 2006: xviii-xix, 102, 331.

33 viz. MUSCARELLA 2000: 24-25.

dealer (although never mentioned). Museum-ritual demands that one eliminate the crucial empirical distinctions between excavated and plundered artifacts; which behavior falsifies the historical record. Museum curator/archaeologists also are “bound by the rules of confidentiality,” rules that control all information about acquisitions.³⁴ Museum confidentiality loyalties take precedence over archaeological loyalties, for which the operating word is *omertà*.

Years ago an ex-museum curator, archaeologist and Director asked me to look at a number of photographs of “antiquities” that a collector wanted to donate to his museum: were they genuine or forgeries? My colleague argued that if they were forgeries it would be bad for the museum, the public and scholars to exhibit them. I agreed. To me all the objects were forgeries. He told me he would inform his curator/archaeologist successor, and ask him not to accept the gifts. Sometime later he informed me that his advice was ignored. The gift was accepted because the rich collector could not be offended. Decades ago I was asked by Teddy Kolleck, Mayor of Jerusalem, to vet a donation of antiquities to the Israel Museum by a rich collector. I reported that all but one object were forgeries. Against the wishes of the museum’s curator Kolleck correctly rejected the gift.

The examples cited here depict but one component of the Great Divide crippling the discipline, and I turn to another group of archaeologists who operate comfortably and successfully within the Plunder Culture. Functioning for decades, they operate successfully as a Fifth Column within the archaeological realm, essentially covertly and unrecognized by many colleagues and the public. Most scholars aware of their roles are either indifferent or remain silent –the latter because they fear their powerful academic connections in the awarding or denying academic positions and fellowships. I give some examples:

University employed archaeologists accept invitations from the Metropolitan Museum’s Department of Ancient Near Eastern Art to become members of their Visiting Committee, which meets several times a year for socials, lunch, private discussions, lectures, and private viewings of antiquity purchases and gifts. The Committee is composed of museum curators, dealers and antiquities collectors, and a good number of archaeologists.³⁵ They are invited to become members by the museum’s Trustees, after which they receive a letter from the museum’s legal Counsel announcing that the “Museum’s Board of Trustees” has appointed them members. One prominent archaeologist wrote in his acceptance letter: “I certainly appreciate this connection with the Museum...[and] I am looking forward to the *continuing association*...[and] hope to be of some help in a visiting, *admiring and advisory* capacity” (italics mine). Another wrote that membership was “rewarding...both on a personal and *professional* level...” (italics mine): the precise nature of this professional engagement was manifested when in a letter to an archaeologist colleague he referred to his “official connections” with the museum that “obliged” him not to discuss an *archaeological* matter. Other archaeologists wrote the more typical “I accept with pleasure” (...to sit alongside my fellow-members, powerful and rich antiquity dealers and collectors).

Noted for years in the invitation letters is that the Committee Chair is Shelby White, possessor of hundreds of plundered antiquities. Other members include the antiquity collectors Jonathan Rosen

34 See MUSCARELLA 2008a: 613.

35 See MUSCARELLA 2008a: 613, 616-617; for a full listing of members see the Museum’s Annual Reports.

(also an antiquities dealer), Sheldon and Barbara Breitbart, and Michael Steinhardt. In Forbes Internet report (12/29/06: 4) the latter, defending his purchasing activities, boasted that he is not intimidated (what billionaire is?), that collecting was “dangerous, but that makes it exciting.”

The archaeologist members serve their colleagues loyally: *omertà* again. They provide their dealer and collector colleagues with lectures on their excavations and research. They visit their homes for social gatherings, and offer advice on their purchases. An archaeologist member was also asked by the museum’s Counsel to contact colleagues and officials of Turkey as the Museum’s representative (another “official” function) to present their position in a matter that concerned a large group of plundered artifacts, the so-called Lydian Treasure, which the museum had purchased and refused to return.

A few years ago I learned that the President of the NYC chapter of the Archaeological Institute of America had voluntarily accepted the Trustees’ invitation to become a Committee member. I informed her of its dealer and collector membership, supplying their names, and asked why she would associate with them. This archaeologist shouted that the archaeologist X was also on the Committee, and stalked away. Years later she piously wrote in the Fall 2007 *aia New York Society News*: “The AIA has worked hard to stop the trafficking of antiquities and established itself at the forefront of preserving the world’s archaeological resources and cultural heritage.” No footnote disassociated her from this claim (after all, she knew that a past AIA President has been a member of the Visiting Committee for more than three decades).

Over many years non-member archaeologists have been invited by the Committee to give lectures on their fieldwork. With ease these archaeologists accept the honor to address White, Steinhardt, Rosen, etc. Once when Joan Oates accepted an invitation to lecture about her site Nimrud before the Committee, I was told by the head of the ANE Department not to come (I had no intention to do so): because Shelby White would leave if I appeared, and that could not be tolerated. Another time when Ian Hodder was speaking at a ticketed meeting at another institution for which the Committee had reserved 25 places, the same authority informed me (through an intermediary) that I could not attend; no ticket was available for me. In both cases, an *archaeologist* was denied permission to hear an *archaeologist* speak, but the dealers and collectors were not denied: on orders from the plunderers. Why did these archaeologists consider it appropriate to give archaeological lectures to plunderers?

Collaborationist scholars also openly support collectors and facilitate their plunder entering the United States. A cuneiformist from Cornell University helped Jonathan Rosen import recently plundered tablets from Iraq (in 2000) by informing Customs that they were “educational material with no commercial value”.³⁶ Rosen took a \$1,000,000 tax deduction when he subsequently gave the tablets to Cornell; and the collaborating cuneiformist will publish them.

Archaeologists also support plundering and the selling of the orphaned antiquities to dealers, museums and collectors, by opposing all legislation attempting to stop them. This was evidenced in Washington D.C. during the congressional hearings on antiquity legislation in the 1970s, where over some days I encountered archaeologists who vigorously opposed any anti-plunder testimony

36 Internet, Michael van Rijn, March 23, 2003.

before Congress. In Israel the Antiquities Traders Association campaign against stopping plunder and the existence of dealers' shops was joined by a number of prominent local archaeologists, and (needless to add) museum curators.³⁷

Others openly serving the plunderers are the *many* archaeologists who write articles for the plunder/dealer-supporting magazine owned by an antiquities dealer (*Minerva*), or those functioning as fronts for antiquity dealers and collectors (*Biblical Archaeological Review*, *Archaeological Odyssey*). Known to these contributing archaeologists is that the dealer-owned magazine, aside from adversary behavior toward archaeologists, in each issue displays many advertisements from antiquities dealers all over the world, and informs its readers about antiquity auction sales worldwide. The front-magazines (one has ceased publication) contain advertisements from antiquities dealers (reduced in recent years), consistently defend dealer and collecting activities and attack anti-plunder archaeologists and their professional organizations. Not one issue of the three magazines is without articles by archaeologists, who report (for a fee) on their excavations or other research matters.³⁸ Archaeologists also serve on their Editorial Boards.³⁹

Some archaeological museums make public announcements of their alleged anti-plundering attitudes, viz. the University of Pennsylvania Museum in 1970, whose staff voted a (mild) "Philadelphia Declaration" against purchasing looted artifacts. But from day one the declaration was ignored (sabotaged) by several members of its own *archaeological* staff—one a former director (Robert H. Dyson, jr.): museum staff collaborated with dealers and collectors then, and continue up to the present.⁴⁰

An advertisement for a *Festschrift* to be published "in honor of" a major serial collector (Moussaieff) has articles by archaeologists and other scholars of antiquity, voluntarily *honoring* the collector. Archaeologists, cuneiformists, numismatists, and art historians also authenticate and provide cultural attributions for plundered antiquities owned by collectors, museums, and dealers; Coggins⁴¹ was one of the first to call them accomplices.⁴² They do this for the social prestige derived from being consulted by the very wealthy and influential, or for grants they seek or receive from them for their excavations.⁴³

37 ILAN et al 1989: 40.

38 A report written by an archaeologist member of the McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research at Cambridge appeared in a recent publication in *Minerva* 2006; (MUSCARELLA 2008a: 610-611). Further the new Director of The University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Richard Hodges, was appointed (in 2007) to this position by the President of the University (guided by an alleged Search Committee) to govern this said-to-be archaeological museum: despite the Committee's prior awareness that he had written many articles and site reports over the years for *Minerva*, and *moreover*, is a member of its Editorial *Advisory* Board (see below). It gets worse: one of the Search Committee members is an archaeologist and the President of the Archaeological Institute of America (on which see also above).

39 See footnote 38.

40 See MUSCARELLA 2008a: 612-613; and footnote 38 above.

41 COGGINS 1972: 264-265.

42 MUSCARELLA 2000: 4, 5, 12, 13, 28, footnote 11.

43 COGGINS 1972: 265. I myself have not authenticated an artifact for a dealer or collector, or participated in the purchase of one post 1970/1 (pace the self-serving and false claims by an antiquities dealer), the year when I first learned from the lectures of Clemency Coggins and Ezat Negahban what purchasing antiquities meant; and when I was instantly converted.

Archaeologists also propagandize for collectors. A university professor of archaeology has for years positively supported antiquity dealer and collector activities, which includes securing professional positions for his graduate students from both groups. Another, whose excavation budget has been financed for years by a fund established by major plunderers, never discusses his sponsors' antithetical-to-archaeology activities; but he publicly defends them. Other archaeologists who raise money from a plundering museum equally accept the requirement –to support the museum's purchasing activities (see above). One might legitimately argue that it is not wrong or immoral for an archaeologist to accept money from plundering sponsors– provided that one not avoid rejecting their activities. An example is the archaeologist K.D. Vitelli, who received money from the Levy-White publication fund, but did not stop her attacks on their plundering activities. For this non-collaborationist, non fifth-columnist behavior, Hershel Shanks mocked her in his *parti-pris* magazine (funded by L. Levy and S. White) *Biblical Archaeological Review* (March/April 2000: 15). Not one of this magazine's archaeologist-editorial board members or authors objected—let alone resigned. I know another scholar who accepted financing from this same fund, but has not ceased to attack their –and that of other collectors and dealers– activities.

A model of the archaeologist/curator dichotomy (pace B. Rose, above), its Great Divide, is manifested by a meeting of archaeologists in Baghdad in 1994 where twenty-three archaeologists signed a petition condemning the plunder and destruction of sites in Iraq. Months later one of the signers, an archaeologist and museum curator, wrote to a curator at another museum asking that she ignore his signature on the petition. It was only a declaration of intent, and no one would expect museum employees to be bound by such restrictions. He proudly noted that the Trustees of *his* museum govern *him*; it is *they* who formulate policies on these matters, they who must be obeyed.⁴⁴ Written with ease, one museum curator to another, he openly and readily discusses deceit and betrayal, both to archaeology *and* the petition co-signers. The letter's importance was underscored when it was forwarded favorably to the administration of the recipient's museum, which subsequently rewarded him. Sometime later, when he applied there for the position of Curator-in-Charge, he was appointed (although he subsequently withdrew). Up to the present he publicly proclaims his concern for stopping plunder and destruction. There exists corroboration of the appointment, and a neat explanation why this archaeologist-curator was offered it. Another archaeologist reported to several colleagues via the Internet that he too had applied for the same position, but was rejected: the museum's director informed him that "I might be too scrupulous about acquisitions..." a concern patently not in place for the one who *was* offered the position.

Relevant, but little known, is that a number of United States university museums actively purchase plundered antiquities, i.e. support the plundering and destruction of ancient sites—and a number of their curators are archaeologists. For examples of Harvard's museums' plunder-sponsoring policy, see Brodie – Renfrew 2005: 353, and for its internal code –which has been ignored (Winter 1992 does not discuss this), see Coggins 1972: 266; Graepler 2004: 118; Muscarella 2008a: 612. Note also the ignored Philadelphia Declaration (above). C. Nagin (1986: 23) quotes the collector Arthur Sackler, who with his purchased antiquities furnished a newly created Harvard museum that bears his name: "...this is a temple [sic!] of art and the art historians are its high priests," and in which

44 MUSCARELLA 2000: 25.

temples plundered artifacts become “art.” It is not a coincidence indeed that one of the owners of Harvard University, James R. Houghton (serving on its Board of Overseers) is also one of the owners of the Metropolitan Museum of Art (as member and chair of its Board of Trustees). For years in both institutions he has encouraged the purchase of “art.”⁴⁵ In the early 1900s Yale University’s museum “borrowed” many artifacts from Peru, from Yale’s excavations at Machu Picchu. Yale never returned them to Peru and as of 2008 continues to refuse repatriation.⁴⁶

Other plunder-active United States university museums include Princeton, Indiana University, University of Missouri, Emory, etc...⁴⁷ University trustees, presidents, faculties, including archaeologists, support these purchases, actively or by their silence: they do not write letters to their university presidents demanding and end to their participation in the destruction of the archaeological record. For European University museum participation in the Plunder Culture, see Graepler 2004.

Conclusions: The archaeological Fifth Column is a significant component of the forces that sponsor and thrive on cultural destruction. Its members are as equally culpable as the advancing columns, *tombaroli*, antiquity dealers, collectors and museum staffs. They continue to flourish, their activities proceed successfully and unabated, they get awarded—revealing that the discipline of archeology has no comprehensive sense of itself, no unclouded self-knowledge, no awareness of its moral and academic weakness.⁴⁸

There remains a parallel conclusion: follow the archaeological work, the integrity and accomplishments of archaeologists like Altan Bey, whose actions manifest proper archaeological behavior.

Çok teşekkür ederim, arkadaşım.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ATWOOD 2007: R. Atwood, “A critical look at U.S. media coverage of antiquities issues,” *SAFE* (Internet), 1-7.
- BRODIE – RENFREW 2005: N. Brodie, C. Renfrew, “Looting and the World’s Archaeological Heritage: The Inadequate Response,” *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 343-428.
- BRODIE et al 2000: N. Brodie, J. Doole, P. Watson, *Stealing History: The Illicit Trade in Cultural Material*, Cambridge.
- BRODIE et al 2001: N. Brodie, J. Doole, C. Renfrew, *Trade in Illicit Antiquities: The Destruction of the World’s Archaeological Heritage*, Cambridge.

45 In a classic conflict of interest action Houghton wearing his Harvard hat awarded an honorary Ph.D. to his Metropolitan Museum employee de Montebello, a degree this director could/would never have earned.

46 E. Karp-Toledo, “The Lost Treasure of Machu Picchu,” *New York Times*, 2/23/08: A17

47 MUSCARELLA 2008a: 612-614; WINTER’S (1992: 35-36) comment that university museums are reluctant to purchase plundered artifacts is incorrect.

48 Every event and issue cited in this paper derives from my own research and experiences –hence the often usage of the pronoun I. There are surely many other examples of which I am unaware.

- BRODIE et al 2006: N. Brodie, M. Kersel, C. Luke, K.W. Tubb, *Archaeology, Cultural Heritage and the Antiquities Trade*, University Press of Florida.
- COGGINS 1972: C. Coggins, "Archaeology and the Art Market," *Science* 175, 263-266.
- GRAEPLER 2004: D. Graepler, "Archäologie und illegaler Antikenhandel: Die rolle der Universitäts-sammlungen," W. Heilmeyer, J.C. Eule (Eds), *Illegale Archäologie?*, Berlin, 116-127.
- GRIFFIN 1986: G.G. Griffin, "In defense of Collectors," *National Geographic* 169, 4, 462-465.
- GRIFFIN 1989: "Collecting Pre-Columbian Art," in *Messenger* 1989, 103-115.
- HORSLEY 1997: C.B. Horsley, "Chinagate," *The City Review*: 1-16.
- ILAN et al 1989: D. Ilan, U. Dhari, G. Avni, "Plundered!," *Biblical Archaeological Review* XV, 2, 38-42.
- MACKENZIE 1988: S.R.M. Mackenzie, *Going, Going, Gone: Regulating the Market in Illicit Antiquities*, Institute of Art and Law, Leister.
- MAZUR 2006: S. Mazur, "Italy-Met Euphronios Accord?" *Scoop* Internet, February 22: 1-12.
- MEYER 1974: K. Meyer, "Behind the Damask Curtain," *MORE*: 11-14.
- MESSINGER 1989: P. M. Messinger, *The Ethics of Collecting Cultural Property: Whose Culture? Whose Property?*, Albuquerque.
- MUSCARELLA 1977: O.W. Muscarella, "Ziwiye and Ziwiye: The Forgery of a Provenience," *Journal of Field Archaeology* 4, 197-219.
- MUSCARELLA 1991: O.W. Muscarella, Review of *Messenger* 1989, *American Journal of Archaeology* 95, 2, 342-344.
- MUSCARELLA 2000: O.W. Muscarella, *The Lie Became Great*, STYX.
- MUSCARELLA 2003: O.W. Muscarella, "Museum Constructions of the Oxus Treasure: Forgeries of Provenience and Ancient Culture," *Ancient Civilizations from Scythia to Siberia*, 8, 3-4, 259-275.
- MUSCARELLA 2006: O.W. Muscarella, "Urtartian Metal Artifacts: An Archaeological Review," *Ancient Civilizations from Scythia to Siberia* 12, 1-2, 147-177.
- MUSCARELLA 2008a: O.W. Muscarella, "Archaeology and the Plunder Culture," *International Journal of the Classical Tradition*, 14, 3/4, 602-618.
- MUSCARELLA 2008b: O.W. Muscarella, "The Veracity of 'Scientific Testing by Conservators'," *Original, Copy Fake?*, Mainz, 9-18.
- NAGIN 1986: C. Nagin, "Patrons of Plunder," *Boston Review*, 5-25.
- ROSE – BURKE 2004: J.D. Rose, D. Burke, "Making Money from buried treasure," *Culture Without Context*, 14, 4-8.
- ROSE 2007: C.B. Rose, "From the President: Common Ground, Can Archaeologists and Museums Work Together?," *Archaeology* 60, 5.
- SIMPSON 2005: E. Simpson "Tall Tales: Celts, Connoisseurs, and the Fabrication of Archaeological Context," *SOURCE* XXIV, 2, 28-41.
- WATSON 1977: P. Watson, *Sotheby's: The Inside Story*, London.
- WATSON 2006: P. Watson, *The Medici Conspiracy*, New York
- WINTER 1992: I. Winter, "Changes in the American Art Museum: The (An) Art Historian's Voice," in *Different voices: a Social, Cultural, and Historical Framework for Change in the American Art Museum*, Association of Art Museum Directors, 30-57.