

Talk:Kaveh Farrokh/Archive 1

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

< Talk:Kaveh Farrokh



This is an **archive** of past discussions. **Do not edit the contents of this page.** If you wish to start a new discussion or revive an old one, please do so on the current talk page.

Contents

- 1 Source comment
- 2 Notability
- 3 Book reviews
- 4 Using a bio submitted to a conference as a 3rd party source
- 5 Queustioning the Reviews of Kaveh Farrokh
- 6 Request for Natasha Adamios
- 7 Blurbs from Amazon
- 8 Reviews section (but not the Amazon stuff)
- 9 Thesis
- 10 Award
- 11 Book review
- 12 titles
- 13 His books
- 14 Institut Chateaubriand
- 15 Is a bio in a conference program a reliable and independent source?
- 16 shortened article without fluff
- 17 Removal of notability tag
- 18 Lead
- 19 Protection
- 20 Compromise proposal
- 21 A scholarly Response to Lendering
- 22 Note on Lendering in BMCR
- 23 Unprotection
- 24 Consensus proposal
- 25 Notability
- 26 serious proposal
- 27 Dbachmann's tone
- 28 To whom it may concern

Source comment

Pan-Turanianism Takes Aim at Azerbaijan: A Geopolitical Agenda is an online book, not an article.Hajji Piruz 21:38, 2 July 2007 (UTC)

well you are free to be Pakistani, and all what Dr. farrokh writes on the Iranian history and Iranian ethnic groups are sourced. So bring your blind sentiments somewhere else; it is all about facts.

--Babakexorramdin (talk) 21:53, 9 December 2007 (UTC)

Plus Iranians don't mostly live in deserts. Only a third of Iran is desert, and those areas are uninhabited. Anyways Iranians are fair skinned olive people, don't argue that please just because you aren't. —Preceding unsigned comment added by 216.154.17.159 (talk) 22:48, 17 January 2008 (UTC)

Notability

Farrokh doesn't appear to meet WP:PROF. If he is at all notable, then for his online nationalistic rants against "Western-centric" misrepresentation of ancient Persia. But this would need to be established by independent third party sources. Otherwise redirect to Shadows in the Desert: Persia at War. --dab (✉) 15:10, 9 September 2008 (UTC)

He appears to be notable enough to have his own Wikipedia article ([1] (http://www.ospreypublishing.com/authors/kaveh_farrokh/)). If you still insist that he isn't please go to AfD instead of unilaterally redirecting the page. khoikhoi 19:44, 20 September 2008 (UTC)

Can someone please tell me what is so "nationalistic" about objecting to the popular projection of Persianate cultures as backwater and its people as a barbarous lot? You're making excuses, and you are simply basing it upon the academician's national background. As sagacious as I am, you will probably disqualify my argument simply on the basis of my Internet moniker. Prejudice is not easily concealed, non?

As long as the image of the Persians as "destroyers of democracy and liberty" prevails within the given set of academical dogmas, your dismissal, on the "appeal of nationalism", can duly be dismissed as pure and utter **bullshit**. --The Persian Cataphract (talk) 14:45, 26 September 2008 (UTC) —Preceding unsigned comment added by The Persian Cataphract (talk • contribs)

Book reviews

One of them, by David Khoupeni, seems to be only online-- I don't think that meets WP standards. The other which is really a comment, comes from the book itself. Seems a bit overdone. Doug Weller (talk) 21:06, 19 September 2008 (UTC)

I've removed the online inaccessible 'review', we need published reviews. And an introduction is not a review, so I've changed the section heading. Surely there are some reviews from reliable, verifiable sources? Doug Weller (talk) 05:23, 21 September 2008 (UTC)

Whoo boy, I found one by a historian who contributed some of the photographs, Jona Lendering. [2] (<http://www.livius.org/opinion/opinion0012.html>)

The heading says "Three books on the Achaemenid Empire, all aiming at the general audience. One of them is just bad, the second one is unnecessary, the third explains what everybody already knows. This is the wrong way to introduce people to one of the most fertile branches of ancient history." Guess which is the 'just bad' one?

One of the last lines of Kaveh Farrokh's Shadows in the Desert. Ancient Persia at War is that "there has been an overall decline of programs and studies of Iranica in western Europe and the United States since 1980". If his book is indicative of the quality of modern-day Iranian studies, the decline can only be lauded. Shadows in the Desert contains dozens of factual errors, repeats Iranian propaganda from the 1970s, and contains numerous unnecessary digressions. Osprey Publishers have obviously invested a lot of energy in producing the book, which is indeed very attractive,[1] but all their care cannot hide that the manuscript ought to have been returned to the writer, much though he is to be praised for trying to redress the Greece-centeredness that bedevils most ancient history.

This I guess explains the problem I'm having finding reviews. Doug Weller (talk) 05:30, 21 September 2008 (UTC)

And here [3] (<http://rambambashi.wordpress.com/2008/07/16/lets-abandon-achaemenid-studies/>) Lendering says:

1. Kaveh Farrokh's Shadows in the Desert is one of the worst books I have ever read; 2. Tom Holland's Persian Fire is unnecessary; 3. Bruce Lincoln's Religion, Empire, and Torture, although a very good book by an excellent scholar, understates its own case.

Of these books, the first one is probably the most dangerous for Iranology, as it contains hundreds of errors and even quotes political propaganda. I was shocked to discover that Farrokh holds a PhD

and is working for a university. The book by Holland also contains numerous mistakes, but at least the author does not claim to be a historian.

Doug Weller (talk) 05:38, 21 September 2008 (UTC)

This section from Lendering's review strikes me as highly relevant to our Cyrus cylinder issues:

The strangest inclusion is the Cyrus Cylinder, a document from Babylon in which the great conqueror presents himself as the ideal king: chosen by the supreme god, he restores order, repairs buildings, allows exiles to return home, and redresses malpractices. In the past, this text - which is absolutely topical - has been taken as evidence for Cyrus' illuminated policy, especially by the government of Mohammad Reza Shah, who even called it "the world's first human rights charter". Farrokh repeats this propaganda verbatim on page 44, apparently unaware of the extensive secondary literature on the subject.

I can't say I'm surprised - his lengthy "rebuttal" of the *Spiegel* and *Daily Telegraph* articles is equally shoddy. I have to say that when read it I thought it wasn't the kind of thing that any serious historian, or at least one with a reputation to defend, would publish. -- ChrisO (talk) 06:43, 21 September 2008 (UTC)

How was the response "shoddy"? I found the original article to be quite disparaging; why was it published in the papers to begin with? Couldn't Wiesehöfer or Holland have compiled some form of journal debating the topic in a more academically neutral milieu? Oh yeah, that's right, the journalist fetched for them, portraying a highly one-sided assessment to a highly extensive field of debate, leaving the reader with **absolutely nothing** as far as the other side is concerned. Henceforth, only a rebuttal could have been apt.

Or is it the fact that he replied to begin with, that bothers your sensibilities? Get your priorities straight. Wiesehöfer is an esteemed scholar, contributing to Iranistics with several interesting findings in his numerous journals, and even though his scrutiny of Cyrus The Great as some humanist was much more careful and tact than that of Tom Holland, he made a mistake by allowing his sayings to be published by, excuse my French, the fucking media. Not just any media; Der Spiegel. He could have handled it more prudently, like his colleague Dandamaev who had additionally written about the allocation of working forces in the Achaemenid empire. Dissent is a natural part of academia, but Der Spiegel turned Wiesehöfer into Naser Pourpirar. Get it? People will take issue with it. And who reads Der Spiegel? Exactly.

So here's what I suggest. If Farrokh's rebuttal is "shoddy", it is only befitting to call the source of the conflict a regurgitating asshole vomiting buffalo's feces in liquid cascades. Yes, very eloquent, I know. Seriously, why would your sensibilities be taken into account when it comes to assessing the quality or notability of an academician? The magazine turned the dispute into some kind of newsflash, while it has been subject to extensive debate since the 1970's, with both sides providing fair points.--The Persian Cataphract (talk) 15:06, 26 September 2008 (UTC) —Preceding unsigned comment added by The Persian Cataphract (talk • contribs)

What makes me call it "shoddy" is the way Farrokh presents and argues it, as well as some of the things he says. If he was a real historian I would have to say that his tract was totally unprofessional, particularly where it piles invective on those he's criticising (repeatedly calling them "historians" with scare quotes, as if they weren't real historians; accusing people of "academic mediocrity"; and so on). In regard to the particular aspect I've been involved with, his views on the Nabonidus Chronicle, he seems to think that A.K. Grayson's translation is the only one that exists - he is apparently completely unaware of the translations by Glassner (2004) and Kuhrt (2007), both of which back up Grayson's much older translation. He parrots the late Shah's claims about the Cyrus cylinder being a "human rights charter", even though the majority of historians don't support that view - indeed, several, including the artifact's custodians at the British Museum, explicitly disclaim it. You might want to have a look at Jona Lendering's scathing review of Farrokh's work here (<http://www.livius.org/opinion/opinion0012.html>) on the Livius website (Lendering describes Farrokh's book *Shadows in the Desert* as "one of the worst books I have ever read" in the field of Iranology). It seems quite plain that Farrokh's flaws as a historian are due to his having no historical qualifications and - one must assume - no training in historiography. It certainly comes through in his writing. -- ChrisO (talk) 15:30, 26 September 2008 (UTC)

I emailed Mr. Lendering on the ordeal about a month ago; this was before it came to my knowledge that the subject of

his editorial became so heated and much debated around certain user-groups that he no longer read any emails pertaining to the subject. Therefore, my lengthy feedback to his article (I am an avid reader of Livius.org, which I otherwise think of as a source of thoroughly high quality) Therefore your reference to his review is hardly news to me. What Jona Lendering has stated about the book will remain to be his opinion; as others have pointed out already, the book seems to have the endorsement of Prof. Richard Nelson Frye. The book has its own blemishes, but my opinion is that Mr. Lendering blew them out of proportion, and effectively dismissed the fact that it contained newly available scholastics on the Partho-Sassanians. The section of the Achaemenians remained to be a rehash of Prof. Shahbazi's treatise on the Achaemenian military machine a wee while ago. For the Achaemenian military, Duncan Head's vaunted Montvert-published book is usually the "yard-stick" scholastic reference of choice; this is admitted by Dr. Farrokh who writes that the scope of Achaemenian militaria was altogether too extensive to fit the scope of the book.

As for his rebuttal of the article in Der Spiegel, you are basing the near-entirety of your argument upon personal appeal. There are plenty of sham historians out there who have for long sought to discredit Cyrus The Great and his historical impact, and by far they outnumber the genuine scholars who have merely sought to establish a discourse on the subject; the former is potential exploitation and revisionism, the latter mere inquisition. There is no "majority" as claimed by either side, and even if there ever was, the appeal to consensus bears its own fallacy. There is a lot of politics involved, and against the will of the scholars, it is inevitable; projecting Cyrus The Great as some bloodthirsty conqueror will baffle many sensibilities, and ultimately serves to unintentionally cater to the propaganda-machine and the related demagoguery established by the Islamic regime of Iran. It's not just a matter of addressing the medias, it ultimately becomes a matter of tactfulness, respect and the scholarly disavowal of politics. Shouting out these insipid things to the popular media is about as tactful as using a buckshot to swat an insect. I had no expectations from Tom Holland; his "Persian Fire" was rubbish. From Josef Wiesehöfer however, I was hugely disappointed.

Furthermore, Dr. Farrokh's presentation of his rebuttal does not fail in its addressal of the matter; he brings up a number of crucial factors to contrast the so-called Nabonidus Chronicle, such as the Judeo-Persian legacy, and most importantly the veneration of the Greeks, which is featured no less than three times: First in the annals of Herodotus who projects him in favourable terms, secondly in Ctesias' rendition (Which finds cross-passages to the writings of Nicolaus of Damascus, generally low historical value) and finally in the semi-fictitious narrations of Xenophon in both the Anabasis and the Cyropaedia. The coin will remain to have two sides to it, but the fact that the Persepolis Fortification Tablets contain data on the employed working forces and their payments seems to lend strong credentials to a postulated "slave-free" society within the proper Iranian realm; this is further corroborated by the feudalistic caste-model societies established by the Arsacidae and the Sassanians, prior to the social reforms of Chosroës I.

Nobody has forgotten any additional translations; their mention is hardly needed. The point was to present the fact that the subject was not as clearly cut as Tom Holland would have wished for it to be. Grayson's translation was found to be flawed by the eminent authority Wilfred Lambert, on the prompt notice of others. Shahrokh Razmjou was not some lightweight either; the man is a contributor to the ARTA project which is directly related to the work pertaining to the NABU journal archive, both endorsed per affiliation by Pierre Briant (and it's probably important to mention that Lendering is a fan of his). So, in all reality, Glassner and Kuhrt are worth absolutely peanuts to my sensibilities. Who wants to take the longest piss? Kaveh Farrokh has a point, whether you like it or not, and whether both sides like it or not, they have to admit it: Their feuding added more depth to the character of Cyrus The Great.

Like any other conqueror he suffered from megalomania, which ultimately got him killed in battle against the Massagetae, but unlike most other conquerors he had his humane expressions which broke new grounds in statesmanship. If no one is willing to accept this (I'm not asking for approval; I'm asking for acceptance), guess what, I will have a problem with those individuals.--The Persian Cataphract (talk) 21:05, 26 September 2008 (UTC)--The Persian Cataphract (talk) 21:05, 26 September 2008 (UTC)

Using a bio submitted to a conference as a 3rd party source

[4] (<http://216.239.59.104/search?q=cache:http://www.wais.stanford.edu/waisprogram.pdf>) is being used as though it is an authoritative source, whereas it is almost certainly something Farrokh himself was asked to submit. That's standard practice at academic conferences, you don't get some researcher researching the participants, participants are asked to

submit biographical information. Thus this is simply what Farrokh has said about himself, but at the moment the article reads as though the conference bio is an authoritative Doug Weller (talk) 16:05, 21 September 2008 (UTC)

Queustioning the Reviews of Kaveh Farrokh

Gentlemen,

I am now in Canada pursuing Hellenic Studies and am new to Wikipedia. It would seem that all of these recent attacks on this forum against Dr. Farrokh are mainly based on Jona Lendering's "review" which was posted around the same time that the Spiegel Magazine article against Cyrus was published (around July or so).

That "review" is actually being examined by a number of academics in Iranian and Hellenic studies – and from what my supervisor tells me, they are not impressed with Lendering's mainly weak command of a number of facts (I'll cite one which I was told shortly below).

I do not claim to be on ancient Iran as Lendering does. From what I see from his writings on ancient Greece (especially Macedonia), Lendering often cites himself as "references" and ignores (or is not aware) of a lot of the pertinent research. I noticed here that some writers here take issue with Dr. David Khoupenia reviewing Farrokh but have no problem with Lendering citing himself in his "analyses". There seem to be a double-standard here.

My supervisor was also very shocked at Lendering's rude language against Dr. Farrokh. I notice that (even with Wikipedia forum rules), this type of tone is being replicated here. To say that Farrokh "has a reputation to defend" is interesting if not misguided.

But the real issue is not the personal attacks on Farrokh. The focus here is Farrokh's retort against Spiegel and Daily Telegraph. The article was actually well-written (unlike what some gentlemen try to convey here). In fact both articles were full of citations and references. These led to Farrokh being interviewed with the Persian services of BBC and Voice of America live. I noticed the links to these on the Kavad website before it was damaged by hackers in late July

Also, I find it interesting that you think that Dr. Farrokh is Persian; he is not. He was born in Greece and is of Ossetian descent (he is half-Azeri I think towards Georgia's southeast region). He never grew up in Iran and has no political connections there or elsewhere. He learned Persian mainly during his graduate studies. Lendering's attempts to tie him to the "Shah's propaganda" is fictional and misinformed. Just because one writes in a way that does not agree with another's views does not make one a "propagandist". That is called expressing your point of view.

But let us return to Lendering. He claims in his website that all reports of dangers to the Pasargardae site are "hoaxes". This shows one thing clearly: Lendering has no clue of what is happening inside of Iran. A number of high-profile sites have already been destroyed by the local authorities– most recently parts of Susa were bulldozed to make room for a hotel. This was reported by Iran's press reports (not some outside diaspora outfit). The news outlet is Mehr News and entitled "Bulldozing Iran's 7000-year-old mound for brick production" link: <http://www.mehrnews.com/en/NewsDetail.aspx?NewsID=747668>

The only reason the tomb of Cyrus has been spared is due to the vociferous protests by the International Community against the present government of Iran. It is now a UNESCO heritage site. Lendering's "review" is certainly false and misleading in that respect. This raises some questions as to the reliability of Lendering's "reviews" in general.

Natasha Adamios —Preceding unsigned comment added by Natasha Adamios (talk • contribs) 16:24, 21 September 2008 (UTC)

I don't think that either review should be in the article. Neither is published, Khouphenia's is on Farrokh's website and Lendering's on his own. The focus here should be on using reliable and verifiable sourced, words which have specific meanings in Wikipedia and in this case I think require published (paper) reviews. I'm not surprised to find local authorities damaging archaeological sites, by the way. (And I never expressed a view of Farrokh's origin).
Doug Weller (talk) 16:51, 21 September 2008 (UTC)

Dear Doug,

I guess you are choosing to ignore that Farrokh is respected by many academics in Greece, Hungary, the United States, Iran, England, etc. Dr. Farrokh has already been evaluated by Dr. Patrick Hunt of Stanford University, Dr. Llewellyn-Jones in Great Britain, Professor Emeritus of Harvard, Professor Nikolaz Kachareva, etc. I have seen this on a number of websites and have heard of this numerous times in Greece and now in Canada. The issue here is that he defends ancient Iran in a balanced and non-partisan manner. This proves psychologically threatening to those who dislike Iran, some facet of Iran today, or the established historiography of Iran (such as Jona Lendering).

Again, I am no expert of Iran and my main focus is my country of origin, Greece. I do know that Lendering is not considered an expert of Greece either, at least from what I have run across in the halls of academe in Greece.

But back to your complaints. Perhaps you are not aware, but internet sources if they are independent of the author, can be used as references - please see:

Dissertations and Theses from Start to Finish John D. Cone & Sharon L. Foster

My apologies I cannot recall the date/publisher, but it states clearly that internet references can be used. There are also specific rules of citing internet reference systems in the APA Manual (American Psychological Association. I saw this in the latest APA manuals at our university bookstore.

Again, the issue is not the personal attacks on Farrokh. Internet references are often used in citations for refereed journals - I actually witnessed this in a Dissertation defense last Thursday - the same issue that you raise came up.

By the way: Dr. Khoupenia, is from the The University of Tbilisi in Georgia. Interesting how even he is questioned now simply because of the review he wrote. This is fascinating. The message is as thus:

I do not like what Professor X has written so I will attempt to discredit him

If I were to do this, then I would be attempting to impose a subtle form of censorship. I am sure you will call this process as something else. I am just letting you know what the attacks are beginning to resemble.

Now what I have to say is from scientific but here is my view of the attacks I see on this forum. As I noted earlier, Farrokh is guilty of writing in a way that is not palatable to views of certain distinguished members. This may explain the vigour and intensity of the (increasingly) personalized attacks against Farrokh.

One note of interest - it seems that you have chosen to engage to expend a lot of energy (in a very petty and picayune manner) against one individual (Farrokh in this case). This is what undermines your position Sir - you are using this forum as a platform for *Ad Hominem* attacks on Farrokh. Very interesting that you rely on Lendering and stay clear of what Farrokh actually stated to Spiegel and the Daily Telegraph - again (I respectfully remind you), the articles were sources and referenced. What is very interesting is that no attacks of the type that you engage in, were seen until these retorts were published.

Finally: As per Farrokh's origin Sir, you cannot have it both ways. You are citing Lendering as your main source, who on top of his flawed (and very biased) review, conveys the false impression that Farrokh is a "nationalist" from Iran. You cite Lendering as a valid source and now seem to be engaged in a partial retraction. It would appear that your dislike of Farrokh is more personal than professional. This may explain why you cited Lendering. Doing so raises questions as to the ulterior motives behind these attacks.

Natasha Adamios —Preceding unsigned comment added by Natasha Adamios (talk • contribs) 17:53, 21 September 2008 (UTC)

I think you misunderstand what is going on here. This is a discussion (at least from my point of view) of the article, not of Farrokh. I was citing Lendering because I found his review and I thought it relevant. I understand about Internet citations but this is Wikipedia and we have different policies and guidelines. What Farrokh wrote in Spiegel and the DT is irrelevant to this article, which is not and should not be trying to judge whether Farrokh is wrong or right (have I commented on that?), that is not our role as editors. Wikipedia values verifiability over truth (eg over proving a position is wrong or right) and reports what reliable and verifiable sources have to say, so editors' opinions of the subject matter should be irrelevant.

Khoupenia as a person is not being questioned, the issue is that his review is on Farrokh's own website. If it were published in a reliable source there would be no problem at all about its being used. I've put a welcome menu on your talk page if you want to learn more about how Wikipedia works. We also expect editors (and you are one now) to assume that other editors are acting in good faith and not attack them. Doug Weller (talk) 18:11, 21 September 2008 (UTC)

Dear Doug,

It is you who misunderstands or most likely misinformed. Allow me to demonstrate:

1)Kaveh Farrokh does not have a website 2)The review you of Khoupenia cite is posted on Iranscope which belong to a certain Sam Ghandchi: <http://www.ghandchi.com/iranscope/Anthology/KavehFarrokh/Khoupenia/index.html>

You can contact the webiste and verify this for yourself. Did you think that Iranscope is Farrokh's website? Surley I hope you are wring. This indicates that judge first and then ask questions later. I beleive that your peronsal dislike of Farrokh is clouding your judgement and analysis.

You may be getting confused with the now-defunct Kavad website that Farrokh had earlier this year but was hacked in July 2008. The Iranscope posting is from 2006 - again contact Iranscope and find out for yourself Sir.

Again Sir, you are playing it both ways - now in 3 cases:

1) First you cited Lendering, then when I point out his review's lack of credibility, you engaged in verbal acrobatics. Simply put, you are caught off-guard because you did not knwo that Lendering is a biased and misinformed source.

2) This very forum attempted to question Dr. Khoupenia's credibility. Then you attempted to mislead me into thinking that Iranscope is Kaveh Farrokh's site. Theremay be legal implications however I am no expert in syuch matters. What is clear is that either you did not know or attempted to convey a false impression.

3) This forum and the one on Farrokh's book did make reference to Farrokh's articles against Spiegel and Daily telegraph. Now you attemptng to divert the conversation as you realize that some fo us have actually read these and know that they are sourced, references and reviewed by places such as Stanford University. Are we now going to question Stanford Univeristy as weli, as we just did with Dr. Khoupenia and the University of Tbilisi? This is a canard.

Interesting that you now have to affirm that your intention is not to "attack" - but your actions belie your words. The case of Iranscope is yet another case in point. Do I have to cite the other unprofessional statements made on this forum? The only reason I chose to enter this forum is that I see it as unbalanced, biased, unfair if not rude. I have done this eventhough I am no expert on ancient Iran. I do however understand that I do not dislike Iran or Iranians and do not take offense at the glorioius role of ancietn Persia in history. I am sure that you will say "oh no I do not dislike Iran/Iranians, I am simply an onjective aditor...". As noted before, your statements do appear to have ulterior motives which are disguised as "editorial".

I understand where you are coming from. Again, you do not like what Farrokh has to say in his publications (on-line and in print)and hence are trying to manipulate this forum to your satisfaction. I witnessed an explosive exchange last year in Athens where a Romanian ethnologist attempted to portray modern Hungarians as genetic descendants of the ancient Dacians. This reminds me of the reactions on this forum and the one of Farrokh's book: the message is not palatable therefore which results in the system of "Let us shoot the messenger"..in this case Farrokh. And here again is where you go astray: Farrokh is not the point - let us focus on the writings. You then cited Lendering and I needed only 1 example to show you that he is unreliable.

I must admit that I see an interesting parallel:

1) Lendering thinks that no archaeological sites are in danger in Iran. You cited this. Now you attempt to backtrack and downplay this by saying "oh I never said that". There is a self-contradiction here. You like to cite Lendering when it suites you and then distance yourself when it is liability. Your self-contradiction reminds me of our politicians in Europe.

2) You "thought" that Iranscope is Farrokh's site. That was (I must admit) very surprising. Perhaps you did not realize that your assertion would be checked.

It is my hope that you engage your energy in more constructive ways. The more you attempt to discuss the "Farrokh case", the more transparent your motives become. Again, this may (partly) explain your mistake with Iranscope.

Natasha Adamios —Preceding unsigned comment added by Natasha Adamios (talk • contribs) 19:24, 21 September 2008 (UTC)

Oh for heaven's sake. I didn't get confused with Iranscope. The article said it was on this site [-//kavad.netfirms.com/savaran_review.html](http://kavad.netfirms.com/savaran_review.html) - I've left of the http so you can see the url. A site which said "Kavad.com: Official Website of Dr. Kaveh Farrokh". That site was on the article until it was changed to the site that you can see on the article now -- an hour and a half ago. Can I please have an apology? I did not try to mislead you. And this is not a forum, please don't treat it as one. I'd also appreciate it if you'd show me where I cited Lending on archaeological sites. I have no idea why you think I cited that. Doug Weller (talk) 19:53, 21 September 2008 (UTC)

Dear Doug,

You are again diverting the discussion. Iranscope was first in 2006 - Kavad did cite that and no longer exists. Please do not divert the attention of what I explained in detail above. I understand that you have personal dislike of Farrokh, which is why you are expending so much effort.

And you did cite Lending. I know how difficult it is when one's self-contradictions are revealed. This is evident to any party that will read these messages. I only revealing inconsistencies in statements made. My apologies if my discourse has unsettled you.

Natasha Adamios

Interesting how you ignore the fact that academic citations are made.

My apologies - the above fragment had not been incorporated (Interesting how you ignore the fact that academic citations are made.) It was meant to reinforce that fact that academics in many universities and countries support Farrokh's book. But more importantly, you seem to have a lot of time on your hands. I myself do not - I must get back to my real life. If I have time in the future I will try to visit this discussion but the points have been made. All is written.

Natasha Adamios —Preceding unsigned comment added by Natasha Adamios (talk • contribs) 20:42, 21 September 2008 (UTC)

I cited Lending, but I didn't say anything about archaeological sites. I did not mislead you over the Kavad/Iranscope site. If you are now telling me that Kavad has been editing his own biography I am a bit concerned. I have no personal dislike of Farrokh, I do have a personal dislike of biographies that are not objective. WHAT academic citations? I can't ignore something I have no information about. Wikipedia doesn't care about people who support Farrokh's book, only about verifiable and reliable sources. I note that you have time to insult me but not to add sources to improve the article. You've used this discussion page as a forum to vent, to attack, but not to be constructive to the article, which is unfortunate. Doug Weller (talk) 21:18, 21 September 2008 (UTC)

- **Comment** Somewhere above it is remarked that this page is about whether or not Farrokh's ideas are correct. This is wrong. This page is about whether or not Farrokh is notable. His ideas can be completely wrong and he might be still notable, or the other way around. WP has articles about astrologers and such, for example (they can be notable according to WP:FRINGE). The only thing that is needed for an article is notability as established by reliable and verifiable sources. The latter seem to be lacking here. I suggest you all take a deep breath and try to focus on the real issue here, not on whether Farrokh is right or wrong. --Crusio (talk) 21:33, 21 September 2008 (UTC)
 - Believe me, Crusio, Doug and I are both very well aware of this real issue, and we've reminded the other editors here of this issue until our fingers bleed. But you might want to read WP:TRUTH to see where they

appear to be coming from. -- ChrisO (talk) 22:04, 21 September 2008 (UTC)

Request for Natasha Adamios

Copied from the Shadows in the Desert talk page, just in case she reads this and not that page: You obviously know quite a bit about Farrokh and seem to know academics who know him, so this shouldn't be too time-consuming. What we need are published reviews (journals, the New York Times, etc) on either or both of these books because so far no one seems to have come up with any. Could you please try to find out if there are any? The lack of them is causing a problem.

Thanks. Doug Weller (talk) 08:15, 22 September 2008 (UTC)

Dear Doug,

I do not know Kaveh Farrokh as you imply. I have read of his works and know Iranscope as these links were forwarded in past 2 years or so among Greek chatgroups. His name has come up with respect to articles, especially his critique against Spiegel. I have however, not made the analysis of the minutiae of Kaveh Farrokh my life's work. I do not have the items you seek. As I noted already, my intention was to ensure balance and fairness. At least I had put a stop (I hope) to the Ad Hominom attacks that were taking place here - especially after inserting Lendering's views into the discussion. This is what raises powerful questions here, and I still have not recieved a satisfactory answer to that.

My issues are focused on the process here - not the person of Kaveh Farrokh. I am concerned but what is taking place here can happen to anyone.

I am fully aware of your attempts to appear "objective". As noted before, your statements belie your previous actions and hence raise questions as to your latent intentions.

1) You cited Lendering as an on-line reference and generated a discussion that was nothing less than low-level Ad Hominom attacks of Farrokh. Some of these comments are simply rude and have little to do with academia:

2) When I pointed out that Lendering makes mistakes on Persia (he also does with Greece but I am not bringing this up here) and is unreliable, you attempted to state that you were not basing the discussion on Lendering. This is illogical: your introduction of Lendering's biased review is recorded here. That "review" (as noted already) is biased, rude and unfair. But the real issue is that the Lendering review is full of mistakes (funny as it keeps trying to say how Farrokh makes "hundreds of errors").

3) You attempted to discredit Dr. David Khoupenia. When I pointed out his affiliations, you then attempted to change the tone of the discussion by stating that "oh but his review is posted on Farrokh's website". That was a deliberate (?) half-truth designed to misguide readers. Iranscope posted Khoupenia's review - and Iranscope belongs to Sam Ghandci. Farrokh website was briefly on-line on early 2008 before it was hacked. Yes, he had a link to Iranscope, but why is that a crime? You make no issues about Lendering self-referencing and I do not see you attacking Jona Lendering's website.

4) The next attempt was to imply that on-line references are invalid. That may sway or swindle some of the general readership but as I noted, on-line references are fully valid if these are from independent sources. As in cases 1-2, you did not directly address the issues, but answered defensively. In this case you now state that you want to have reviews in printed journals. Even if that were to appear, you would most probably find fault with that as well,

The tone of this discussion group has the signature of Joan Lendering, who clearly has a self-serving agenda. This is what raises questions as to the true intentions here. You feel entitled to post very selective and biased views (by Lendering) yet feel unsettled when inconsistencies are revealed.

Finally, you certainly have the luxury of having a lot of lot of time on your hands. I have noticed that you respond almost immediately to each and every posting and the same may said with respect to the other names on this discussion, panel, etc. I do not have the time or energy to spend as you do to work at launching attacks against one man. Lendering's attacks on Kaveh Farrokh appeared at the same time as the Spiegel and Daily Telegraph articles were published. When Farrokh retorted against these publications, Lendering simply increased his attacks all over the internet. It is only logical

that he would like to manipulate Wikipedia as well.

Once again, I have concerns with the process taking place here - although the main thrust here now has become "is this person notable"? is . Again I am no expert on Persia, nor am I legal expert not do I have the time you gentlemen do engage in petty discussions against one person. I have my statements in name of balance and fairness.

Natasha Adamios —Preceding unsigned comment added by Natasha Adamios (talk • contribs) 13:39, 22 September 2008 (UTC)

Deep breath. You clearly have time for long albeit extremely misguided edits. I gather that you are not interested in understanding how Wikipedia works and why 'on-line references' are a problem. You aren't even reading what I've written or you wouldn't accuse me of trying to discredit Khouphenia (although I see you are very happy about discrediting people yourself. You are using this page as a soapbox to discuss Farrokh, Lendering, etc which is totally inappropriate. I think you have violated WP:BLP by the way, and if you see some of your text removed that will be the reason. IF that happens, please don't replace it because you'll only end up blocked from editing (not by me as I'm involved). As for my rapid response, well, I'm retired and a large part of my role on Wikipedia involves preventing vandalism (removing obscenities, etc) and blocking vandals. I have a huge number of articles on my watchlist and as soon as they are changed I know about the change. You clearly have an agenda and won't believe me, but my agenda is keeping Wikipedia encyclopedic, and I recently treated a biography of a minor politician I'd vote for if I lived in the same constituency the same way I'm treating this article. By the way, I didn't think you knew Farrokh, but because you were writing about professors who somehow have evaluated him it was obvious you knew more about him than I do. Anyway, it's clear that you don't know about any published reviews either, which is a bit disappointing but as I'd already searched quite a bit, not surprising. Doug Weller (talk) 14:03, 22 September 2008 (UTC)

Hi I have also read some articles from Dr. Kaveh. The impression I got is that he is not objective and he is extremely biased in certain issues. But this comment should not discourage him; I still appreciate some of his interesting articles. Whoever contributes here on Wikipedia, should be objective. Unfortunately, there is a lot of unscientific, biased documents on Wikipedia (especially on history-everybody has their own agenda), regardless of the field. This mentality and approach degrades the Wikipedia. —Preceding unsigned comment added by 94.209.63.244 (talk) 19:48, 22 September 2008 (UTC)

Blurbs from Amazon

These blurbs really need verifiability. It isn't a question of suggesting Amazon is lying, but of where the original sources can be found so, for instance, people can read the missing bits. Amazon is a commercial site and you wouldn't expect them to include anything negative that the authors of these blurbs might have said. I can find a bit of Dankof's comment here [5] (http://blogs.albawaba.com/kramfoknad/1539/2007/06/04/71563-dr_kaveh_farrokh_shadows_in_the_desert_ancient_persia_at_war_mark_dankofs_rbn_radio_guest_for_wednesday_may_30th) but not all of it (and I think it's all or none by the way, you can't decide which ones you like and which you don't). His connection with Dankof is interesting, isn't it? Doug Weller (talk) 07:34, 24 September 2008 (UTC)

Well according to Wikipedia:RS#Primary.2C_secondary.2C_and_tertiary_sources tertiary sources allowed though not for detailed discussion. I think they could be used for establishment notability of a book Alex Bakharev (talk) 08:33, 24 September 2008 (UTC)

Alex, blurbs from Amazon may be tertiary sources and they are verifiable. The problem is, that they are not independent. In addition, it is very irregular to cite all these blurbs literally in an article. If you really want them mentioned in the article, despite the foregoing, I guess I could live with a neutrally-worded phrase saying that several academics have commented on the book, with a reference to the Amazon site. Copying the whole bunch here is a bit silly and borders on copyvio. --Crusio (talk) 08:42, 24 September 2008 (UTC)

I've raised the issue here [6] (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Reliable_sources/Noticeboard#Citing_unverifiable_Amazon_.27editorial_reviews.27_as_book_reviews) -- I think these are not verifiable, they are selective (note the ellipses) and thus could be misleading, and they are on a commercial website trying to sell the book. In fact, I think they are misleading in that one of them is by an assistant professor in the Health Science, Kinesiology, Recreation and Dance Department of the University of Arkansas, but they simply list him as Timothy

Baghurst, The Traveler, whereas other university staff are given their departments. It seems pretty clear that they wouldn't want to list Baghurst's department as that might make people wonder about his expertise in the field of Persian history. Doug Weller (talk) 08:48, 24 September 2008 (UTC)

And it's worse than I thought, one of these is by a New York chemistry grad student writing in "The modern magazine for Persian Weddings, Cuisine, Culture and Commentary". We would be misleading our readers if we accepted these at face value, the original sources need to be shown clearly. Doug Weller (talk) 09:01, 24 September 2008 (UTC)

The comments by academics on his work shouldn't be removed".--*Mardetanha*^{talk} 09:14, 24 September 2008 (UTC)

Who is a New York chemistry grad student? Amazon.com is both reliable and verifiable, but if your issue is with the reviewers written by the non-Academics, that I could agree with that. So as a compromise, we'll just remove the questionable quotes from the non-academics and only keep the quotes from the notable academics. --CreazySuit (talk) 09:16, 24 September 2008 (UTC)

I removed the trivial reviews, only keeping the academic ones. --CreazySuit (talk) 09:21, 24 September 2008 (UTC)

- CreazySuit, this is why Amazon is not a good source: Suppose I would publish in some reputable scientific journal a scathing book review of some really bad book. I might write something that boils down to "this book is well written, unfortunately, all that is written is wrong". This would almost certainly end up on Amazon or the publishers website as "the famous book critic Crusio said in *The Important Scientific Journal*: "this book is well written...". Unless someone would bother to look up the whole review, nobody would know that the book was actually demolished in that review. The bit that the publisher took from my review is more generally known as a blurb, not a review. Hope this clarifies the matter and that we can now proceed with deleting this fluff from the article. --Crusio (talk) 09:40, 24 September 2008 (UTC)

Reviews section (but not the Amazon stuff)

The first paragraph is a couple of sentences which aren't from a review.

We then have a sentence about a book signing. Not a review.

We then have an online review by 'Professor David Khoupenia'. It's not just that it's online, when did Dr. Khoupenia get promoted to professor? Ah, here [7] (http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Kaveh_Farrokh&diff=prev&oldid=147576111). So far as I know, he is not a professor, and the 2 photos he contributed to Shadows are attributed by Farrokh to 'Dr. David Khoupenia'. And what gives a physician specialising in herbs and supplements the expertise to comment on this book? [8] (http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m0EIN/is_1998_July_21/ai_50179298)

Then we have the introduction of the book classified as a book review. To be blunt, that's ridiculous. Something that is included within the book can't be called a book review. Doug Weller (talk) 09:54, 24 September 2008 (UTC)

Thesis

I have added a reference to Farrokh's MA thesis (which I found on Worldcat), but can't find his PhD thesis. Anyone have a reference for that? --Crusio (talk) 22:40, 24 September 2008 (UTC)

Never mind, I found it and have added references to the article. --Crusio (talk) 23:05, 24 September 2008 (UTC)
Well done. So why was he called a linguist? You know, if this article had been written according to WP guidelines and policies, instead of a lot of distortions, misrepresentations, etc, probably no one would have thought to take it to AfD. Doug Weller (talk) 08:05, 25 September 2008 (UTC)

Award

I'm dubious about the awarding organisation (obviously as I've raised an AfD as there were no sources in the article suggesting notability), but as they've got a typo for the title of his book I've used their web contact form to contact them about it. They also call him Professor which is of course inaccurate and worrying when an award body does that. Doug Weller (talk) 07:57, 25 September 2008 (UTC)

Book review

I am asking CrazySuit to read the source, it is very clear that this is a one page book review of *Iranian Nationality and the Persian Language*, which is a real book by Shahrokh Meskoob. The source lists the page numbers for the entire issue, and if it were more than one page it wouldn't just say one page. Doug Weller (talk) 09:55, 25 September 2008 (UTC)

Concerning "short": I think that a review article of 1 page would be "extremely short" (I doubt any even exist that are that short). Original research articles of 1 page exist, but are extremely rare, so that would also be "short". However, for a book review, one page is a rather current size, so in that case I think that "short" does not apply. Just my opinion as a professional editor. --Crusio (talk) 10:12, 25 September 2008 (UTC)

I'd removed 'short' before I saw this. You're right. I don't want to go the other way. The problem with this article and I think the reason it went to AfD is that it wasn't honest. This one page book review, for instance, was described as an example when the article read that Farrokh "has contributed articles to internationally recognized academic journals". That appears to be completely untrue. Just as you discovered that his PhD was not linguistics, as was suggested by the article. Just as the forward to his book is described as a review, etc. And the basic reason for what I see as mispresentation is the bio that I am sure he himself submitted to WAIS, conference organisers don't write the bios for participants. The original article creator should have verified his claims. Doug Weller (talk) 10:23, 25 September 2008 (UTC)

Who said his PhD was not linguistics? His PhD is on "the cognitive and linguistic processes of Persian speakers". --CrazySuit (talk) 12:33, 25 September 2008 (UTC)

Looks more like psychology to me. -- ChrisO (talk) 12:44, 25 September 2008 (UTC)

The only references we have that mention departments mention " Kareh Farrokh, External Reader, Ph.D. Research, Educational and Counselling Psychology, University of British Columbia (2001)", and this one [9] (<http://www.lerc.educ.ubc.ca/fac/norton/CV%20UBC%20September%202007.pdf>) from someone in the Language and Literacy Education Department. It's only a guess, but I imagine he used his PhD research for his article on dyslexia, and our best clue until we know more is probably his job at Langara, in counselling [10] (http://www.langara.bc.ca/academic-services/counselling/success_workshops.html) which matches with the evidence that his PhD was in "Research, Educational and Counselling Psychology". Doug Weller (talk) 13:34, 25 September 2008 (UTC)

I forgot. A blog related to Mark Dankof has promoted him [11] (<http://batr.net/fyi/>) has him as "professor of Persian Studies at the University of British Columbia". See why we want really reliable sources and often find web sites don't meet our standards? Doug Weller (talk) 13:38, 25 September 2008 (UTC)

titles

I think that it's totally enough to mention his academic titles in one sentence. In the body of the text, titles such as Dr., Prof., etc should be avoided. Thus, I suggest to replace, for instance, "Dr. Farrokh" with "Kaveh Farrokh" or simply "he". Tajik (talk) 00:18, 26 September 2008 (UTC)

Well spotted. The article needs to be brought up to WP standards, and here's what WP says about academic titles:

Academic titles

Academic and professional titles (such as "Doctor" or "Professor") should not be used before the name in the initial sentence or in other uses of the person's name. Verifiable facts about how the person attained such titles should be included in the article text instead. In cases where the person is widely known by a pseudonym or stage name containing such a title (whether earned or not), it may be included as described above. Post-nominal letters indicating academic degrees (including honorary degrees) should not be included following the subject's name.

Stephen William Hawking, CH, CBE, FRS (born January 8, 1942) is considered one of the world's leading theoretical physicists. Hawking is the Lucasian Professor of Mathematics at the University of Cambridge...

His books

These should be mentioned here, obviously, as they are his claim to notability. But there is an article already on *Shadows in the Desert*, and there should only be a brief mention of the book with the usual Main article: etc. Doug Weller (talk) 05:58, 26 September 2008 (UTC)

Forgot. Amazon is not a reliable source for reviews, so any reviews have to have their original source. Doug Weller (talk) 05:59, 26 September 2008 (UTC)

Amazon is a tertiary source. --CreazySuit (talk) 08:20, 26 September 2008 (UTC)

The consensus at the reliable sources noticeboard disagrees. See WP:RSN#Citing unverifiable Amazon 'editorial reviews' as book reviews. -- ChrisO (talk) 15:32, 26 September 2008 (UTC)

Institut Chateaubriand

I have removed the information about his high school and the award that he purportedly received there. After extensive searching on google.com and google.fr, I cannot find a site for this school. It probably exists, as it is listed on a site that is the French equivalent of schoolmates.com (or whatever it may be called), but that is all that comes up. The da Vinci award also gives no hits 'except, of course, for this WP article and the conference program with Farrokh's CV. As an apparently local award to a high school student is nothing special in any case, I have removed this phrase. --Crusio (talk) 18:00, 27 September 2008 (UTC)

You might find this interesting: [12] (<http://books.google.com/books?client=firefox-a&um=1&q=Institut+Chateaubriand+cannes&btnG=Search+Books>), [13] (<http://books.google.com/books?id=CKBGAAAAMAAJ&q=Institut+Chateaubriand+cannes&dq=Institut+Chateaubriand+cannes&ei=fRzfSMbuDIu8tAP-nNi0AQ&client=firefox-a&pgis=1>), [14] (<http://books.google.com/books?id=kudUAAAAMAAJ&q=Institut+Chateaubriand+cannes&dq=Institut+Chateaubriand+cannes&ei=fRzfSMbuDIu8tAP-nNi0AQ&client=firefox-a&pgis=1>), [15] (<http://books.google.com/books?id=kudUAAAAMAAJ&q=Institut+Chateaubriand+cannes&dq=Institut+Chateaubriand+cannes&ei=fRzfSMbuDIu8tAP-nNi0AQ&client=firefox-a&pgis=1>). Also, through a quick search, it appears that this (http://cvr-unn.org/chioli_pascal_chijioke.htm) individual attended the same school, showing that it does indeed exist even though it may not have an official website. I'm also assuming that "the Leonardo Da Vinci prize" is in French, not English. Regardless, this information is backed by what appears to be a reliable source (<http://wais.stanford.edu/waisprogram.pdf>). As for the tag, Farrokh is indeed notable according to WP:PEOPLE, There has been no consensus concerning the Amazon reviews. IMO Amazon is a decent tertiary source. Khoikhoi 06:00, 28 September 2008 (UTC)

As I said above, there is no doubt that the Institut Chateaubriand exists. However, it seems to be only a high school, so I don't see much reason to mention it. I searched the Cannes city website and google.fr (I am a French civil servant, so I can read French...) and don't find any mention of a da Vinci prize (I searched for "da Vinci" and Cannes, because "prize" may be several other words in French). It is therefore likely that this award is not very notable and I see no reason to include something like that in an article. As for the tag, the result of the AfD was "no consensus", with the closing admin stating that he felt the default keep decision was wrong. Notability still is an issue therefore. Sources please! Concerning the Amazon reviews, according

to WP:QS, websites that are promotional in nature are questionable sources, I gingerly suggest that Amazon is part of this, their business, after all, is not providing info but selling books. Amazon can be a great source to find out whether a or several reviews exist for a given book. However, the original source for that review is then necessary. There is mostly a consensus on

WP:Reliable_sources/Noticeboard#Citing_unverifiable_Amazon_.27editorial_reviews.27_as_book_reviews that Amazon can be used as a source to find reviews, but not as a source to cite them, the original review is needed, otherwise it's just a blurb. Given the foregoing, I am going to re-delete the mentioned info from the article. --Crusio (talk) 10:36, 28 September 2008 (UTC)

I changed that section to reviews and blurbs. How about that? Also Amazon might promote their book, but to jump to the conclusion that those reviews/blurbs are madeup is somewhat stretching it. Has there been numerous examples where Amazon has lied like this? --Nepaheshgar 00:28, 29 September 2008 (UTC)

First, we have an article about the book, which is where reviews, etc. should go, not in the bio.

Second, no one is accusing Amazon of lying and I think you know that. Read the RSN discussion. We can't verify these blurbs, and they aren't even all complete. Maybe the left out parts are critical - readers need to be able to verify the **whole** quote, why do editors seem to disagree about this? But the key thing is, to use them, we need to use the original source. Not Amazon.

And back to the subject of this session, 'reliable source'? It's a bio submitted to a conference. Haven't I been clear about that? Conferences to not employ researchers to check high school records and look up either details of a participant's life, they ask the participant to submit them. In other words, this is from the subject of the article, Farrokh. I have no reason whatsoever to doubt that it is correct. I do think it makes the article look a bit silly and as though someone was straining to make him look important. Doug Weller (talk) 06:02, 29 September 2008 (UTC)

I wonder whether Farrokh even knows this article exists? If I were in his place, I'd request deletion of the thing, because it indeed looks silly and scratching together negligible crumbs to make him look important. --Crusio (talk) 10:33, 29 September 2008 (UTC)

But he's the one who told WAIS about his high school award, so I'm not sure. But I agree about the look. Doug Weller (talk) 11:21, 29 September 2008 (UTC)

True, didn't think of that, so perhaps he would not object. --Crusio (talk) 11:27, 29 September 2008 (UTC)

Is a bio in a conference program a reliable and independent source?

I have raised this issue that has led to some reverts today here. --Crusio (talk) 22:03, 29 September 2008 (UTC)

sometimes the organizers of conferences ask bio's from the participants or from the convenors of the panels. Sometimes they make the bio's themselves. In any case they always check and edit the info they get. They should do it any way. Sometimes they even put wrong info about a participant. But most of the time they shorten bio's. In any case it is up to the Organizers to publish a well-written and true bio. I do not think this case is any different than all the other casdes. Your personal grudges against Kaveh Farrokh should not lead you to cast doubts about everything.--Babakexorramdin (talk) 16:48, 30 September 2008 (UTC)

Having participated at several such meetings and having been involved in the organization of quite a few others, I can tell you that those solicited bios are only shortened, at best. Nothing is checked, so only if someone would put in something glaringly wrong would that be caught. Conference organizers have better things to do than check those bios, the only purpose of which is to give attendants an idea about who the speaker is, nothing more or less. I am, however, rather dismayed that you abandon WP:AGF by assuming that I have a personal grudge against Farrokh. I don't know him, never met him, and don't care one way or another whether there's an article on him in Wikipedia or not. What I *do* care about is that articles in Wikipedia are properly sourced and neutrally written, as behaves an

encyclopedia. I have been accused of having personal grudges against astrologers and magicians and of being a sinner for proposing the deletion of an article on a faithful housewife. If you want to add Farrokh in that distinguished list, that's fine with me. Have a look at [Wikipedia:Reliable_sources/Noticeboard#Is a bio in a conference program a reliable and independent source?](#) and you will see that some editors that have never been involved with this article admonish me for leaving a high school award in the article, because that makes it look like a hagiography. You seem to want to keep it in, now tell me again, who has a personal grudge against Farrokh and wants to make him look bad? --Crusio (talk) 17:15, 30 September 2008 (UTC)

Well I did not mean that you have grudges against him in person, but regarding your "discourse": You seem to question everything about him in a manner that most outsiders would assume that you have grudges against him. I personally would never put a highschool award in my CV. But do you see a CV with a high school award in that. Then there should be checked if that award was worth to be mentioned or not. Or what is the purpose of mentioning it. Is it in this case because the original author wanted to describe Farrokh's preoccupation with history since his young years etc... Is it written in a conference biography? Be it. The reader can himself/herself judge about the reliability of that. Finally the notability of one is not only because of his publications. Farrokh is very active and writes online also about the ethnic issues in Iran and he is not an "un"notable figure in that respect.--Babakexorramdin (talk) 14:19, 1 October 2008 (UTC)

This is becoming a tiresome repeat of the recent AfD. If he's so active and notable, then *please*, add reliable, independent sources to this article showing that. Not Amazon blurbs, not highschool awards from an autobio thingy, but real independent sources. Nobody in the AfD was able to do that and the "no consensus" decision only came about because of a number of people yelling and distracting the discussion, for whatever reasons of their own. Yours is, as far as I know, the first mention of Farrokh writing about "ethnic issues in Iran" in addition of being an expert on historical issues. Do you have any sources for that? If yes, don't post them here but improve the article. Once that is done, we can get rid of all the fluff (highschool award, Amazon blurbs and such) and create a solid, encyclopedical article instead of the fan-site (in fact screaming "non-notable" to all who actually read it) that we have now. As for the readers themselves who would have to judge the reliability of sources, if you want to change WP policies, go ahead and try to get that done. But for the moment, it's us, the editors, that have to make sure that sources are reliable and prevailing consensus is that a conference autobio is *not* a reliable source and neither are "editorial reviews" on Amazon. I am going to remove all that nonsense yet again and hope that the discussion here convinces all involved that this kind of fluff is not needed and actually counterproductive. --Crusio (talk) 14:59, 1 October 2008 (UTC)

Now this is exactly one part of the problem. You and especially dougweller have removed his online articles and online book. The official reason was that they are self-published. First of all many publications are self-published too. Also those from respectable scientists. Secondly these were not self-published. these were placed in external websites as well as his own website. Iranscope is not his website. Rozaneh Magazine is an established online Iranian source which publishes on Social and cultural aspects of Iranian life. There were also other sources. If I am not mistaken "asian times" etc... His online book Pan-Turanism takes aim at Azerbaijan is also listed in google-scholar and external sources have referred to it. So I think bringing them back to the article , improves the article.--Babakexorramdin (talk) 15:37, 1 October 2008 (UTC)

I have posted something on your talk page. All and all I think his online book Panturanism takes aim at Azerbaijan should be listed. It is well sourced and well written and as I know it has got enough attention by people in Iran and the republic of Azerbaijan (which cannot be always googled properly)--Babakexorramdin (talk) 16:47, 1 October 2008 (UTC)

Self-published articles/books are *primary* sources and can be cited as, say: So -and-so published this or that. Not much use doing that if there is no reason to assume that those primary sources in themselves are notable (such as having been

reviewed in reliable and independent sources, or cited a significant number of times by other scientists). Before going into the article again, please have a look at how it is now. I may be biased because I just did all this editing, but I sincerely think that the article is encyclopedic now, does not contain fluff, and does not disparage its subject, but present him and his works in a fair and neutral way. If you have sources to add, show them and let's talk about them first to get a consensus. I won't make any further changes without discussing them here, either. --Crusio (talk) 15:50, 1 October 2008 (UTC)

- I'd love to know how those poor conference organisers spoken up above were able to check things like high school awards. Maybe where everyone knows everyone else and it's a small conference, this unlikely event might happen. But normal conferences, no. Doesn't happen. Shall we remove the award since we can't check it and the organisers might have got it wrong? :-) Doug Weller (talk) 19:14, 30 September 2008 (UTC)

shortened article without fluff

I have just removed a lot of unnecessary info (highschool award, number of languages spoken) and info from sources that are not WP:RS. I maintain that the article as it stands now is much more encyclopedic than the fluffed up version that we had before. I gingerly request that any editor wanting to re-add the removed information first explains on this talk page why that information is pertinent, reliable, and improves the article. --Crusio (talk) 15:10, 1 October 2008 (UTC)

Removal of notability tag

I have removed the notability tag. As the article stands now, with all the fluff removed, notability actually seems to be much less of a problem than it was before. One minor issue remaining is the layout/formatting of several references. --Crusio (talk) 15:17, 1 October 2008 (UTC)

Good work. I've made a few changes as well, which should mostly be fairly self-explanatory. The most important is that I've made the lead much more specific than it was before. I found Farrokh's current line of work - he's an educational counsellor at Langara College (see [16] (<http://www.langara.bc.ca/academic-services/counselling/who.html>)), where he gives exciting-sounding workshops on "speed reading" and "test-taking skills and exam anxiety" ([17] (http://www.langara.bc.ca/athletics/intramurals/student_life_october.pdf)). After PelleSmith drew my attention to the rather unsatisfactory line sourced to Radio Free Europe, I've replaced this with a more detailed description taken from the biographical notes in one of Farrokh's own books. -- ChrisO (talk) 23:35, 3 October 2008 (UTC)

Lead

Your poor attempts at ridiculing Farrokh's day-job, and similar personal comments (i.e. [18] (http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Talk:Kaveh_Farrokh&diff=242063591&oldid=242058804)), are not only insulting but are also blatant violations of WP:BLP. He is a published author, his day-job's description does not belong in the lead. As "unsatisfactory" as it may be to you or PelleSmith, Radio Free Europe is a government-sponsored source, and most certainly a WP:RS. κhoikhoi 00:10, 4 October 2008 (UTC)

Huh? I thought we were writing a biography here. A person's day job is *obviously* relevant to that. Go to Category:1962 births (in which Farrokh is included) and look at literally any biography in there - you'll see that every one of them starts "<firstname> <surname> (born 1962) is a ..." where the ... is the person's job - bank robber, comedian, footballer, whatever. Farrokh is, indisputably, a counsellor at Langara College. Osprey Publishing's own profile of Farrokh confirms this [19] (http://www.ospreypublishing.com/authors/kaveh_farrokh/) and the college is obviously an ultra-reliable source. His role and activities are publicly advertised on its website, so it's hardly a "personal" (by which I assume you mean private) issue. Nor am I ridiculing Farrokh's job - I'm sure it's all very

worthy, but personally I would be bored rigid by what he teaches, hence my comment. Now, could you explain what the point is of not mentioning Farrokh's job in the lead, and also explain why a throwaway line by Radio Free Europe should get such prominence? It's a reliable source, but it doesn't give any indication of *who* considers him an expert, nor - obviously - does it say anything about what he actually does. Rather than use such a vague and subjective comment from a random media source, isn't it preferable to stick with the conservative and indisputable list of facts given in his biographical profile? -- ChrisO (talk) 00:26, 4 October 2008 (UTC)

The lead should contain what he is most well-known for, obviously. This is border-line trivia, it has nothing to do with his publications, or his appearances on documentaries, etc. WP:LEAD says that the intro should "explain why the subject is interesting or notable". When it comes to the field of Iranian history, which is the area he is notable for, we have a reliable source calling him an "expert". Radio Free Europe obviously considers him one, they're the ones calling him that. Khoikhoi 00:42, 4 October 2008 (UTC)

Why is it border-line trivia? It's what the man does, for heaven's sake! You're right that it has nothing to do with his publications, because his publications have nothing to do with his professional qualifications - he doesn't have any qualifications as an historian. But I really cannot see any justifiable reason why you want to remove a straightforward, reliably sourced, factual reference to his profession from the lead. Unless of course you are personally uncomfortable with this description. -- ChrisO (talk) 00:47, 4 October 2008 (UTC)

Of course it's what he does, but it's not what he's **notable** for. If you search his name in Google, Google Books, Google News, Google Scholar, etc. -- only 1% of the links will be about his work as counselor. Did you read what I quoted from WP:LEAD, or were you too caught up in trying to downgrade his qualifications? Practice what you preach for a change Chris. Khoikhoi 00:52, 4 October 2008 (UTC)

Please cut out the personal attacks - they're not helping anyone. Yes, of course I know what WP:LEAD says, which is precisely why I **expanded** the lead to state what he is notable for - not the vague fluff about being "an expert", but what he has actually done to earn his (marginal) notability. But you appear to be using WP:LEAD to *exclude* information that you don't seem to like. WP:LEAD requires us to *say* why the subject is notable but it doesn't force us to exclude other relevant information. Farrokh is an educationalist who happens to be known for certain other things - that's a completely factual, neutral statement. There's no POV involved, the sources are completely reliable, so what is the problem? -- ChrisO (talk) 01:11, 4 October 2008 (UTC)

"but what he has actually done to earn his (marginal) notability" -- please provide sources showing that he is most notable for being a counselor. Last time I checked, the lead is supposed to summarize the main body text of the article ([20] (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Cyrus_cylinder/Archive_2#Lead)). The rest of the article discusses everything *except* his work as a work as a counselor. Notice how the sentence "He is currently a learning and career specialist in Langara College in Vancouver, British Columbia" only comes near the very end of this (http://www.ospreypublishing.com/authors/kaveh_farrokh/) paragraph. All of this is proceeded by "Kaveh has collected data and primary sources on Sassanian cavalry for 18 years resulting in travels to locations such as Naghshe-Rustam (Iran). He has given lectures and seminars in the University of British Columbia and the Knowledge Network Television Program of British Columbia and

has written articles for various journals. Kaveh obtained his PhD in 2001 from the University of British Columbia where he specialized on the acquisition of Persian languages." The bottom line is that this trivial information, which has nothing to do with his notability as a scholar and does not qualify to be in the lead, especially as the definition of the article. Khoikhoi 02:34, 4 October 2008 (UTC)

He is best known first and foremost an author, not as "a counselor at Langara College", so his job is really trivial (not lead material) in that context. --Nepaheshgar (talk) 03:19, 4 October 2008 (UTC)

{unindent}News reports are unsuitable as a way of describing his expertise. He has written on dyslexia and language acquisition, his subjects being Persian speakers, but he isn't a linguist and shouldn't be described as one. From an academic point of view, the exact language is not the important thing. I don't see why his profession as a counsellor (and it is one, he has a PhD in it, what more do you want?), shouldn't be in the lead. Doug Weller (talk) 06:05, 4 October 2008 (UTC)

We have a standard approach to biographical articles - name, date(s) of birth/death, profession, thing that makes the person notable. This is entirely what WP:LEAD requires - establish the context (i.e. who he is) and explain why the subject is interesting or notable (i.e. what he has done to make himself notable). Every other biography I've looked at in Category:1962 births, in which Farrokh is included, follows exactly the same format. Why should this one be different? -- ChrisO (talk) 09:08, 4 October 2008 (UTC)

I think it is strange not to mention his day-time occupation in the lead (as if it would be something to be ashamed of), but I agree with Khoikhoi and others that Farrokh's notability derives from being an author. So why not start the lead as "Farrokh is a counselor and author"? As for the fact that his PhD is in another field and he should therefore not be called a linguist or historian, I don't agree with that. My own PhD is in zoology (and my earliest scientific publications are in botany), but I claim to be a neurobehavioral geneticist now. There's no reason to believe that somebody stops developing professionally after the PhD. Farrokh has published on history, I don't have any problem with calling him a historian. I think the word "expert" goes a bit too far, given that apparently he has not been able to get employed as a historian (which he surely must have tried as it seems to be his main interest). --Crusio (talk) 10:00, 4 October 2008 (UTC)

I think the problem is more that even the most definitive sources we have on his life - namely his publisher's biographical profile and the profiles in his books - don't call him an historian. At best, they describe him as a researcher. Calling him a historian would seem to me to be original research without a reliable source that calls him that. -- ChrisO (talk) 10:51, 4 October 2008 (UTC)

I don't think it's OR to call an author of historical books a historian. But would a workable compromise be to call him in the lead a "counselor and author of historical books"? --Crusio (talk) 11:09, 4 October 2008 (UTC)

Yes, that sounds reasonable. Calling him a "historian" is somewhat misleading given that he doesn't have any qualifications that are even loosely related to that field. In your own case, you've been trained in the biological sciences, so your work as a neurobehavioral geneticist is an obvious development of that; but I don't think you could say that Farrokh's historical work has been an obvious development of his own professional field of work or study. It seems to be very much a personal thing. I note that the biographical profile published in *Shadows of the Desert* says that he'd been researching Persian history for 18 years, i.e. well before he acquired his qualifications in a different field. -- ChrisO (talk) 11:19, 4 October 2008 (UTC)

Radio Free Europe is is a government source and, therefore an objective WP:RS, it should not be removed.--CreazySuit (talk) 14:42, 4 October 2008 (UTC)

Not quite, it's a private organisation that is publicly funded, rather like the BBC or PBS. -- ChrisO (talk) 18:17, 4 October 2008 (UTC)

I find the idea that Radio Free Europe is de facto a reliable source highly problematic given its primary function for years as a propaganda outlet. A radio station with a distinct geo-political agenda should not be

compared to other publicly funded media outlets simply because they have similar funding (not that I think ChrisO is suggesting this). Perhaps something for the RS/N.PelleSmith (talk) 19:58, 5 October 2008 (UTC)

Even if RFE is considered reliable for general news items how on earth are they to be considered arbiters of "expertise" in academic fields? My initial comment on the RS/N concerns more than general reliability. I wouldn't source anyone's supposed academic expertise to a news outlet of any kind -- Radio Free Europe, New York Times, etc. We have no expectation that news reporters can distinguish between historians and non-fiction writers lacking the academic qualifications and/or *recognition*. He has no credentials, so do historian reviewers in peer-reviewed history journals refer to him as a historian?PelleSmith (talk) 20:25, 5 October 2008 (UTC)

I haven't found any reviews of his 2 books in any history journals, let alone peer-reviewed. I looked on JSTOR also. Doug Weller (talk) 21:16, 5 October 2008 (UTC)

I looked on JSTOR on Saturday and a bunch of other journals as well. No mentions of Farrokh. I've also not found any books referencing any of his works. -- ChrisO (talk) 21:21, 5 October 2008 (UTC)

Charles Bukowski's day job was as a postman, but the wiki article doesn't mention it until 3/4 of the way down the page. George Orwell taught at a boy's high school, Sherwood Anderson had a manufacturing plant, etc etc etc... Notable people have been everything from bums, to bank tellers, to the rich with no day job. It is what they are noted *for* that makes them notable, not their day-job. It is not up to Radio Free Europe or New York Times to decide exactly whose version of history to accept, but the assumption is that they would not choose to showcase a window cleaner with no background, but would look to someone they (these credentialed reporters) have ascertained is an expert. Nor is it that Farrokh's view is outside of the mainstream. It is not. Tundrabugy (talk) 03:12, 6 October 2008 (UTC)

"These credentialed reporters"? So you know the credentials of the writer on the Radio Free Europe website, and you trust that those credentials give him the ability to understand what counts as "expertise" in the field of history? I'm sorry but that is not a standard that I am comfortable with. We have reliable ways to source expertise in academic fields. A popular science writer is not afforded the same credentials as a scientist. The same applies across the social sciences and humanities. It is not meaningful at all that one news reporter referred to him as an expert, though it would be immensely meaningful if actual historians did. If he had a PhD, held a teaching position in this field, or had a publishing history that clearly involved peer-review the story might be different.PelleSmith (talk) 12:04, 6 October 2008 (UTC)

I also note that you have used only writers of fiction above in your example about "day jobs". If there was ever an apples to oranges comparison that would be it. You know William Carlos Williams was a doctor during the day ... and then on his spare time he wrote poems. Thankfully we don't rely on poems or novels to source factual claims in history, science, economics, etc.PelleSmith (talk) 12:07, 6 October 2008 (UTC)

Yep, he was, in fact, my doctor as a child. We don't know how the RFE reporter got in touch with Farrokh, whether someone else recommended him, etc. Farrokh had written a book and had written online stuff that was relevant to the article, that presumably was enough for the reporter. This is for me a matter of principle, we need better sources than a journalist to call someone a professional linguist/historian/whatever. I am asking the other editors to recognise this so that we can move on. Doug Weller (talk) 12:45, 6 October 2008 (UTC)

- Frankly, I don't care about the credentials or lack thereof of any reporter. The word "expert" is a WP:PEACOCK word. Read, for example, the lead to the article on Albert Einstein, somebody who published important works in physics while having a completely different day time job (clerk at a patent office): "Albert Einstein (14 March 1879 – 18 April 1955) was a German-born theoretical physicist. He is best known for his theory of relativity". Note the absence of words like "reknowned", "world -famous" (or just "famous"), "expert", "ground-breaking", "revolutionary" etc. even though almost anybody would agree that these words would apply to Einstein and his works. It isn't any different here. Farrokh is being portrayed as an academic, so his academic daytime job is relevant. He publishes books on history, so we can call him a "historian" or "author of historical books". But we should not call him an "expert on history". --Crusio (talk) 14:39, 6 October 2008 (UTC)
 - I don't quite follow. You just said that the Einstein article doesn't mention in the intro that he was a clerk at a patent office, but then you say "his academic daytime job is relevant". When we're talking about academics, we have the historical works Farrokh has

written and we have his day job as a learning and career specialist. I fail to draw the connection between the two not because they are totally different subjects, but because if he only did the latter we never would never have an article on him, it wouldn't meet the notability criteria. He is an author of historical books who *happens* to also work as a counselor in something completely unrelated and un-noteworthy. I have no objection to the latter being mentioned, but I fail to see why this trivial information should be mentioned in the intro simply because "it's what the man does". As Crusio pointed out, Einstein is a good example. KhoiKhoi 19:32, 6 October 2008 (UTC)

- The difference is that Einstein wasn't employed as an academic at the time I mentioned. In addition, the Einstein article covers his whole life, and he was a patent clerk only for a short period. It would be wrong to say in the Einstein article that he "was a clerk", because that was only a small part of his (professional) life. Here, as far as I can see, it's what this person *is*, like right now. That somehow seems to make a difference to me. Having said that, Dougweller's compromise solution just below is acceptable to me. --Crusio (talk) 21:56, 6 October 2008 (UTC)
- If you search his name, as I've pointed out above, 99% of the time he isn't introduced as a college counselor. Why then should we have this in the intro on Wikipedia? The search results alone show that his day job is irrelevant to his notability as an author/writer of historical books/etc. KhoiKhoi 03:03, 7 October 2008 (UTC)
 - Well, I'm sensitive to this argument and that's why I said that Dougweller's compromise (mention "author of historical books" in the lead, his daytime job elsewhere in the article). I guess it just feels weird to me to muffle away someone's occupation. But given the difficulties to find his occupation, I guess you're right and it should not be in the lead. --Crusio (talk) 07:14, 7 October 2008 (UTC)

So, will you agree that the intro calls him an author and doesn't try to claim expertise in anything, and that further down his day job is mentioned? Doug Weller (talk) 21:44, 6 October 2008 (UTC)

By "further down", do you mean further down in the intro, or further down in the article? He is indeed not only an author, he is also a specialist/expert or whatever you want to call it. He would not have been introduced as such by the BBC, VOA, and RFL. We can call him a "historian" or something similar, but simply labeling him as a "writer" doesn't seem sufficient IMO. KhoiKhoi 03:03, 7 October 2008 (UTC)

Where is he referred to as an historian? What is he a specialist/expert in? Certainly not history ... not simply because Radio Free Europe decided to say it. PelleSmith (talk) 04:49, 7 October 2008 (UTC)

Following this from BLP/N - it strikes me as strange that we don't mention his actual profession in the lede of the article. It may not be the source of his fame, but it certainly is a vital fact of who he is. This article is biographical, not a professional history, and should include important biographical facts - date and place of birth, religion perhaps, family status, profession, etc. Not complex pieces of information, of course, so they don't need any elaboration, but they still belong in or near the introductory section. Avruch^T 14:54, 6 October 2008 (UTC)

- Not even Einstein is referred to as a specialist/expert. Those are words I always remove when I clean-up/edit bios. --Crusio (talk) 07:14, 7 October 2008 (UTC)

I would just point out that *just as we accept news content from valid news reporters* (eg *credentialed* to NYT) from reliable sources (ie NYT, Radio Free America), so do we accept someone who is sought out by such reliable sources (ie NYT, Radio Free America) as "an expert source." Such respectable publications would not use a high-school history teacher or amateur historian to advise or interview on a subject; or if it were so, would have to be proved. Tundrabuggy (talk) 15:29, 6 October 2008 (UTC)

They use amateur historians all the time. Of course you probably don't want to call these

historians "amateur" just because they write history books as a hobby. PelleSmith (talk) 15:49, 6 October 2008 (UTC)

Let's step back a bit and review what sources we do have on this person. There are three primary sources that I can think of:

- Biographical note in *Sassanian Elite Cavalry AD 224-642* (2005)
- Biographical note in *Shadows in the Desert* (2007)
- Biographical profile on his publisher's website (undated, but probably 2007, as it's a slightly longer version of the *Shadows in the Desert* profile) [21] (http://www.ospreypublishing.com/authors/kaveh_farrokh/)

They all describe him in similar ways, as someone who has been "researching the military history and technology of Persia for two decades." They mention his PhD in linguistics from the University of British Columbia in 2001, giving lectures and seminars at UBC, and in the case of the 2007 profiles, his job at Langara College. They don't claim any historical qualifications or call him a historian. It's fairly safe to assume that - since they are published in books he authored - Farrokh had a hand in these profiles. In short, they're as close to "official" biogs as we're going to get.

The RFE piece is not even about Farrokh in the first place. [22] (<http://www.rferl.org/content/article/1057143.html>) It cites him briefly (just two sentences) in the course of a much longer article. The only info that it provides about him is the line "Kaveh Farrokh is an expert on the history and linguistics of Persia, particularly in the pre-Islamic era." It doesn't give any other details - the purpose of the line is simply to set him up as a credible source for the quote that follows. It's not biographical information - it's merely the journalist's own personal view of Farrokh.

I honestly don't know why some people don't want to mention Farrokh's job. Are they embarrassed about it? If so, that's pretty silly - it's a perfectly respectable job. It doesn't give him any extra credibility as a historian, but we're not trying to boost his reputation here - or are we? -- ChrisO (talk) 20:06, 6 October 2008 (UTC)

Given that there appears to be no one arguing against mentioning the profession of the subject of the article, it would seem to be an opportunity for an {{editprotected}} request. If there is no other objection to including this biographical detail in the lead, then I'll make the request in the morning (8-10 hours from now). **Avruch**^T 03:30, 8 October 2008 (UTC)

What do you mean "no one arguing against mentioning the profession of the subject of the article"? The main dispute here is about the inclusion of his day-time job in the lead, which has nothing to do with his notability as an author and commentator. Otherwise, his "profession" is already mentioned. Khoikhoi 04:48, 9 October 2008 (UTC)

What I meant was that there was no one *still* arguing against including his "day time job" as you put it in the lead. Most of the discussion above is about describing him as an expert/historian etc. Is your belief that his day time job is unrelated to his notability the sole argument for excluding it from the lead? We usually put geographic origin and date of birth in the lead, is that an element of notability for most BLP subjects?

Avruch^T 13:43, 9 October 2008 (UTC)

Obviously the info in the lead is not just a catalogue of notable items. Any biography has to have a minimum of key pieces of information - a person's name, date of birth (and death), country, profession and thing(s) for which they are notable. That's the kind of information you would expect to find in the lead of any biographical article. I really have no idea why there seems to be such resistance to putting this information in the lead of this article. What is it about this subject that means it has to be treated so differently? -- ChrisO (talk) 15:46, 9 October 2008 (UTC)

There appears to be no consensus as of yet and should remain protected for a while longer. Tundrabuggy (talk) 04:34, 9 October 2008 (UTC)

Something else: go ahead and delete this article. But the persons involved should know that they cannot reach any thing by bullying an entire people. Kaveh Farrokh is one. They cannot make 70 million people keep silent. No Iranians cannot

appreciate things such as 300 and not without my daughter etc... no one can laugh at insults and harassment,.....I wanted to load off something off my heart. Please go ahead and ask for my permanent ban, seemingly I as a non-Western am not allowed to express my opinion. go ahead please...--Babakexorramdin (talk) 14:51, 7 November 2008 (UTC)

Protection

The article has been fully protected until disputes have been resolved. Please form a consensus and then contact me or another administrator at requests for unprotection. Please let me know if you have any questions. KnightLago (talk) 23:03, 4 October 2008 (UTC)

Compromise proposal

As a compromise between the opposing viewpoints above, I propose the following:

- (1) In the lead, change the first phrase from

"Kaveh Farrokh (born 24 September 1962, Athens) is an expert in the field of Iranian history and linguistics.[1]"
to

"Kaveh Farrokh (born 24 September 1962, Athens) is an author of books on Iranian history."

- (2) Under "Life and Education", add the following phrase at the end of the section:

"He currently works as a counselor at Langara College in Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.[13]" (The reference is from the next section).

- (3) Under "Works", remove the phrase "He also works as a counselor at Langara College in Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.[13]"

Would this be acceptable to all involved? --Crusio (talk) 08:36, 9 October 2008 (UTC)

- Amended proposal. The discussion in sections lower on ths page centers on the use of the word "expert". This is considered a POV word by some. Others insist that it should be used. Would the word "specialist" be a good compromise? Specialist is much more neutral, as it does not inherently implies quality (such as "expert" does), but rather is a description of someone's interests. Thus, I would modify the opening sentence listed under (1) in the proposal above to "Kaveh Farrokh (born 24 September 1962, Athens) is an author of historical books specializing on early Iranian history." I would like to stress that I personally find this less satisfactory than the neutral and factual original proposal and I definitely think that we should not go any farther than this. --Crusio (talk) 10:20, 4 November 2008 (UTC)

Why not "is an author of books on Persian history and linguistics and a counselor at Langara College in Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada." ? **Avruch T** 15:51, 9 October 2008 (UTC)

That works for me, Avruch. -- ChrisO (talk) 16:07, 9 October 2008 (UTC)

I did not propose "is an author of books on Persian history and linguistics and a counselor at Langara College in Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada." because this is supposed to be a *compromise* solution and some people object to having his current daytime occupation in the opening sentence. --Crusio (talk) 16:30, 9 October 2008 (UTC)

What I don't understand is *why* they object, given that it's perfectly normal to cite a person's profession in a biographical lead. I haven't seen any coherent explanation yet. -- ChrisO (talk) 16:43, 9 October 2008 (UTC)

Is there anything wrong with taking the day time profession out of the first sentence but still keeping it in the lead? I agree with Chris that there has been no guideline or policy based reason given here to not include his main profession in the lead. On the other hand,

it also clear that this main profession has naught to do with his (be it limited) notability. Chris, I think you do actually "understand *why* they object". It detracts from their claim that he has "expertise" in Iranian history to state that he is not employed as a historian but as a counselor. If Kaveh deserves and entry the first piece of information we get about him really should be about that which establishes his notability. His profession then becomes secondary, but clearly can and should be stated in the lead since that is what he does professionally.PelleSmith (talk) 16:59, 9 October 2008 (UTC)

That makes sense. I have numbered the different components of my proposal above and propose the following amendment: let (1) and (3) stand unchanged, but modify (2) to add the proposed line at the end of the lead. --Crusio (talk) 17:19, 9 October 2008 (UTC)

I think I can live with that. It certainly doesn't belong in "Works" but is relevant to the other sections you mention. -- ChrisO (talk) 18:09, 9 October 2008 (UTC)

Unacceptable. This is not a "compromise", his day-time job has absolutely nothing to do with his notability as an author and expert on Iranian history, and therefore has no place in this article's lead. --CreazySuit (talk) 17:43, 9 October 2008 (UTC)

- CreazySuit, I think part of the compromise has to come from your side. As ChrisO said in the preceding section, we also put his birthdate and birthplace in the lead (in the very first sentence), and neither has obviously anything to do with his notability or lack thereof. The article is the bio of a person. An important part of that is indeed what this person does to earn a living. Obviously, not only notable events and feats are described. So the compromise basically is to leave his daytime job in the lead, but not at the very beginning but rather at the very end, thereby removing any emphasis that you apparently find undue. --Crusio (talk) 18:14, 9 October 2008 (UTC)
 - I'm sure this was covered at some point in the past, but by what notability criteria is he being judged here? He certainly is not verifiably an "expert" in Iranian history, though clearly he is the author of published books. The best solution to this page may in fact be WP:AFD if he doesn't pass any notability test.PelleSmith (talk) 18:32, 9 October 2008 (UTC)
 - This went through a rather acrimonous AfD already, with a "no consensus" outcome and a closing admin who remarked that he actually didn't agree with his own closing conclusion.... See Wikipedia:Articles_for_deletion/Kaveh_Farrokh. --Crusio (talk) 18:47, 9 October 2008 (UTC)
 - Yeah I knew that ... I voted myself to take Dab's suggestion to redirect it into Shadows in the Desert: Ancient Persia at War and delete the content of this page. I guess what I'm trying to say is that this type of suggestion should stay on the table here. He's being promoted as something no one can verify that he is, and his notability seems limited to one book ... not a larger field of research. That's why I'm asking again by what standards he is being judged here. Sorry for not being clear.PelleSmith (talk) 18:53, 9 October 2008 (UTC)

Crusio, the whole dispute was about mentioning or not mentioning that he is an expert or what his day-time job is in the lead. So by omitting the sourced assertion that he is an expert, and keeping the trivial info about his day-time job in the lead, you're not conceding any point, or relinquishing any position. So this is not not a viable compromise. --CreazySuit (talk) 02:10, 10 October 2008 (UTC)

Agreed. Last time I checked, a "compromise" is when there are concessions from both sides. I'm not at all against mentioning his day job, but it definitely does not belong in the lead. KhoiKhoi 02:22, 10 October 2008 (UTC)

The idea that the entire entry isn't simply redirected to Shadows in the Desert: Ancient Persia at War is the biggest concession I can think of here. What is the policy basis for not including basic biographical information, and on what grounds can you verify his "expertise"? WP:IDONTLIKEIT is not an argument against abiding by basic policy and guidelines.PelleSmith (talk) 03:12, 10 October 2008 (UTC)

- OK, then let's go back to the original unmodified compromise proposal. It goes in your direction in that his "trivial" job is not mentioned in the lead and should satisfy others because the info still is in the article. "Expert" stays out, not even Einstein is called an expert. Journalists sometimes

also say things like "John Doe is one of the most brilliant scientists studying suc and such". If that appeared in a reliable source, would you then include it in a bio? That's not very neutrally-worded. As for conceding points, I am not conceding anything, I am only trying to find a compromise acceptable to all. That's not easy, given that one side feels Farrokh is a complete nobody and the other side feels that he's God's gift to mankind. --Crusio (talk) 05:01, 10 October 2008 (UTC)

This looks like a more reasonable offer. However, I have received a bunch of sources in Persian (i.e. BBC Persian, VOA, etc.) referring to him as an expert. I am trying to get these verified and translated (since I don't speak Persian), and I will post them here within the next 48 hours or so. Khoikhoi 00:53, 16 October 2008 (UTC)

I can see no reason to use the word expert no matter what. And certainly not with a BBC/VOA etc source as the rationale. The article should stay in line with others, right? And you'd need expert opinions (plural) to call him an expert in any case. Not non-historians, etc. Doug Weller (talk) 05:34, 16 October 2008 (UTC)

Yes, exactly. It's patently a peacock term. We don't use that kind of promotional language about others; what makes Farrokh so special that he needs to be hyped in this way? -- ChrisO (talk) 07:25, 16 October 2008 (UTC)

What about "historian"? That's not a peacock term. Khoikhoi 22:26, 17 October 2008 (UTC)

Its not a peacock term but it is a term reserved for ... "historians". He doesn't meet WP:PROF and is clearly not a "historian".PelleSmith (talk) 23:05, 17 October 2008 (UTC)

Compare Tom Holland (author). He's written books on historical matters, such as *Persian Fire* and *Rubicon*, but he's identified as an author (which he is) but not a historian (which he is not). -- ChrisO (talk) 23:34, 17 October 2008 (UTC)

That's a good example. Then how about "an acclaimed Canadian author", like the page you're linking to. Khoikhoi 00:52, 19 October 2008 (UTC)

Do you actually firmly believe there is an accurate way to describe this author or are you fishing for a complementary term to legitimize his work?PelleSmith (talk) 02:16, 19 October 2008 (UTC)

Acclaimed by whom? And yes, Pelle, the answer to that question is obvious. -- ChrisO (talk) 08:17, 20 October 2008 (UTC)

On the article re: Amélie Kuhrt she is referred to as an "historian and specialist in the history of the ancient Near East." Perhaps some wording of that nature, ie "specialist" rather than "expert." (On a side note, the article says she "specializes in the social, cultural and political history of the region from c.3000-100 BC," and mentions nothing of the linguistic or language areas. One might expect that a translator of ancient languages would give it mention somewhere.) It is a stub, but I would mention that the first paragraph that mentions her expertise does not mention her day-job, even if it is "prestigious." Tundrabuggy (talk) 03:28, 19 October 2008 (UTC)

I still think the best solution here is to redirect the page to Shadows in the Desert: Ancient Persia at War. This quibbling over terminology overlooks the fact that only this one book makes him even remotely notable. Calling him a historian is simply incorrect, "expert" is a peacock term (not to mention of dubious accuracy) and even "specialist" is highly suspect given that there is no body of work in the area that might fill the void created by the lack of proper academic training.PelleSmith (talk) 05:35, 19 October 2008 (UTC)

I don't think anyone here has demonstrated that Farrokh does not have "proper academic training." Finally, "proper academic training" and conventional "credentials" do not make a scholar or expert. Many people have become experts in fields in which they have not had "proper academic training" or the conventional credentials. Some examples: Thomas Edison, inventor of the light bulb, the phonograph and numerous other inventions that "contributed to mass communication and, in particular, telecommunications" was home-schooled. He was also the founder of GE. As a young man he was a telegraph operator, not a university professor. Wright Brothers who are "generally credited with inventing and building the first successful airplane" dropped out of high school, started a printing business and bicycle shop. Nikola Tesla : "Tesla's patents and theoretical work formed the basis of modern alternating current electric power (AC) systems, including the polyphase power distribution systems and the AC motor, with which he helped usher

in the Second Industrial Revolution" dropped out of University in this 3rd year. Alexander Graham Bell, responsible for the telephone, became interested in sound due to his mother's deafness. He was homeschooled, and when he did go to regular school, he did not do well. He left school at age 15, later became a teacher of elocution and music. Bill Gates of Microsoft fame, dropped out of Harvard. Point? You judge a tree by its fruits, not its credentials or "proper" training or lack thereof. Tundrabuggy (talk) 20:32, 19 October 2008 (UTC)

The one thing that is sure beyond doubt is that this man does not have the proper academic training. He has no degree in history or related field. Its been discussed ad nauseam. Expert is out also beyond doubt because its a PEACOCK term. If we were to judge this man by his fruits we would need to see some reviews of his work by actual historians. I've not seen any such reviews. We don't judge anyone's works ourselves, if that is what you were suggesting. Please review WP:NOR and WP:V.PelleSmith (talk) 02:53, 20 October 2008 (UTC)

Perhaps "actual historians" are busy researching and writing history books and not critiquing others' works, who knows? What we do know is that he wrote a couple of books on Persian history, that the book has been reviewed (if negatively) by Lendering, and that his opinion has been sought by NYT and VOA and others. What exactly is the "proper academic training" for 'notability' in history? Tundrabuggy (talk) 03:57, 20 October 2008 (UTC)

A graduate degree in history would indicate the "proper academic training"--as I already stated and as is fairly obvious. "Actual historians" review each others work regularly. *Notable* books usually get reviewed several times over. I have yet to see an actual review of this book from a peer reviewed publication. ChrisO and Doug Weller indicated above that they cannot find any either. Without the usual academic qualifications you could make a case that his work is accepted by academic historians if such reviews existed, particularly if they portray the rigorousness of his scholarship favorably. If you want to base your argument on the off handed remarks of a reporter or two, then just do so but the question of his academic qualifications is abundantly clear.PelleSmith (talk) 13:28, 20 October 2008 (UTC)

A scholarly Response to Lendering

Why should Lendering's review be important in deciding what information should go in this page? There is already a strong scholarly retort to Lendering's review in here: <http://www.rozanehmagazine.com/Rozanehweb/DRKFINDEX.html> --Babakexorramdin (talk) 15:40, 24 October 2008 (UTC)

Edit conflict, I'd written ":Lendering's view has been irrelevant to what information has been put in the article. By the way, I didn't see anything from Farrokh there -- just an unsigned letter to some website from people who dont name themselves but claim to be worldclass scholars (and the letter could be by just one person, we can't verify it)" but I see that the edit has been changed (not a good idea) as the editor agrees with me about not finding anything but Farrokh. I'll just emphasise again that this is an anonymous letter which could have been from anyone, Doug Weller (talk) 15:46, 24 October 2008 (UTC)

The retort is well sourced. Everyone can read the sources themselves. This is exactly a case that content counts. By the way, lendering himself is correcting his own website continously. Is that alss not a "good idea"? --Babakexorramdin (talk) 17:12, 24 October 2008 (UTC)

The number or even the quality of cited sources does not make something a reliable source. I could point to any number of 9/11 conspiracy web pages that cite mainstream sources, but that doesn't make them remotely reliable. -- ChrisO (talk) 18:21, 24 October 2008 (UTC)

The document provided proves that Lendering is wrong. It mentions facts and sources which could be traced. Many times authors use pseudonyms and it does not make the documents less credible. It is all about the content. You can name the authors any things you want but it is still the content that counts. Honestly it is very convincing.--Babakexorramdin (talk) 22:21, 24 October 2008 (UTC)

No, it's a pseudohistorical nationalist rant. I'm not surprised the authors wanted to remain anonymous, frankly. -- ChrisO (talk) 00:56, 25 October 2008 (UTC)

sorry but your accusation seems to be baseless. The document refers to so many 'non-Iranian' sources, and above all reminding that Lendering was mistaken about many of his assumption does not make something 'nationalist'.--

Babakexorramdin (talk) 01:05, 25 October 2008 (UTC)

It does seem odd that these accusations all came out at the same time:

"It is interesting that the timing of attacks against the historiography of Iran (esp. Cyrus the Great), the field of Iranian Studies and Farrokh were all launched in a 6 day period (July 15-21).

Farrokh was then interviewed live by on the Voice of America TV program as well as the BBC. These resulted in a sharp increase of Lendering's postings against Farrokh; these were essentially the same as the July 16th versions (same time period as Spiegel's article). " [23] (<http://www.rozanehmagazine.com/Rozanehweb/DKFIntroduction.html>)

Apparently somebody has "issues"... Tundrabuggy (talk) 01:52, 25 October 2008 (UTC)

The Spiegel article seems to have come out first on 15th July. It obviously produced some media interest and reactions from nationalists like Farrokh, which produced further media interest. You don't have to interpret everything in terms of a conspiracy, you know... -- ChrisO (talk) 10:42, 25 October 2008 (UTC)

No it doesn't have to be a conspiracy, but on the other hand you don't have to be a dumb fuck to see the similarities of the arguments provided and... Whoops, the "coincidentally" narrow span of time in which the relevant articles were produced. Yes, let's call it a "coincidence" so that even the unusually optimistic folks don't need to critically analyze the peculiarity of the situation to begin with. Convenience rules, doesn't it? De Quetteville and Schultz can have their precious breather.

Why was the retort dismissed? Now it has been compared to 9/11-related conspiracies and yet again for unknown or undisclosed reasons, I don't know maybe one of you two geniuses could break it down for me so even a stupid Iranian like myself (Hey, don't look at me, if Dab said it, by Jesus, Mary and Judas, it must be true!), but obviously the content hasn't been addressed. Am I correct? You don't need to answer, I know I'm correct. Another case of comparing apples with cement, Doug Weller? Do you have a problem with people who decide for themselves to remain anonymous for reasons that are none of your concern? I mean obviously, in everything you do, you must certainly disclose your full name, credentials, your address, social security number and all that shit, right? What is it that you want? At least a B.A in history? An M.A even? Or are you settling for no less than an authority with a shining Ph.d to cut the expectations?

Apparently the review of a Dutch archivist (Hey, I'm not judging anyone, I think Mr. Lendering is a fine scholar and a human being with his own bad days, but wait until I get to the punchline.) means more to you than the preface of an eminent Aga Khan Professor Richard Nelson Frye. Peculiar that you didn't wave him off. Why? Is it because you don't really give a shit about credentials, or is it because you're just a hypocrite who isn't even half as clever as you think of yourself?

If you can't address the content of the retort for reasons, other than of course touting the dead-beaten fallacious appeal to nationalism, well guess what, no one's interested in hearing your faulty comparisons. You want me to help you out? Wish granted! The article is **reactionary**. It was prompted as a retort to a shoddy, recklessly written review which has strong hints of ad hominem, not just in the review but in selected material available on-line in outlets such as Roman Army Talk. Mr. Lendering is just very baffled that someone like Kaveh Farrokh holds a Ph.d, I mean the guy is flabbergasted! And he's sharing it with his on-line buddies.

It's basically garbage replying to garbage. This debate has existed for decades, and guess what? Scholars have gotten along just fine. These arguments are nothing new. I'm for instance not familiar with any dispute between the eminent scholars M.A. Dandaev or the late S. Shahbazi even though they differ like day and night in their perceptions of Cyrus II The Great. Are you? Can you get any more impartial than me? I can't believe how much I rule. It's about professionalism, and professional courtesy. Jona Lendering needs to get over the fact that there exists another school of

thought other than his obsession of Pierre Briant, just as much as the other school of thought needs to acknowledge the other and vital archaeological components such as the Nabonidus Chronicle. It's not going to detract from Cyrus' legacy as a one-of-a-kind statesman, at least not as much as neither of the divisions think.

And if you can't accept the existence of that critical balance, because of "nationalism" or "Persian pride", that's just your problem. If you find factually-related problems with the retort, fine, fair and square... I'll even applaud you for giving it a shot critically analyzing its content, but until then, kindly fuck off. This applies to your girlfriend ChrisO too. Get your shit together. --The Persian Cataphract (talk) 15:16, 9 December 2008 (UTC)

Note on Lendering in BMCR

Lendering's review has been published in the Bryn Mawr Classical Review (<http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/bmcr/2008/2008-09-62.html>), which is peer-reviewed journal recognized as official scholarly publication. That is not a mere webpage. Doesn't this solve all problems about Lendering or Farrokh being recognized as real scholars? Muhamad, Esfahan

Lendering is certainly recognised as a real scholar, but one review does not indicate recognition of Farrokh's credentials - if anything, quite the opposite, given how scathing Lendering is. It's surely significant that Lendering's review is the only review of any of Farrokh's books that anyone has been able to find so far. Nobody seems to be citing Farrokh's books as a source, either. -- ChrisO (talk) 10:01, 25 October 2008 (UTC)

BMCR isn't peer reviewed. It can be a very useful place to find book reviews, though. --Akhilleus (talk) 12:11, 25 October 2008 (UTC)

BMCR is a good venue to find book review. Good books are discussed there. The fact that farrokh's book is discussed there means that the book is worth it. That Lendering has used it as a venue to attack Farrokh is another thing. --Babakexorramdin (talk) 21:10, 25 October 2008 (UTC)

Lendering's review is rather obviously on the basis that it *isn't* a good book - he calls it "one of the worst books I have ever read".[24] (<http://rambambashi.wordpress.com/2008/07/16/lets-abandon-achaemenid-studies/>) Lendering explains here (<http://www.romanarmy.com/rat/viewtopic.php?t=23256>) why he reviewed it: "Some time ago, Jasper [Oorthuys] invited me to write a review of a book on Achaemenid warfare. Unfortunately, it turned out to be one of the worst books I've ever read. I decided to make the review a bit "wider", integrating two other books, equally bad, to prove that not the authors, but Iranology itself has some serious problems. You can find the review here. It is rather long, but I seized the opportunity to address a lot of common misconceptions." -- ChrisO (talk) 21:25, 25 October 2008 (UTC)

Lendering has some personal grudges against Farrokh, he tried to damage Farrokh's reputation, he now has a retort which questions his knowledge. I am not a historian, but the retort is well sourced and convincing.--Babakexorramdin (talk) 21:38, 25 October 2008 (UTC)

I don't know why you think that Lendering has "personal grudges" against Farrokh. He clearly doesn't think much of Farrokh's quality of scholarship, but that's fair enough - Farrokh's book makes a lot of mistakes. Admittedly Osprey (his publisher) is a popular print, not an academic press, but even so you would have thought that they might have done a better job of fact-checking. -- ChrisO (talk) 00:56, 26 October 2008 (UTC)

Look at it this way: lendering says that farrokh's book has a lot of mistake, but he does not base his statemnets on solid facts. The document I showed you says in fact that farrokh's book is Ok and it is Lendering who makes a lot of mistake. I do not know why you favor Lendering so much and belittle Farrokh or accuse him of Nationalism. You were suppose to edit with **good faith!**--Babakexorramdin (talk) 12:26, 26 October 2008 (UTC)

Unprotection

Everyone needs to work towards a consensus that will result in the unprotection of this article. Crusio has advanced a compromise that may prove practical. Please continue working towards some agreement. If discussion remains stagnant I am going to have to determine a consensus based on the existing discussion and go with it. It is something I am loath to do, but this article cannot be protected forever. KnightLago (talk) 20:47, 2 November 2008 (UTC)

I think a large part of the problem is that there are such different and incompatible ideas about what the article should be - a neutral overview of this not-very-notable individual, or a hagiography. Crusio's compromise looks workable to me, but it may not suit everyone's agendas. -- ChrisO (talk) 22:27, 2 November 2008 (UTC)

This article should be about this scholar, his ideas, publications and other activities. That's it. No need to belittle or ridicule him, as you always do.--Babakexorramdin (talk) 07:48, 4 November 2008 (UTC)

Personal attacks like this on other editors breach WP:CIVIL and certainly are inappropriate in an attempt to resolve a dispute. It's already been shown that there are some very notable people whose articles do not label them as 'expert' and just report their achievements, and that's what this article should do. It certainly shouldn't rely on a journalist to describe anyone as a linguist, historian, etc. dougweller (talk) 08:32, 4 November 2008 (UTC)

Ah I see. Now it seems to be me who poses personal attacks.. Thank you for reminding me. Now that you go to this level. May I remind you that it was you and ChrisO who began to attck Farrokh on this level and it was me who reminded you that this is not good. So please do not twist the facts. thanks--Babakexorramdin (talk) 09:47, 4 November 2008 (UTC)

The bigger problem is that there seem to be two very different perceptions of Farrokh. In the world of Iranian nationalist websites and blogs, he's Professor Kaveh Farrokh, leading Iranologist and award-winning expert, defender of Iranian heritage and honour. In the real world, he's Kaveh Farrokh Ph.D, a teaching assistant and unqualified amateur historian who has written a total of two books which have been almost completely ignored by academia, but who appears to have made a name for himself among online nationalists for his tracts on the iniquities of Western historiography. The difficulties we are having here are essentially due to this gap between perception and reality. -- ChrisO (talk) 09:09, 4 November 2008 (UTC)

It seems that you have a negative image of Iranian nationalists. This is also the reason that you try to disqualify Kaveh Farrokh. What you fail to prove is to mention which websites are nationalist and why you call them nationalist. It is not my understanding any way that Rozaneh Magazine or Osprey publishing are Iranian nationalists. The former is a magazine of Iranian diapora in Canada and publishes material from all types of political and social underpinnings. The second one is a publishing company which publishes military historical material, also written by non-Iranians.--Babakexorramdin (talk) 09:52, 4 November 2008 (UTC)

Nationalist sources cannot be used on Wikipedia as secondary sources. They can, and should, be used as primary sources when discussing topics of nationalism. This article is, of course, about Iranian nationalism beginning to end. The lead, however, pretends that it is about "an expert in the field of Iranian history and linguistics." If this was the case, the subject would need to pass WP:PROF, which he clearly does not. The only acceptable solution will be to redirect this title to *Shadows in the Desert: Ancient Persia at War* pending formal substantiation of WP:NOTE. And no, it's not "keep the article tagged now, and maybe establish notability in 2010", it's "recreate the standalone article *after* notability has been satisfactorily established". dab (☎) 20:36, 4 November 2008 (UTC)

Consensus proposal

I agree with Crusio on this. I should say that no one insists that he or any other scholar should be called an expert on something. But the attempts to depict him not as a historian is baseless. he is a Historian and has his own specialism.

Every scholar has his. So, the problem lies in the fact that many editors, for certain reasons, want to depict him as a non-scholar. This is baseless.--Babakexorramdin (talk) 11:36, 4 November 2008 (UTC)

He didn't study history at post-graduate level, and he works as a college counsellor, right? Doesn't that make him an amateur when he is writing history books? Amateurs can do good work, but please don't link his books on history with his academic career in a very different field. dougweller (talk) 13:27, 4 November 2008 (UTC)

You are not right. He is a historian and not only a counsellor. He has won also awards for his work. He works at the university of British Columbia. This is unlike Lendering who has no position at any universities. (You know what I am talking about any way!)--Babakexorramdin (talk) 13:57, 4 November 2008 (UTC)

What evidence do you have that he works at the University of British Columbia? It will have to be from the UBC website of course. Assertions don't count on Wikipedia, you need reliable sources. dougweller (talk) 14:14, 4 November 2008 (UTC)

It was you who said that he works only as a counsellor. Yes? The assertions, as you call them, say that he has given lecture or he gives lectures from time to time. In any way he is connected to the University of British Columbia, Langara College. He has a doctorate from there and has publications in English. This is in sharp contrast to Jona Lendering, who has no position at any university and who has only written some non-refereed Dutch publications. Any way think how large a language is Dutch and how many of them might be interested in ancient history. In any case Kaveh Farrokh is more read and more respected, may be more criticized than Jona Lendering --Babakexorramdin (talk) 14:44, 4 November 2008 (UTC)

Please point out the diff where I said 'he works only as a counsellor' - I don't think I have and I don't like people claiming I've written things I haven't written. I once gave a lecture at the University of Sheffield, but I never worked there. In the past I have hired a number of people who weren't scholars to give lectures at the University where I was an academic, but I wouldn't say any of them worked there. And where are the reliable third party sources for these lectures, and what were the lectures about? If you want to use this information to prove something about him, you really have to back it up with explicit, well sourced information. dougweller (talk) 16:13, 4 November 2008 (UTC)

There are many pages from UBC and Langara College which show that Farrokh works there. There are many secondary sources which state that Farrokh has given lectures. These are sufficient for the claims made here. And now you are getting personal. I do not know you and I am not interested in your lectures at Sheffield or any where else, nor do I care that you hire people to give lecture. But at the same time, if they have given lecture at your university, they are entitled to mention that. That's it.--Babakexorramdin (talk) 17:21, 4 November 2008 (UTC)

Yes, we can mention any lectures he has given I guess (I'm not sure though, one lecture seems pretty trivial. Anyway, since you haven't provided any sources, a search of the UBC.ca site turns up this: [25] (<http://www.cnrs.ubc.ca/index.php?id=11798>) "Kaveh Farrokh (Langara) - Pharos lecture "An Unknown Legacy of Synthesis: The Greeks and the Persians". However, this was hosted by the Hellenic Cultural Society of Vancouver at the Hellenic Community Centre [26] (<http://www.cnrs.ubc.ca/index.php?id=11798#pharos>) so not at the University. Searching the UBC site turned up one other hit [27] (http://www.zoology.ubc.ca/~berger/Academic_Plan/cord.htm) showing him working with a faculty member in a project on neuro-trauma injuries as a trainee or technician (I presume this was while he was studying there but perhaps not)-- look at the people under "Linda Siegel (Education) – Clinically Applied". Anyway, so far we have no evidence for lectures paid for by UBC or for him working there after he completed his PhD unless his trainee/technician work for CORD took place after he finished. We really need specifics for these lecture claims, particularly after finding the Hellenic Cultural Society one which someone may have thought was a UBC lecture. dougweller (talk) 18:09, 4 November 2008 (UTC)

- Dear Doug and Babakexorramdin. To be very honest, I don't care much about your discussion in this section at all. Farrokh obviously has no appointment with UBC that can be sourced, so it does not go into the article. Whether or not he gae one or two lectures anywhere is immaterial, because they're really not worth while mentioning in any case. What would be nice is if we could leave all this bickering behind us and concentrate on getting a text that is acceptable to all. Please tell me whether or not you feelk that my last compromise proposal ois acceptable to you. If it is, we can request unprotection of the article and modify it as proposed and *then leave it alone*. If it isn't, I give up and will remove this article from my watchlist. --Crusio (talk) 19:14, 4 November 2008 (UTC)

Dear Crusio I said earlier that i agree with your proposal. --Babakexorramdin (talk) 03:09, 5 November 2008 (UTC)

Apologies, this was really a concern about what might happen after unprotection. I will agree to your compromise proposal although I suspect my attitude towards it is the same as yours. dougweller (talk) 20:09, 4 November 2008 (UTC)

Yes, I'd agree with Doug. -- ChrisO (talk) 20:50, 4 November 2008 (UTC)

- OK, so it looks like we have agreement! I'm in a bit of a hurry right now, but I'll ask an admin to unblock later today and will make the changes that we agreed upon when that has happened. I would also request that before making any other changes to the article in then future, to prevent edit warring, that we post them first on the talk page here and only go ahead with changing the article after consensus has been obtained. --Crusio (talk) 07:33, 5 November 2008 (UTC)

I repeat what I state in the section right above, unless compliance with WP:PROF is established, I will naturally insist that this article be redirected. It is pointless to debate points of neutral phrasing when it hasn't been shown that the article subject passes WP:NOTE in the first place. I think we can all agree that *He has written and lectured on linguistics and has published two books on ancient Persian history, as well as acting as an historical advisor and expert for film and documentary makers* is a long way from establishing anything like sufficient notability as required by our guidelines. We have this article because he is a nationalist hawk, not because he is a great scholar. So either make this article *about* the nationalist, and show that he is notable *as* a nationalist, or simply redirect it to the article on his book, which I might add should be scrutinized wrt WP:BK too. dab (🗨️) 18:08, 5 November 2008 (UTC)

OK, so it seems that we have **no consensus** after all. dab, I suggest that you take this article to AfD again, because at this point there is no consensus for a redirect. Perhaps you should at the same time also propose the article on the book for AfD. If you can get a "delete" vote on both, the problem is solved. I don't think you will, so then we're back here and you may think about the compromise proposal again. I am not saying that I would vote "keep" in such AfDs, but I think that the reality is just that these articles are here to stay for the foreseeable future and I think that the best thing you could do is to make the best of it. But that's just my opinion and I cannot and don't want to tell you what to do. I do think that at this point you should choose: go to AfD, or accept this consensus. --Crusio (talk) 18:43, 5 November 2008 (UTC)

I'm sympathetic to your concerns, dab, but I have to say that Crusio has a point. I don't think it's likely that a fresh AfD will succeed in the short term, no matter how justified it would be. The unfortunate fact is that we have a coterie of Iranian nationalist agitators, probably being directed off-wiki, who will block any attempt to have the article deleted - as happened with the last AfD. The same would happen to any attempt to send his book to AfD. The only way that problem is likely to be resolved is to create the conditions in which such agitation can be blunted. I'm working on that, as are others (and I would encourage you to assist - I'll send you more information later). In the short term, I would urge you to support Crusio's compromise so that we can get past the immediate problem that it's intended to fix. -- ChrisO (talk) 19:37, 5 November 2008 (UTC)

I am not trying to delete this title, I am simply saying there is not sufficient evidence that would allow us to keep it separate at present. No AfD necessary, we can just redirect it. I am perfectly open to reconsider *after* such evidence has been presented. We all need to follow Wikipedia guidelines, remember? It is completely irrelevant if there is "no consensus" based merely on WP:IDONTLIKEIT. Those wishing to keep the article bear the burden of establishing notability. If they cannot, no amount of wikilawyering should enable them to get their way regardless. *A a coterie of Iranian nationalist agitators* should have no effect on any of this, or on AfD. We are not voting on anything here: if the bona fide editors editing here recognize there is disruption going on here motivated by nationalism, we just need to deal

out a few blocks and carry on evaluating the situation regardless. Once the article is unprotected, I will re-add the {{merge}}, {{notability}} templates that were removed without proper justification and leave it that for an appropriate period of time. If those wishing to keep the article separate are unable to provide the references necessary within a week or so, I suppose we'll all have to agree it belongs merged. This article shouldn't have been protected in the first place. The proper reaction to nationalist agitation is blocking editors, not locking articles. dab (talk) 20:04, 5 November 2008 (UTC)

- As nobody is willing to budge, consensus is impossible. Have fun, guys, I'm out of here. --Crusio (talk) 20:25, 5 November 2008 (UTC)

PS: This AfD has some interesting parallels to this article and discussion. --Crusio (talk) 07:20, 7 November 2008 (UTC)

I think there are differences. Farrokh has not published a book himself but by externs, he has won an award and his book is nominated. He is interveiwed by important Radio's etc... moreover as Lendering and his allies here say Farrokh is accused of being a Nationalist agitator, which makes him only more notable. Jona Lendering himself seems to be not very much notable. If Farrokh gets deleted, logically Jona Lendering himself should get deleted. I wonder if his proxies here can agree with that.--Babakexorramdin (talk) 07:54, 7 November 2008 (UTC)

I'm a mouse click away from reporting you for that last statement, will you please retract it? If you want to AfD Lendering, go ahead. dougweller (talk) 12:54, 7 November 2008 (UTC)

It is totally unacceptable that ChrisO calls the Iranian editors *a coterie of Iranian nationalist agitators* --Babakexorramdin (talk) 23:23, 5 November 2008 (UTC)

maybe you could stop mistaking Wikipedia for a campaign platform and begin respecting its foundational principles, and your editing experience will likely improve drastically. This Kaveh Farrokh is obviously an Iranian nationalist agitator, and him being that is the only reason we have this article. This is unacceptable, no hard feelings. Iranian nationalists, similar to Hindu, African-American, Egyptian, Armenian, Syriac/Assyrian, Greek and Slavic ethnic nationalists have gone out of their way to create a pathetic image of themselves and their inferiority complexes right in front of everyone here on Wikipedia. Notably, the puerile rage over a *comic book adaptadion* the Iranian teenage nationalists have let us witness on Talk:300 (film) is simply saddening, and a disservice to the public image of their nation. We cannot fix these issues, but we need to stop allowing this sort of stuff. It hurts the image of the nations in question just as much as it hurts Wikipedia's integrity. --dab (talk) 10:01, 6 November 2008 (UTC)

With all due respect, you know nothing of different types of nationalisms if you group together all these non-related cases and types of nationalism. Moreover there is not THE Iranian nationalism. Different people are called Iranian nationalist by different people, for different reason. In your lexicon seemingly nationalism means a bad thing. Any way I can assure you that I am not a nationalist. people who know me in real world can confirm it. And judging on the materials which Kaveh Farrokh has produced, I cannot label him as a nationalist. The fact that lendering attricutes (what he calls) Iranian nationalism to Mohammadreza Shah means (said very subtly) that he does not know the Iranian History well. Mohammadreza Shah was a bitter enemy of Mosadegh the Nationalist leader. The democratic guy. And yet this is another inability of lendering, and may be you, or any other anti-Iranianist scholar in the West. Nationalism in Iran as well as in many other places was and is an emancipatory movement. And let us approach the thing from other angle. Why people should keep silent if they are constantly harassed and defamed??? You yourself brought the example of 300. Yet another thing is that Farrokh comes up with sources. Lendering, you and any other opponents should come up with sources. They should keep it an academic debate rather than attacking person. Having said this, this is very unfortunate that lendering engages in this kind of tactics where (in the Netherlands) these kinds of things are not appreciated at all. Another thing is that he pushes his POV in an agressive way. This is also very un-Dutch. Finally if you want to call Farrokh a nationalist, you should come up with evidences and proofs and know that it does not make him less notable. In fact it makes him more notable if he is the nationalist agitator that you call him. feel free to add that in the artcile, but the burdon of proof is yours --Babakexorramdin (talk) 22:11, 6 November

2008 (UTC)

in my lexicon, nationalism is something that collides with WP:NPOV. You can be a nationalist all you like, I won't pass judgement, you then just need to keep off Wikipedia. You don't need to "keep silent". Write a blog or something, and rant all you like there, peace to you. Of course nationalism was "emancipatory" in the case of rise of nationalism under the Ottoman Empire. That's just, like, 90 years ago. It's also the sort of "emancipation" that always ends in lynchings and mob rule. If that's your thing, grab a machete and take to the streets, but keep away from Wikipedia. You are welcome to wallow in your own issues, but do it elsewhere, per WP:NOT. --dab (♻️) 15:47, 7 November 2008 (UTC)

[further ranting addressed to me personally moved to my talkpage] --dab (♻️) 16:15, 7 November 2008 (UTC)

To dougweller: I wonder why you seem to be this offended? You attacked me on several occaion. You attacked Kaveh farrokh. You deffend Jona Lendering. And there is no certainty over whom I called a proxy of Jona Lendering. He himself knows it. Not only a AFD but certainly a notion of sockpuppetry are among my options.--Babakexorramdin (talk) 13:15, 7 November 2008 (UTC)

You said proxies, plural. And you are confusing criticism of an article with criticism of its subject. Where did I attack you (ie call you a liar, sockpuppet, etc). I have no brief for Lendering either. You've made this more difficult by bringing up an accusation of sockpuppetry. You really must either take action on that or retract it. By definition, "A sock puppet is an alternative account used deceptively." Accusing editors of being sockpuppets should not be done lightly and should not be done at all without carrying through with a report. I hope to see either a retraction or a report at WP:SUSPSOCK. dougweller (talk) 13:23, 7 November 2008 (UTC)

I did not say that you were Lendering's sockpuppet. But there are some indicatuions which shows that Lendering himself is involved in all this. And I do not understand why you react so fiercely when one speaks of Lendering. Any one can criticise any thing. But the publication of Schultz and its back up action off wikipedia by Lendering came exactly in a time when Iraniasns were underfire and the Iranian people were harassed and defamed internationally. Kaveh Farrokh is only a minor target of this, mainly because he opened up his mouth and protested. These people want to say : "oh you Iranians should get used to it. We attack you and you keep quiet, otherwise there are more consequences." OK Lendering can do any thing but Farrokh is as much entitled to react to it and express his opinion as any one else. Moreover he always brings sources, and hence these are not purely opinions. Why a westener is allowed to express his opinion, but an Iranian is not allowed? Why are these double standards?--Babakexorramdin (talk) 14:46, 7 November 2008 (UTC)

You said 'proxies' plural, please name names or retract your claim. I'm not reacting fiercely to mention of Lendering, I said I had no brief for him, in other words I really don't care one way or another about him. I'm reacting to your claims of 'proxies', sockpuppet, etc, which are serious attacks. Are you withdrawing them or continuing to make vague, unsubstantiated but serious accusations? dougweller (talk) 15:08, 7 November 2008 (UTC)

Look if it makes you happy: I retract them for now, but I will come back. It was so dumb of me to say something. It is always smarter just to do it before warning. OK? Meanwhile thank you for not reacting on the Iranian vs. Western part of it. Does it implictely mean that you agree with it? You called many Iranians nationalists (which obviously is a bad thing in your lexicon), only because they were deffending their dignity. It shows how much respect you have for Iranians.--Babakexorramdin (talk) 15:42, 7 November 2008 (UTC)

I have a lot of respect for Iranians, although not for their present government. Please never read silence as meaning agreement when you read what I write. dougweller (talk) 16:01, 7 November 2008 (UTC)

You are free to have your opinion about the Iranian government as

anyone else has the right to have his/her own opinion on any government. Nevertheless it is wrong to say that insults towards the Iranian people are towards their government or that they were only minor jokes. I did not say you said that but in case...--Babakexorramdin (talk) 16:07, 7 November 2008 (UTC)

Babakexorramdin, can you *please* cut to the chase and tell us why you think we can keep this article? Base your case on WP:NOTE, especially WP:PROF. If you can provide evidence that Farrokh is notable, I will concede it in good grace and leave the article alone. If you cannot do it, you should just drop it. We do *not* keep biographical articles on people just because they have a PhD or have written a book. You need to provide a proper *reason*. --dab (✉) 16:23, 7 November 2008 (UTC)

Just a thought, attacks on him by a controversial self declared expert, with deep anti-Iranian and anti-Greek sentiments has made him notable.As Farrokh and Lendering reacted to each other their fates are tied to each other. Any treatment Farrokh gets. Also Lendering should get. --Babakexorramdin (talk) 11:08, 8 November 2008 (UTC)

That isn't the way Wikipedia works. Each article is normally considered on its own merits. And we don't redirect articles to web sites as you suggest below. I don't think you grasp how Wikipedia works. dougweller (talk) 11:32, 8 November 2008 (UTC)

The redirect to the book is a good option. On the 300 movie though, it was not only Dr. Farrokh. Other Professors who are in the top of the field (for example Touraj Daryae is the top expert in the World on Sassanids currently)[28] (http://www.faculty.uci.edu/profile.cfm?faculty_id=5432)[29] (<http://www.tourajdaryae.com/>), have protested the movie: [30] (<http://www.iranian.com/Daryae/2007/March/300/index.html>). At the same time, I think this page also should receive the same treatment: [31] (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jona_Lendering) and be redirected to the website livius. --Nepaheshgar (talk) 21:20, 7 November 2008 (UTC)

I am not "a controversial self declared expert", I am a self-declared Wikipedian. If you catch me creating the Dieter A. Bachmann article about a notable "controversial self declared expert", you may gleefully submit me to AfD, ok? Until then, try to focus and either build a case or go away. dab (✉) 17:10, 8 November 2008 (UTC)

I do not get it, are you saying now that you are Jona Lendering himself? I do not get it.--Babakexorramdin (talk) 17:27, 8 November 2008 (UTC)

Notability

No, the page won't be redirected anywhere. He meets the general notability guideline, and there is no consensus otherwise. Khoikhoi 01:17, 8 November 2008 (UTC)

"He meets the general notability guideline"? How? Please convince be, because I really have better things to do than babysit this article. If you can formally establish that Farrokh passes WP:Bio, I'll just bugger off, ok? Obviously, having a PhD in Educational and Counselling Psychology doesn't establish notability by a long shot, and I don't see Farrokh is being discussed by virtue of being a psychologist either. He is discussed by virtue of being a badass patriot. Now, if he headed some major nationalist party in Iran, that would be something. But just somebody being a patriot won't buy them a biography article on Wikipedia. --dab (✉) 17:07, 8 November 2008 (UTC)

since I seem to be the only one interested in following guidelines: WP:CREATIVE:

- *The person is regarded as an important figure or is widely cited by their peers or successors.* nope.
- *The person is known for originating a significant new concept, theory or technique.* nope.
- *The person has created, or played a major role in co-creating, a significant or well-known work, or collective*

body of work, which has been the subject of an independent book or feature-length film, or of multiple independent periodical articles or reviews. perhaps *Shadows in the Desert: Ancient Persia at War?*

- *The person's work either (a) has become a significant monument, (b) has been a substantial part of a significant exhibition, (c) has won significant critical attention, or (d) is represented within the permanent collections of several notable galleries or museums, or had works in many significant libraries.* nope.

Farrokh's *only* claim to Wikipedia fame would appear to be *Shadows in the Desert: Ancient Persia at War*, which *already* has an article. It may be the book passes WP:BK, I am not going to contest that. " multiple independent periodical articles or reviews" for *Shadows* would establish we can keep the article on the book. If that's the case, Farrokh is still purely notable as the author of the book, and his patriotism may be mentioned in the article on the book. There is no reason for a standalone biography article. WP:PROF doesn't even apply, since the article itself doesn't pretend Farrokh is a historian. He is a psychologist who has written a patriotic book about ancient Persia in his free time. The article is not aware he is notable in any way in his professional field of psychology. dab (🗯️) 17:20, 8 November 2008 (UTC)

His online book "Panturanism is taking aim at Azerbaijan" is such an important work., He was one of the first who revealed this state of affairs and did a deep investigation. No empty talk or accusations, but he pointed to names!--Babakexorramdin (talk) 17:30, 8 November 2008 (UTC)

You think it's important, fine. That has nothing to do with being notable. Please try to read some Wikipedia policies and guidelines. It is extremely rare for anything published on the web to be notable by the way. dougweller (talk) 17:36, 8 November 2008 (UTC)

I am sure Babakexorramdin will now want to present *multiple independent periodical articles or reviews* in academic journals dealing with "Panturanism (<http://www.rozanehmagazine.com/NovDec05/aazariINDEX.HTML>)". I am perfectly willing to make this an article about a notable nationalist, we just need *references*, and we need to stop pretending he is notable as an academic. I am sorry, but we don't exchange personal opinions here. all I can see is an online rant by one nationalist against an opposing brand of nationalism (yawn) and venting his national inferiority complex about *Iranians as Negative Propaganda Targets* and (eevil!) *Manipulation of Western Media*. If you want to establish this pamphlet is "important", you'll need to point to *literature*. --dab (🗯️) 17:38, 8 November 2008 (UTC)

All I can see here is a bitter and arrogant European who sees himself above an Iranian who has inferiority complex because of his nationalism. You are again being very rude and it is blatantly racist too.--Babakexorramdin (talk) 17:51, 8 November 2008 (UTC)

You are being given an awful lot of slack here by some of us. There is nothing racist in Dab's post. Once again you have breached WP:CIVL. Being anti-nationalist is definitely not racist. You need to apologise, but I doubt that you will. dougweller (talk) 18:34, 8 November 2008 (UTC) all I can see here is a pov-pusher who realizes they have no case, so they resort to political noise and personal attacks instead. You are not the first to try this, Babakexorramdin, and it has never worked before. The irony, as so often, is the accusations of "racism" for the refusal to cut the "ethnic" editors any slack with the implication that, hey, they can't be expected to edit on par with everyone else. If your comment implies that you do not have the references you were asked to provide, I suppose this case is closed. Unless there are any *serious* attempts to meet the challenge to establish WP:NOTE, I suppose we can unprotect since we have a de facto consensus to redirect this article. --dab (🗯️) 18:35, 8 November 2008 (UTC)

I suppose we can unprotect since we have a de facto consensus to redirect this article. I beg to differ. The article appears to have been nominated for deletion and the result was **no consensus**. He appears to fulfill the notability guideline fairly well. [32]

(http://www.ospreypublishing.com/authors/kaveh_farrokh/) I think you are unfairly scrutinizing this individual to a point which reveals some kind of bias. There are plenty of people on Wikipedia with less notable credentials, and no one appears to be as zealously pursuing their deletion the way I see things being done here. All these countless articles on Wikipedia and you are pushing your POV like the world will end if this article remains. There is no consensus for deletion or redirection. IranianGuy (talk) 20:25, 8 November 2008 (UTC)

ok, so you want to establish notability? Bring on your sources. I have no bias. Present the references required, and I'll be satisfied. No references, no discussion. Understand that the burden lies on *you*. We already know he published two books

with Osprey. Astoundingly, "published two books with Osprey" isn't listed at WP:Bio, so pray begin citing reviews and journal articles. --dab (✉) 20:45, 8 November 2008 (UTC)

By the bye, your "ethnic" comment is unwarranted since you're just as "ethnic" as the rest of us. IranianGuy (talk) 20:28, 8 November 2008 (UTC)

that's what I was saying. You apparently didn't bother reading my comment. I was citing my *refusal* to treat Babakexorramdin as "ethnic". Which is why the "rest of you" need to follow policy like everyone else. --dab (✉) 20:45, 8 November 2008 (UTC)

This is racist and any one can see it and Mr Dougweller, do not try to teach me lessons!
--Babakexorramdin (talk) 21:57, 8 November 2008 (UTC)

This is racist and any one can see it and Mr Dougweller, do not try to teach me lessons!
--Babakexorramdin (talk) 21:57, 8 November 2008 (UTC)

1- cut the "ethnic" editors any slack with the implication that, hey, they can't be expected to edit on par with eve

2- venting his national inferiority complex about *Iranians as Negative Propaganda Targets* and (eevil!) *Manipulation of Western Media*. **Said by DBachmann** --Babakexorramdin (talk) 22:18, 8 November 2008 (UTC)

It doesn't look like I can teach you anything. And can I remind people that it was up for AfD and the result was not 'Keep' but 'No consensus'. That doesn't prove notability.
dougweller (talk) 22:14, 8 November 2008 (UTC)

It also doesn't mean that you can simply take unilateral action and redirect the article. Dbachmann and yourself are two editors who dislike this article - two editors does not make a consensus. You might want to teach yourself a thing or two. There is no consensus for a redirect. IranianGuy (talk) 23:42, 8 November 2008 (UTC)

The action isn't "unilateral". I asked you in all civility to establish notability. You chose not to react to the request. Hence, no case has been built. Redirection/merging is a perfectly regular outcome for "no consensus" AfDs. --dab (✉) 10:18, 10 November 2008 (UTC)

serious proposal

You can have the article Kaveh Farrokh deleted, but if you are fair and honest you should delete the article Jona Lendering. He does not meet any of the criteria which is posted by Dbachmann. Moreover people who know Lendering in real live will know it better. I have been one of his students by the way.--Babakexorramdin (talk) 22:24, 8 November 2008 (UTC)

So why don't you take the article to AfD? Put your money where your mouth is. dougweller (talk) 22:35, 8 November 2008 (UTC)

BTW don't put your money in ICEsave--Babakexorramdin (talk) 22:36, 8 November 2008 (UTC)

Dbachmann's tone



This section **may stray from the topic of the article**. Please help improve this section ([//en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Talk:Kaveh_Farrokh/Archive_1&action=edit](http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Talk:Kaveh_Farrokh/Archive_1&action=edit)) or discuss this issue on the **talk page**.

{{split}}??? The very tone of this particular editor on this page is condescending and rude. I highly suggest that this editor recuse himself from this matter or otherwise the issue should taken to the administrator's noticeboard and have other (more neutral) people comment, because this person displays incivility and obviously has a grudge against Iranians. IranianGuy (talk) 23:35, 8 November 2008 (UTC)

this is *textbook* wikilawyering. Once the pov-pushers have been exposed as having *no case*, they switch to making political noise. "Please establish notability" - "I don't like to" - "You don't have a case" - "I, um, I don't like your tone. You bigot. Western arrogance, how dare you. You must recuse. You are rude. And condescending. I don't like you. See, I told you there is no consensus." --dab (♻️) 10:22, 10 November 2008 (UTC)

Comments like this by Dbachmann: "Which is why the "rest of you" need to follow policy like everyone else" are not helpful or conducive to civility. Putting the emphasis on the "rest of you", obviously referring to editors of Iranian background or origin, is rather patronizing, not to mention imperialist. I seriously suggest this person brush up on their manners. There is clearly a level of systemic bias being displayed by this editor. IranianGuy (talk) 23:40, 8 November 2008 (UTC)

this is rich. The "rest of you" deliberately used scare quotes in reaction to your own comment, *you're just as "ethnic" as the rest of us* where **you** by "the rest of us" clearly made the "patronizing" or "imperialist" implication that there is an "us" of Iranian editors. There isn't. There are just those editors who respect policy, and those who don't. By pulling such a stunt of taking a comment out of context on the *very page* the context is still visible really you are really taking this to new extremes of insulting people's intelligence. --dab (♻️) 10:27, 10 November 2008 (UTC)

And again, another beautiful piece of work in the name of anti-nationalism by Dbachmann as seen further above:

"maybe you could stop mistaking Wikipedia for a campaign platform and begin respecting its foundational principles, and your editing experience will likely improve drastically. This Kaveh Farrokh is obviously an Iranian nationalist agitator, and him being that is the only reason we have this article. This is unacceptable, no hard feelings. Iranian nationalists, similar to Hindu, African-American, Egyptian, Armenian, Syriac/Assyrian, Greek and Slavic ethnic nationalists have gone out of their way to create a pathetic image of themselves and their inferiority complexes right in front of everyone here on Wikipedia. Notably, the puerile rage over a comic book adaptadion the Iranian teenage nationalists have let us witness on Talk:300 (film) is simply saddening, and a disservice to the public image of their nation. We cannot fix these issues, but we need to stop allowing this sort of stuff. It hurts the image of the nations in question just as much as it hurts Wikipedia's integrity."

As an administrator, and apparently a long-time Wikipedia user, this person should very well know the policy of not crusading or preaching or pushing any kind of POV. The above paragraph is a rather pathetic rant on his part and it is obvious he is quite emotional and thus irrational. I must stress that this user recuse himself as there is clearly a conflict of interest. Otherwise, I suggest that evidence of his misconduct be taken to the community at large for comment. It is simply unacceptable for this person to crusade against editors he labels as "nationalist" and attacking the subject of the article in such an irrational fashion instead of focusing on the actual issues.

It is also even more distressing that Dbachmann, as with most race-obsessed people, lumps all Iranians in one category, and of course the easiest category to throw them in is "nationalist". Where have we witnessed this attitude before and where did that lead? I've been going through this person's edit history, and there is clearly a pattern emerging here. How did this individual become an administrator? There is no neutrality here. There is only an obvious and disturbing pattern of systemic bias. IranianGuy (talk) 23:50, 8 November 2008 (UTC)

I think this essay from his user page makes his POV even more obvious: User:Dbachmann/Wikipedia_and_nationalism. Unfortunately, his anti-nationalist ranting is just that: ranting. It has no place in Wikipedia, nor should he be allowed to attack other editors with this sort of senseless ranting. Being critical of nationalism is one thing, using the appellation as a term of abuse and slander is quite another. This is an extremist viewpoint and I certainly hope there is no tolerance for

such irrationality on Wikipedia. IranianGuy (talk) 00:01, 9 November 2008 (UTC)

I have also come across this: Wikipedia:Requests_for_arbitration/Dbachmann#Remedies. I quote:

"1) Dbachmann is reminded to avoid using his administrative tools in editorial disputes in which he is personally involved, and to avoid misusing the administrative rollback tool for content reversions."

"1) Should any user subject to an editing restriction violate that restriction, that user may be briefly blocked, up to a week in the event of repeated violations. After 5 blocks, the maximum block shall increase to one year. All blocks are to be logged at Wikipedia:Requests for arbitration/Dbachmann#Log of blocks and bans."

There is this statement by an editor from that proceeding:

"Dbachmann has been condescending to me and to other users: [1], [2], [3]. During a talk page argument at Afrocentricity over material Dbachmann deteled from the article, Dbachmann posted a link to a nearly two year old case on deeecevoice in order to "shame" her. Later Dbachmann openly asked another admin to look in to a block for him"

And this one:

"I emphatically agree with User:Futurebird I have seen Dbachmann egregiously and repeatedly violate Wikipedia policy on at least two articles: Afrocentrism and Race of Ancient Egyptians. He has been uncivil yes, but also has launched into personal attacks and revert-warring, all this purportedly in the name of upholding policy. What I believe should be looked into is the seriousness of his breaches of policy as ocmpared to the potential breaches of policy he says he's trying to prevent. Basically, most of his defense for his behavior is that "the end justifies the means"."

The committee has stated the following:

"Purpose of Wikipedia: 1) Wikipedia is a project to create a neutral encyclopedia. Use of the site for other purposes—including, but not limited to, advocacy or propaganda, furtherance of outside conflicts, and political or ideological struggle—is prohibited. Passed 11 to 0, 19:59, 14 January 2008 (UTC)"

Certainly, Dbachmann's zealous promotion of his aggressive anti-nationalist (or what he perceives as "anti-nationalist") ideology and his attacks against other editors based upon this rigid and hostile POV is relevant here. Wikipedia aims to be neutral. Dbachmann violates this very precept through his own POV. IranianGuy (talk) 00:16, 9 November 2008 (UTC)

I think it is clear that considering previous proceedings, there is doubt, none whatsoever, that Dbachmann is a problematic editor who has abused his administrative power and is continuing his pattern of systemic bias and has taken a threatening and condescending tone against other editors with whom he strongly and relentlessly disagrees.

Considering that his tone and actions only make things worse, making it difficult for those editors with whom he disagrees to contribute productively, something must be done. IranianGuy (talk) 00:09, 9 November 2008 (UTC)

I disagree with the above user and I actually think Dbachmann is a geat admin and I am glad he is on Wikipedia. My only concern is that some of the other editors (not Dbachmman) follow wikipedia rules when it suits them. For example, how does exactly Jona Lendering who has no academic position and does not have many books fit WP:notability. His review on the Kaveh Farrokh book was responded to soundly (he for example did not know that some archeological sites still existed or the issue of the Achaemenid navy and Darius where he made a baseless accusation and a blunder). "What is good for the goose is good for the gander". --Nepaheshgar (talk) 05:56, 9 November 2008 (UTC)

I keep saying if you don't like Lendering's article take the article to AfD. All I really know about Lendering is that a lot of articles seem to reference his web site. I've had my doubts at times about that, and don't know how I'd vote in an AfD. dougweller (talk) 07:21, 9 November 2008 (UTC)

I am used to being attacked by editors whose very account names show they are here for single-topic pov-pushing. Who do you expect to be neutral on topics of Iranian nationalism? A user called "IranianGuy", or a Swiss editor contributing under his real name and no stakes in the matter? Who, for that matter, do you expect to be neutral on topics of Armenian

nationalism, an editor called "AraratArev" (vel sim.) or said Swiss editor? What about Assyrianist antiquity frenzy, a user called "Chaldean" or said Swiss editor? Needless to say, you never see a user called "Assyrian warrior" trying to help fix disputes at Iranian topics, nor do you see user "Persian hero" helping out with disputes on Mordvins, or a user called "Hayk the Great" contributing to resolving questions on the national identity of Egyptians. This is all to be expected and it all speaks for itself. I don't feel my blood pressure raising one bit when accounts "IranianGuy" and similar rant at me. But I do think that our general policy on clamping down on such accounts (warn-block cycle upon unconstructive rants and attacks like above) should be much more strict to clear the air for constructive debate. In the case at hand, I do *not* see any disputes, the usual ranting, WP:IDHT and WP:IDONTLIKEIT by accounts named "\$ETHNIC Guy" or the like aside. We should unprotect this article, let the bona fide users sort it out amicably, and clamp down on further nationalist disruption. It's the only approach that works. --dab (♻️) 10:14, 10 November 2008 (UTC)

since even the empty wikilawyerling seems to have petered out now, can some admin unprotect this page so we can redirect it *for the time being*, i.e. pending proper and formal presentation of how this passes WP:Bio. Nobody has risen to the challenge, and seeing the effort that has gone into this, I suppose that's because it cannot be done, but I will obviously be willing to reconsider the minute new evidence is presented. --dab (♻️) 18:33, 17 November 2008 (UTC)

It's been fully protected for six weeks, which I think is more than long enough; accordingly, I've done the WP:BOLD thing and unprotected it. If edit-warring resumes, I suggest taking the page to Wikipedia:Requests for page protection. -- ChrisO (talk) 19:40, 17 November 2008 (UTC)

On nationalism. It strikes me that just because a user has a name like "American_Guy" or "BritishGal" and edits American and British subjects (which he or she would tend to know something about) doesn't necessarily make them nationalistic editors. Nor would a Swiss editor somehow automatically be neutral re America or Germany or Iran or any other country. First of all we don't generally verify national identity here on wiki, and secondly, being Swiss is no guarantee of neutrality. Borders are porous. How do we define "nationalism"? Who would know more about a country—the residents/citizens of said country or the residents of another country altogether? There is much wrong with the idea of nationalism as expressed here at wiki where we are anonymous ideas at best. Perhaps if we try just to stick with the content of a person's edits and not vague negative generalities and assumptions, we would do the project a whole lot more good.

Tundrabugy (talk) 01:56, 18 November 2008 (UTC)

Perhaps, but as another editor pointed out to me a while back, there's a definite "Persian Pride" agenda being pursued on a range of articles. That sort of thing works against our efforts to create a *neutral* encyclopedia and we shouldn't close our eyes to it. -- ChrisO (talk) 09:04, 18 November 2008 (UTC)

The sad thing about the "Persian Pride" thing isn't that some people like their country, which is perfectly honourable, but that it is being pursued so naively and immaturely that all it achieves is making Iranians look stupid. --dab (♻️) 09:54, 5 December 2008 (UTC)

This is ridiculous. "It makes Iranians look stupid"...? Who the fuck are you? A political commentator? An outspoken, self-proclaimed expert on contemporary Iranian politics? Oh right, my pen-name is *The Persian Cataphract*, so let me try to decipher your next tactical move. The race card? Oh right, your name's not Al Sharpton or Jesse Jackson. Let me guess the next one. **Nationalist**. That's right, you'll throw each and every syllable of content present in my message, in favour of this preconceived straw-man, fallacy and red herring. You'll probably even point to my liberal use of profanity. I just must be nothing else than this lion-and-sun foam-at-mouth Persian nationalist with an inferiority complex spiced with a pinch of victim mentality. And certainly I must be dumb, as you so eloquently have arbitrated above.

You said it yourself, right here:

...I am used to being attacked by editors whose very account names show they are here for single-topic pov-pushing. Who do you expect to be neutral on topics of Iranian nationalism? A user called "IranianGuy", or a Swiss editor contributing under his real name and no stakes in the matter? Who, for that matter, do you expect to be neutral on topics of Armenian nationalism, an editor called "AraratArev" (vel sim.)...

Is that how you assess **content**? By making a shallow assumption on pen-names? Expectations? The God-given right to

anonymity on the Internet? How fucking petty are you and the idiot who made you an administrator? What next, are you going to ban Iranians from editing or contributing to Iran-related articles? Indeed not just a laughable policy, but indeed a dangerous one as well. Most of the world-class authorities **are** Iranians. With your fucked up logic, we should dismiss their contributions because irrespective of their content, you'll instead look at their political affiliations and their names and put it into the bin of rejection. Oh right, you're Swiss and because Switzerland is this shining paragon of neutrality hosting thousands of bank accounts of Islamic terror organization, you're obviously this stereotypical neutralist... Good lord, listen to yourself.

Luckily academia doesn't work like that. Scholarly enterprise and political affiliations remain strictly separated. So it doesn't really matter if Kaveh Farrokh or anyone else is a self-declared outspoken Nazi, Communist, Socialist, Liberal, Conservative or what have you, it has no bearing on content that must be assessed purely by content. That's NPOV. A sober, neutral, objective approach, just bare-bones, bare-knuckles source critique. *Source. Critique.* Make an assessment on the content, not the person(s). You marginalized IranianGuy. Period. And as conveniently as you shrugged him off because of his pen-name, you shrugged off his fully legitimate criticism of your approach. No matter what country or pen-name or real name you have, it has a universal stamp: **Asshole behaviour**. --The Persian Cataphract (talk) 15:40, 9 December 2008 (UTC)

To whom it may concern

<http://www.kavehfarrokh.com/about/>

below, under the page are copies of the documents and even an email from the UBC which shows that Kaveh Farrokh has taght there.--Babakexorramdin (talk) 09:03, 17 November 2008 (UTC)

Ok, I presume he found out about this dispute and that is the reason for this new stuff on his website. We can use that I believe, I see no sense in him making it up and am sure it is genuine. However, it still seems clear from the examples of other articles on genuinely notable figures that the word 'expert' should definitely not be in the lead, and must be attributed. So, where it already says he has lectured at UBC, we can say that he contributed to UBC Continuing Studies courses and even that their website (must be specific here) described him as an expert. None of this contributes to making him notable and I still do not think he meets our criteria for notability, but while the article exists my suggestions seem to meet our policies and guidelines. dougweller (talk) 08:30, 18 November 2008 (UTC)

Two proposals. either drop the expert thing and make it more neutral Or delete this article together with that of Lendering. If Farrokh is not notable lendering is also not notable. Moreover his blunders mentioned earlier in that article, makes one doubts about his knowledge.I was a student of Lendering before, so I am aware of it, but I guess it should not influence my decision--Babakexorramdin (talk) 12:41, 20 November 2008 (UTC)

Again, we can't delete any articles just because we'd like to, it would be necessary to take either to WP:AfD. Let's just drop the expert thing and make it more neutral. Then if you want to get Lendering's article deleted, you can still do that. dougweller (talk) 13:08, 20 November 2008 (UTC)

Actually, we can delete any article that doesn't make clear its *raison d'etre*. Farrokh isn't notable (in the sense of WP:PROF). Jona Lendering isn't notable (in the sense of WP:PROF). So, yes, at long last, Babakexorramdin, both these articles should be tagged with {{notability}}, and after an appropriate period of time (a week or two), unless new material is presented that establishes they pass WP:BIO in *some* sense, they should be deleted. Coming here to argue about the Lendering article is the WP:OTHERCRAP fallacy. As far as I can see, Jona Lendering isn't protected, and nobody is stopping you from tagging it for notability. --dab (♻️) 14:01, 20 November 2008 (UTC)

As the article stands now, I would also be prepared to compromise and grant it *just about* passes WP:BIO, provided we drop the "academic" categories, for better or worse discuss Farrokh as an "Iranian writer" who won a few awards and establish his notability as an Iranian nationalist. --dab (♻️) 14:09, 20 November 2008 (UTC)

for some personal reason and because Lendering and I know each other in real life, I won't tag his page, but

if you tag it for deletion I will react on it. On Farrokh I disagree somehow, Although he is an Iranian Azeri, he is born outside Iran (In Greece) and lives in Canada, and I am not aware of the fact if he holds a Canadian or Iranian nationality. I also do not think that it is justified to call him an Iranian nationalist. He might be one, I don't know, but his academic writings are all sourced and could be assessed objectively without any bias. The themese of his publications could be attractive for the Iranian nationalists but he is bound to certain academic ethics when he is writing them. As long as I have read them he cites and refers to scholarly sources of mainly non-Iranian scholars.--Babakexorramdin (talk) 14:59, 20 November 2008 (UTC)

Ok, I'll go and slap a notability tag on the Lendering article. WP:BLP is also very specific regarding non-public figures (WP:NPF). Farrokh is fair game by his internet campaigning, media appearances etc. Lendering needs to be treated with care, just writing a book and operating a website doesn't make you a public figure. I would agree with your assessment re nationalism if it wasn't for his unspeakable online publications, such as the Panturanism (<http://www.rozanehmagazine.com/NovDec05/aazariINDEX.HTML>) pamphlet, or the Spiegel rant (http://bbold.com/clients/kaveh/?page_id=68). Not exactly cool-headed or professorial behaviour. If you can get so worked up over the question whether "slaughter" is an appropriate term for an Iron Age military action, as it were making it a question of national honour, you clearly have a problem separating nationalist fancy from detached scholarship. --dab (✉) 11:06, 21 November 2008 (UTC)

I think he as an Iranian Azeri might have got emotional when he sees his native Azerbaijan being targetted by panturkists. But he still gives ref.s and citations to many notably non-Iranian sources. He does not talk out of blue and many other do agree with him. On the spiegel thing I should say that I am not an expert on the field of classical studies. I have followed some courses, but Ok I am not an expert. What I know is that Lendering and other revisionists such as Schultz are controversial people. It is also important to know some of the champions of revisionism in the ancient Iranian studies. Such figures such as Nasser Pourpirar, are truely a joke. He, an anti-semite is cited many times by those people who are mentioned in Farrokh's Turanism. There were so many highly educated experts over so many years and they more or less agreed on the ancient Iranian history, now some minor figures came and try to rewrite the whole history, and it is fishy that they get so much attention at once, when there is so much pressure against Iran. I believe that it is a politically motivated game.--Babakexorramdin (talk) 20:28, 22 November 2008 (UTC)

Azerbaijan's population is predominantly Turkic-speaking, so I am not sure what targeting by "pan-Turkists" means. Any particular incidents? Here is another example of utter lack of scholarship and pure original research endorsed by Kaveh Farrokh [33] (<http://www.ghandchi.com/iranscope/Anthology/KavehFarrokh/farrokh4.htm>) - an article which claims that poet Nizami had Christian (or even Armenian) mother: "...that Nezami was Persian, with a Christian, probably Armenian mother, were not acceptable to them, no matter how hard you tried to give them dates and facts about the Turks beginning to arrive in those parts at about the time of Nezami and of the first Shaikh Safi (the remote ancestor of Shah Ismail and the founder of the Safavieh Sufi order)."

Probably writer has very little idea that it was poet Khagani and not Nizami who had Christian mother, and Nizami's mother wasn't Persian but Kurdish according to his own words and Dr. Julia S. Meisami of Oxford. But this is just one example of sort of "scholarship" in the style of Kaveh Farrokh - that is, blame the Turks :)

Also, I wonder what are the notability guidelines for self-promotion in Wikipedia. Are there strict rules? I.e. does it mean any PhD graduate with a list of conference/journal publications can create a Wikipedia bio page as a notable scholar? Atabøy (talk) 02:23, 25 November 2008 (UTC)

What I think you and your organization are notable enough. You can make a page about that if you want. But please mention in it the guests you invited and that you lobbied to bomb Iran.--Babakexorramdin (talk) 15:10, 25 November 2008 (UTC)

Farrokh is free to fill the internet with his theories, at websites called ghandchi.com, or elsewhere. The question is, why is he mentioned on Wikipedia. Reviewing this article, and the one on Shadows in the Desert: Ancient Persia at War, I find that notability has been artificially inflated in the best tradition of Wikipedia pov-pushing. This is just another Osprey book, not more, not less. Just give it a list entry at Osprey_Publishing#General_Military. What is this "Persian Golden Lioness Award" awarded by an otherwise unknown "World Academy of Arts, Literature, and Media", and why do we have an article on it? Why do we have an article on a writer because he was interviewed by Voice of America and the History Channel? I strongly suggest we should take a strict approach of enforcing WP:Bio here, because it looks for

all in the world as if internet-savvy Mr. Farrokh is actively trying to abuse Wikipedia as a vehicle to boost (as opposed to *document*) his notability. Now don't get me wrong. Osprey is a perfectly respectable publisher catering to the military history geek. Farrokh's book isn't trash, it is simply one of literally scores of perfectly respectable titles published with Osprey. This should duly buy it a list entry, but hardly *two* standalone Wikipedia articles. We have *one single* standalone article dedicated to a single Osprey book, while most of the many dozen other titles aren't as much as mentioned in a list. This single title just *happens* to be about conspiracy theories regarding a western-centric "Alexander mystique" that caters to the inferiority complex of our resident Iranian patriots. Go figure. More balance, more WP:DUE, less wikilobbying please. --dab (✉) 09:36, 25 November 2008 (UTC)

I do not know. I do not oppose deletion of this article, if Lendering too is also deleted. But the very fact that Atabey is so fierce against him says something that he is notable among these types of people. Atabey and co. run an organization connected to the American neo-cons and lobby for bombing Iran.--Babakexorramdin (talk) 15:16, 25 November 2008 (UTC)

so, you are saying, all your arguing on this page has merely been in "revenge" for the existence of the Lendering article? Babakexorramdin, are you familiar with WP:POINT? If you feel the Lendering article should go, kindly express the sentiment at Talk:Jona Lendering. --dab (✉) 17:42, 25 November 2008 (UTC)

No not in revenge. It is just that lendering started the smear campaign against Farrokh, and I think it the best if both are here or none of them. Because the existence of one article leads undeniably to a further going debate and smear campaign.--Babakexorramdin (talk) 18:34, 25 November 2008 (UTC)

ok, I've moved the Lendering article to Livius Onderwijs. I agree we don't need to cover the BLP *and* the livius.org. Now. It appears *Shadows in the Desert* is an extremely shoddy book, transparently and shamelessly touting Iranian nationalism (which, *big surprise*, inspired Iranian nationalist kids to tout it on Wikipedia), which makes Kaveh Farrokh an amateur author who has published an extremely shoddy book and was interviewed on television a couple of times. I am glad we had this conversations, and I suppose we can now get rid of this article, based on WP:BLP alone. --dab (✉) 17:52, 25 November 2008 (UTC)

Seems fair enough to me. I think it might be worth taking a look at the notability of *Shadows in the Desert* as well. I can't see how it meets any of the criteria set out at the top of Wikipedia:Notability (books). Viewed objectively, I don't see anything about it that makes it more notable than any other Osprey book - indeed, it's somewhat less so given that only one (very uncomplimentary) review of the book seems to have been published. -- ChrisO (talk) 09:16, 26 November 2008 (UTC)

Babakexorramdin, who is "me and my organization", why not focus on topics of editing? It requires a simple English to read this piece of writing [34] (<http://www.rozanehmagazine.com/NoveDec05/aazariINDEX.HTML>) to see what kind of radical and intolerant views are being exercised by Kaveh Farrokh. Wikipedia is a place for neutral and respectful editorship, not for promoting radical ideologies and bias. Promoting Aryanism in 21st century, after a World War which took millions of lives, by way of targeting Turkic-speaking nations, sickening anti-Semitism and other forms of racism and intolerance, isn't really a scholarship. Atabøy (talk) 17:25, 26 November 2008 (UTC)

It seems that you haven't read his book. You cannot accuse him of any thing like that. He wrote a book and he referred to sources and cited many of them. It is a well sourced work. I do know that it is frowned upon in the circles around you, which always have their mouth full of bombing Iran and kill all Iranians. But it has had its fair attention from the circles who do not hate Iran. A master work!--Babakexorramdin (talk) 22:13, 8 December 2008 (UTC)

The question isn't, is he a nice man, but, is he *notable*. Farrokh just needs to make a *bad enough* mess of things, and he'll surely get his own article in due time, just like N. S. Rajaram or Gene Ray did. --dab (✉) 19:45, 26 November 2008 (UTC)

Retrieved from "http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Talk:Kaveh_Farrokh/Archive_1&oldid=345327203"

- This page was last modified on 21 February 2010 at 01:29.
- Text is available under the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike License; additional terms may apply. By using this site, you agree to the Terms of Use and Privacy Policy.

Wikipedia® is a registered trademark of the Wikimedia Foundation, Inc., a non-profit organization.