Epstein ‘Facilitated’ — But Didn’t Actually Fund — Wexner’s Donation to Construct Harvard Hillel Building, Director Says

Convicted sex offender Jeffrey E. Epstein facilitated donations to build Rosovsky Hall, the Mount Auburn Street building that houses Harvard Hillel.

Harvard Hillel. Photo: Ryan N. Gajarawala
Epstein — whose arrest and trial on sex trafficking charges made national headlines this summer — was previously believed to have helped finance the construction of the building.

In 1991, the New York Times reported that four men, including Epstein and billionaire and major Harvard donor Leslie H. Wexner, pledged to raise $2 million for the construction of Hillel’s new building.

The building — which cost roughly $3.6 million in total — was completed in 1994 and named Rosovsky Hall. In 2003, The Crimson reported a plaque at Hillel listed Epstein as a donor of the “Rosovsky Naming Gift” alongside Wexner and his wife, philanthropist Abigail S. Wexner. Epstein was Wexner’s financial manager at the time.

Henry A. Rosovsky, who is a dean emeritus of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, did not respond to requests for comment on the funding and dedication of his namesake building. Wexner reportedly connected Epstein and Rosovsky in 1991, and Rosovsky later attended several discussions held in Epstein’s Cambridge office.

Wexner also did not respond to requests for comment.

Commenting for the first time since the allegations against Epstein surfaced, Steinberg wrote in an email Wednesday that Hillel’s records show Epstein himself never contributed funds to the project. Steinberg added that Hillel replaced the plaque bearing Epstein’s name with signage excluding him “several years ago.”
Wexners,” Steinberg wrote. “Given that, and in view of Mr. Wexner’s having severed connections with Mr. Epstein, we were glad to list only Leslie and Abigail Wexner as having donated the naming gift for Harvard Hillel’s building.”

The only contribution Hillel has on record from Epstein himself is a $50,000 donation he made at a Hillel fundraising dinner in 1991, “long before his criminal activities became known,” Steinberg wrote. He did not respond to questions about whether Hillel planned to return or review the donations.

Steinberg’s statement Wednesday came shortly before University President Lawrence S. Bacow announced in an email to Harvard affiliates Thursday that Harvard would review Epstein’s donations to the University.

Bacow wrote Thursday that Harvard received at least $8.9 million in donations from Epstein between 1998 and 2007. Though the University has spent most of those gifts, it still has an unspent balance of $186,000, which will be donated to organizations that support victims of human trafficking and sexual assault.

Bacow also wrote in the email that Harvard would also review any donations made to the University at Epstein’s “suggestion.”

Wexner hired Epstein as his financial manager in 1987 and gave him power of attorney through a legal document, granting him the ability to “do all the acts, take all the proceeding; and exercise all the rights, powers, and privileges which I might do, take or exercise with respect to any of my assets.” The Times reported in July that Epstein grew more involved in Wexner’s charitable pursuits in the 1990s when he became a trustee of a Wexner family foundation.

Wexner recently wrote in a letter to employees that he cut ties with Epstein in 2007, after the allegations against him surfaced and Wexner discovered he “misappropriated vast sums of money from me and my family.”

While Wexner’s gift to construct Rosovsky Hall was made directly to Hillel — which receives no funding from the University — he has also donated more than $19 million to the Harvard Kennedy School over the years. Some of those donations occurred while Epstein still served as his financial manager and had power over his assets.

The allegations against Epstein received renewed attention beginning in November 2018, when a Miami Herald investigation found he allegedly ran an underage sex ring out of his Palm
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The Herald identified around 80 women who say Epstein molested or sexually abused them before 2006, when a team of lawyers — including Harvard Law School professor emeritus Alan M. Dershowitz — struck an extraordinary plea deal with the District Attorney’s office.

Epstein was arrested on new charges in New York in July. In August, he died in the Manhattan Correctional Center in what authorities said was an apparent suicide.

Beyond facilitating Wexner’s donation to Hillel, Epstein boasted deep, longstanding ties to Harvard, despite not being an alumnus of the University. He was associated with several administrators and faculty including Dershowitz, Rosovsky, former University President Lawrence H. Summers, and Mathematics and Biology professor Martin A. Nowak.

—Staff writer Molly C. McCafferty can be reached at molly.mccafferty@thecrimson.com. Follow her on Twitter @mollmccaff.
Harvard, true to form, will go for positive PR by donating a pittance ($186,000) when the dirty money was more than nine million. It just makes you wonder at how becoming part of Harvard’s administration makes your every utterance false and hollow.
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jeffJ1 ➔ Martin • a day ago

As easy as it is to pounce on this, I totally buy their reasoning. The money was given and spent long long ago, before he was convicted. Any money they can still identify as being directly tied to Epstein is getting moved along. Harvard is not responsible for Epstein's crimes, and they don't need to make a multi-million dollar "gesture" of shame out of current student's tuition dollars or unrestricted donor money.

Martin ➔ jeffJ1 • 10 hours ago

You’re confusing whether Harvard should regret accepting Epstein’s money with my point about Harvard’s PR disconnect of a statement of profound regret and the return of a measly $186,000. ‘Profound regret’ should coincide with the return or donation of all of Epstein’s support. Anything less is contradictory

PurpleJean ➔ Martin • an hour ago

There is nothing wrong with accepting money from someone who is not certifiably odious. Accepting money from Epstein before his conviction was fine. One should not have to return donations should the donor be convicted of an offense at some point in the future.

One might also argue that someone who has paid his debt to society, as Epstein was considered to be after his release, should be able to be welcomed back into polite society. But Epstein appeared to continue his pattern of abuses, so he should not have been welcomed back.
Big Data is my pimp name • a day ago
Interesting to that this news comes out while Harvard is hosting Shabbat 1000
   • Reply • Share

Maplecroft • a day ago
To be fair, then, the Harvard Palestinian Students Organization should get half of the Hillel.

Steinberg added that Hillel replaced the plaque bearing Epstein's name with signage excluding him "several years ago."

How many years after he pleaded guilty to 'soliciting prostitution' from a child, exactly?
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ShadrachSmith • a day ago
Why be outraged about donations? That wasn't Epstein's sin.
   • Reply • Share

PurpleJean • ShadrachSmith • a day ago • edited
Any donations given before Epstein was a known sexual predator should be considered OK, which covers the period in which Harvard Hillel was constructed. One could argue about the period afterwards, and whether after having served one's time one should be accepted in polite society.

It is ironic that Epstein's conviction was in Florida, which is restoring rights of criminals who have paid their debt to society.
   • Reply • Share

ShadrachSmith • PurpleJean • a day ago • edited
I disagree. When did the corporation know Epstein was a sexual predator? With all respect your comment begs that question. Littlefinger procured young women for corporation donors, and you tell me the corporation had no idea? The Big Lie is pretending that returning a few donations absolves the corporation from reaping millions in donations from human trafficking for a decade or more. Has the corporation incurred any debts to society?
   • Reply • Share

Greta • ShadrachSmith • a day ago
Harvard committed a 'sin' by helping a criminal whitewash his reputation in exchange for money. Donations from sketchy people should never be accepted if (and this is always the case) it requires turning a blind eye to their illicit acts or worse yet, lauding the donor as a visionary as Drew Faust did the disgraceful Wall
ShadrachSmith ➔ Greta • a day ago • edited

Accepting the donation is not the sin. The corporation's knowing involvement with using young women as party favors for big time donors is the sin. If repentance is called for, why is concealment of donations a good thing?

If you wish to repent sin, I could advise you about sincere repentance. I've...

Greta ➔ ShadrachSmith • a day ago

That would be a sin if true, but I've seen no evidence or allegations that Epstein provided any underage sex victims to Harvard donors, whether or not as quid pro quo for donations, have you?

ShadrachSmith ➔ Greta • a day ago • edited

And you don’t intend to see any either. For all I know you still believe Trump is a Russian asset and Kavanaugh is a rapist on a lot less evidence than we have of Littlefinger procuring young women for corporation donors. Your choices about who and what to believe have always been a mystery to me, but I love you anyway :-)

Greta ➔ ShadrachSmith • 21 hours ago

I think it much more likely and obvious that Trump is an Israeli asset, and have no idea whether Kavanaugh is a rapist, though it seems entirely plausible that he did stupid things when he was a teenage drunk. And while I wouldn’t say I love you, I respect that you stand for something (too few do) and are open about it by making your posting history accessible. And let’s face it, who doesn’t love the phallic, yellow closet case Bert?

PurpleJean ➔ Greta • an hour ago

Do you have any evidence that Israel took steps to swing the 2016 election to Trump?

Estimates for the Jewish vote for recent Republican presidential candidates are:
McCain 22%
Romney 30%
Trump 24%
ShadrachSmith ➦ Greta • 18 hours ago • edited

Your avatar is OK, but mine is a work of art. A familiar face from your childhood, a patient friend to all. A friend who always listens then considers carefully and gives potentially helpful advice with malice toward none, all presented with an eye catching yet somehow soothing palette.

You only know my posting persona. And you read it exactly as I