

## THE CALIFORNIA AGGIE

### EDITORIALS

#### AS PAPERS

## New plan promising

Associated Students Providing Alternative Publications Equal Resources is an ASUCD special project whose funding was recently cut.

Established in 1993, AS Papers has provided the necessary resources for campus and community members to create and run alternative publications on campus.

The purpose of AS Papers was to help students in the process of creating and running their individual publications. Unfortunately, it has not been successful in recent years, due to a combination of decreasing student participation and funding.

We believe in the power of alternative publications as a means to express the various voices of the community. Though they would compete with The Aggie, UC Davis is

a diverse campus with many diverse opinions, and we feel it is important that these viewpoints are addressed.

We are pleased that AS Papers Director Sean Dolan will seek to establish a workshop class in technocultural studies, dedicated to more relevant 21st century media. If Dolan follows through with his plan, students will have a chance to design and establish individual publications, an opportunity that is otherwise unavailable without AS Papers. Hopefully this class will be a solid platform for alternative publications, which could develop into separate important campus institutions.

Without this program, our campus is at a loss. We hope that Dolan follows through with his plan to save the program.

#### EDITORIAL BOARD

Mark Ling <i>Editor in Chief</i>	Janelle Bitker <i>Campus Editor</i>	Robin Migdal <i>Arts Editor</i>	Maddie McCurry-Schmidt <i>Science Editor</i>
Max Rosenblum <i>Managing Editor</i>	Becky Peterson <i>City Editor</i>	Jason Alpert <i>Sports Editor</i>	Jeff Perry <i>Photography Editor</i>
	Nick Markwith <i>Features Editor</i>		

Editorials represent the collective opinions of The California Aggie editorial board. The Opinion page appears Tuesdays and Thursdays.

## LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

### Advertisement Response

The opinion expressed by Mark Ling on the issue of David Horowitz's ad does not represent the view of the entire Editorial Board. We do not support apologizing for controversial content and we do not support the censorship of opinions, so long as it does not constitute as hate speech, which, legally, must advocate for violence.

What Horowitz wrote is hateful, but it is not hate speech. We are not sympathetic to his ideas, but hiding his point of view does not make it go away.

As a newspaper, we are obligated to provide an open forum and an unapologetic devotion to freedom of expression. It is inevitable for some to take offense to certain content.

JANELLE BITKER  
*Aggie Campus Editor*

NICK MARKWITH  
*Aggie Features Editor*

BECKY PETERSON  
*Aggie City Editor*

MAX ROSENBLUM  
*Aggie Managing Editor*

### Response to David Horowitz ad

As faculty at UC Davis, we were appalled to read a half-page paid advertisement by right-wing activist David Horowitz in The Aggie on Thursday. The ad was full of the most blatantly racist and anti-Arab language, wildly inaccurate statements and hysterical accusations. The title, accusing Palestinians' opposition to Israel as based on "a genocidal lie," was in itself incendiary and shocking.

Denying that Palestine and the Palestinian people do exist in effect justifies policies of annihilation and dispossession. It is rabid statements like this that are, in fact, based on lies and distortions of historical facts, and that provide racist justification for ethnic cleansing and genocidal violence. In the post-9/11 era, Arab, Palestinian and Muslim American students are consistently profiled and targeted by racial constructions of "terrorists" in the U.S. In Israel, illegal settlements, home demolitions, road closures, checkpoints and the illegal wall continue to displace Palestinians and violate their basic human rights. Given this climate, this ad only serves to make Palestinian and Arab students feel more unsafe.

We are also deeply troubled that this ad was placed during Palestine Awareness Week and do not think this timing is coincidental. While off-campus groups may be able to buy space to publish hateful rhetoric targeting a particular group based on their race, under the cover of freedom of speech, this does not make it any less offensive to the campus community. We find it disturbing that anti-Arab racism and Islam-phobia is implicitly sanctioned by such hateful speech.

Furthermore, we have been very disturbed to note a pattern of problematic and often racist articles and op-eds about Arab and Muslim students appearing in The Aggie over the past several weeks and months. For example, in this very issue, The Aggie also published a lengthy op-ed by Matan Shelomi of Aggies for Israel calling the Law Student Association's decision not to condemn the criminalization of the Irvine 11's protest "a victory for free speech."

This is deeply ironic, given that the UC students who engaged in that protest at UC Irvine were, in fact, exercising their rights to free speech and yet were met with exceptional demonization and harsh punishment from the university and, later, unprecedented criminal charges from the Orange County District Attorney's office. In fact, 17 UCD Law School faculty have opposed the prosecution of the Irvine 11 ([irvine11.com/supporters-and-allies/#UCDF](http://irvine11.com/supporters-and-allies/#UCDF)).

We also note that while The Aggie did include a large photograph in this issue of the mock wall erected by Students for Justice in Palestine, the writer of the brief article accompanying the image chose not to report on any of the facts that SJP was trying to share with the campus (that the wall is deemed illegal by international law and is actually built inside Palestinian territory, or that 63 years refers to the founding of the state of Israel in Palestine in 1948). When is it that students at UC Davis will be allowed to know historical facts and details about Israel-Palestine?

We hope that this is the last of such racist and biased publishing and writing in The Aggie.

MARISOL DE LA CADENA  
*Anthropology*

CAREN KAPLAN  
*American Studies*

SUNAINA MAIRA  
*Asian American Studies*

SUSETTE MIN  
*Asian American Studies*

ERIC SMOODIN  
*American Studies*

## GUEST OPINION

### Response to David Horowitz ad

By RACHEL PEVSNER

I must inform you that the advertisement in The Aggie on Thursday titled "The Palestinians' Case Against Israel is Based on a Genocidal Lie" has two major flaws which make it very suspicious. First, it is written in a style of extreme propaganda. Second, its content is a denial of a human rights violation.

Propaganda oversimplifies an issue by only giving one perspective, and polarizes people into two groups — with the speaker, or "the enemy." For example, when a line from the advertisement says, "There is one reason and one reason alone that there is no peace" such a statement leaves no room for discussion and suggests that all other opinions are invalid. In addition, the name-calling in the piece, such as "the Arab aggressors" gives the advertisement a racist spin that makes the rest of the advertisement suspect. By offering only a binary, us vs. them mentality the advertisement encourages readers to look at

the issue from only a one-sided perspective. Personally, I am disturbed that such an obstruction to intellectual debate needs to be used.

As a student of human rights, I have learned that a group of people (whether you call them Palestinians or by some other name) was forcibly removed from their homes during the creation of the State of Israel. The term for forcibly removing an ethnic group from a geographic location is "ethnic cleansing." I believe that this is a core issue that is trying to be debated, though the advertisement does not mention this except to say that Palestine does not exist.

In genocide class this week we studied denial, and on the very same day this advertisement ran, we learned about a type of denial called "reversal" which is, essentially, the defense of accusing a victim of being a perpetrator. This advertisement had many lines that made me think of reversal, including those claiming that the Palestinians' case is "genocidal" and that they "honored the

murderers" of "a calculated war on women and children."

In denying any responsibility for the hardships faced by Palestinians or Arabs (groups not distinguished in the article), the advertisement accuses the Palestinians for injustices done to Israel. However, such accusations do not absolve Israel from responsibility. In addition, it blames Arabs for their own suffering: "It is true that the Arabs of the West Bank and Gaza are suffering. But they are suffering because of 60 years of Arab aggression ..." Again refusing to take any responsibility for anything, this advertisement seems, to me, a prime suspect for denial of a human rights violation.

In the future, when publishing an advertisement in a college newspaper, I would encourage the David Horowitz Freedom Center to present its arguments in a way that doesn't make use of propaganda, racism, accusations and a denial of any possible responsibility. And I encourage all newspaper readers to watch out for propaganda.

## LETTER FROM THE EDITOR

### David Horowitz's advertisement

By MARK LING  
*Aggie Editor in Chief*

On Thursday, a paid advertisement titled "The Palestinians' Case Against Israel is Based on a Genocidal Lie" was printed on page seven of The California Aggie. As editor in chief of The Aggie, a part of my job is to act as the final filter of all advertisements. Put simply, if I deem an ad to be unprintable, it will not be published.

About a week ago, David Horowitz's ad was sent to me for approval, and I allowed it to go to print. As a direct result of my decision, people on this campus — our campus — felt racially discriminated against, and for that I sincerely apologize.

In response to the ad, a group organized a protest on Friday afternoon. They gathered on the quad and marched down to The Aggie newsroom. I spoke with about 10 people for over two hours. During the discussion, I was convinced that the ad is indeed racist.

As a result, The Aggie will update its advertising guidelines. An existing policy barring racist, sexist, bigoted, homophobic or otherwise discriminatory written content from running will be extended to the advertising department.

During my tenure as editor, I've dealt with a bevy of controversial issues. Each of these issues had a person or a group of people demanding retribu-

tion. It is generally the policy of The Aggie to not succumb to protestors because we carefully make decisions that are intended to inform and promote discourse.

This is the first time that I feel compelled to publicly acknowledge a mistake, not because people protested and not to appease readers or advertisers, but because the situation truly merits it.

We at The Aggie take our job very seriously. As a result, we sometimes act as journalists to a fault, regardless of the consequences. However, before journalists, we are people who must try to comprehend the collateral damage of our decisions.

I deeply apologize on behalf of The Aggie for allowing a racist advertisement to run and I guarantee that, before my tenure ends, I will personally do all that is within my power to prevent this from happening again in the future.

If you'd like to publicly express an opinion regarding this issue, you are encouraged to write a guest opinion or letter to the editor or attend a special meeting of the Campus Media Board this Friday. The exact time and location are to be determined and will be announced in The Aggie later this week.

MARK LING can be reached at [editor@theaggie.org](mailto:editor@theaggie.org).



Rob Olson

### In conclusion . . .

In my column this year, I took a few positions that seemed less than popular with a college audience. Two in particular stand out: keeping tax cuts for the rich at the federal level and opposing the proposed tax extensions in the state of California (which almost certainly means higher tuition rates for you and me).

At first, these two issues seem related only in that I am defending low taxes. But in reality, they are connected in a much greater sense, in something intangible without which numbers and details become meaningless.

Way too often in politics facts are cited entirely bereft of context. This complication muddies the waters of political debate, as we attempt to navigate through what isn't outright false, but is instead a flawed interpretation or argument that must be carefully picked apart.

For example, in opposition to tax cuts for the wealthy, some have cited statistics on the lack of increase in household income since about 1980. But household income is entirely separate from the better indicator of individual income.

"The household thing is really a tipoff, I think," said economist and Hoover Institution Senior Fellow Thomas Sowell in a recent interview. "Whenever I see someone quoting household income, he's trying to make things look bad."

"For example, over a period of about 30 years, household income

rose by only 6 percent. Over those same years, per capita income rose by 51 percent, because the number of people per household was declining all the while."

In other words, since the Reagan and Bush tax cuts were enacted, it is inaccurate to say that the rich have been getting richer while everyone else has been left behind. On average the rich have been getting richer, but others have been getting

richer too. The notion that tax cuts for the rich hurt you and me is a myth based on statistics viewed without context.

Though I increasingly enjoy arguing economic policy to determine what will make us all more prosperous, I must switch gears with the little space I have left to look at another example of a debate without context.

Tens of millions of Californians are on the verge of getting tax relief in a bad economy. Life in the Golden State has been on the decline in recent years, as a tough job market, a bad housing market, increasing gas prices and one of the highest overall tax burdens in the nation have all been driving folks out of the state at a rapid rate.

It's all well and good for us to gather and demand high taxes so that our tuition rates don't go up any further, but the problem is that the money we seek doesn't actually come from the state government. It comes from our fellow Californians.

So as the governor, the legislature and the state consider keeping sales, vehicle and income taxes at their present levels, we must consider what that means not just for us college students, but also for John Q. Public.

Sales taxes hit rich and poor alike. They increase tax consumption, not income, and even the poor must be consumers of some-

thing. Are we really prepared to deny lower taxes to the poor to even partially fund our time at one of the premier college systems in the country? How many of the California poor do you think have a four-year degree?

Vehicle taxes are indexed for the value of the vehicle, but it is little consolation to me with my 1998 Mazda van that the rich guy in El Macero has to pay more for

his Mercedes too. Higher taxes are higher taxes.

And higher income taxes, even merely on the rich, are not economically sound, as we've already looked at in multiple columns.

I am increasingly concerned that we in America are becoming a tribal society, in which different groups of people compete for their own demographic to get additional money from the government.

It is nothing new — at least for political scientists, of which I am thankfully not one — to note that the tax burden is spread across many, while government monies are often spent on smaller, select groups. The cost is spread out, and the benefits are concentrated.

This makes those receiving the benefits (for example, college students at a public university) much more vocal than the millions of California consumers and vehicle owners who face the prospect of tax extensions for years to come.

There is no changing the fact that we are faced with difficult times. But if we make smart decisions, if we look at facts within context and without forgetting the bigger picture, we have it in our power to make a more prosperous society for years to come.

Take your last opportunity of the year to e-mail ROB OLSON at [rolson@ucdavis.edu](mailto:rolson@ucdavis.edu).

## FEELING STRONGLY ABOUT SOMETHING?

submit a letter to the editor to have your opinion printed in The California Aggie.  
[editor@theaggie.org](mailto:editor@theaggie.org)