

wesleyan a fells

Middletown, Connecticut

Volume CXXXVII, Number 31

Friday, February 22, 2002

Edward Said lecture fills Crowell

by Miriam Gottfried Assitant News

"What I propose is an effort in understanding, understanding being a never-ending process," controversial speaker Edward Said (pronounced Sah-eed) as he began his lecture to a packed audience in Crowell Concert Hall Tuesday afternoon entitled "The Palestinian Situation Today." The talk was presented by the group, Students for a Free Palestine (SFP).

Said's appearance provoked protests by members of the group, Students for Israel, and others who passed out pro-Israel literature at the lecture and put up anti-Said posters throughout campus

last week (see article on page 14).

Over one hundred people were turned away at the door after Crowell reached its capacity. Some tried to listen through windows.

"My purpose is to put forth a narrative that is more inclusive, but it is not meant to be anything more than restoring a history," Said said.

After stating his purpose, Said outlined the framework for his goal of portraying the Palestinian history and current situation.

"We need to remember that we live in a time, not of the clash of civilizations, but of the clash of interpretations of history and identity," he said.

Said explained the idea of a

fragmentation of history, which he sees as a modern phenomena resulting from the inclusion of the voices of more marginalized sections of societies. He stated that, while this process was something to be celebrated, he also saw it leading to incoherence because of the variety of perspectives that might come out of one event.

According to Said, the world is becoming more heterogeneous, as is evidenced by the now mixed populations of formerly homogenized European countries. In response to this many people are reverting to fundamentalist versions of religion where the "right way" is open to different interpretations.

"Palestine/Israel is the most deeply invested geography so far as claims, counter-claims," Said said. "Religion is the natural product of Palestine, not

Said, page 15

Edward Said spoke to a capacity crowd in Crowell Concert Hall Tuesday about the plight of the Palestinian people.

Early Decision applications decline

by Ben Abelson Contributing Writer

The Office of Admission mailed some 140 acceptance letters to Early Decision (ED) II applicants last Friday bringing the total number admitted through ED to 300 this year, according to Senior Associate Dean of Admission Gregory Pyke. This year, the ED applicant pool decreased by about 10 percent, which Pyke attributed to high schools' decreased emphasis on ED

Average combined SAT scores are up about 20 points among this year's ED applicants from last year's applicant pool, according to Pyke. The median score of students admitted to the class of 2005 was 1410.

Pyke declined to disclose other ED statistics.

He noted that a few ED admittees are sometimes allowed to decline admission if they deem their financial aid award unacceptable.

"I think a number of people in school have learned that ED is a plus, but it doesn't make a dramatic difference in who colleges are looking for. What we

saw this year was the way the bottom of ED pool shrank considerably. One measure of that is the average scores are higher for the ACT and SAT in ED applicants."

Typically, the University admits approximately 40 percent of its class from ED applicants.

Pyke said the number of students admitted through Early Decision is kept "relatively low" at 40 percent so the Office of Admission has enough flexibility to admit other students during the regular application phase.

According to Pyke, certain groups are less likely to choose ED, especially those among the highest achievers in their high schools. These students are more likely to apply to several top schools and pick and choose from among them.

Other groups that are less likely to apply under ED are students of color and students who require financial aid and have to compare financial aid offers, according to

Mean SAT scores, page 6

University pledges \$1 mil for Neighborhood Arts Center

by Anna Talman Assistant News

The University announced Monday that it plans to build a million dollar community arts center in the North End neighborhood of Middletown as part of a community renewal project in the

The Green Street Arts Center, as it will be called, will be housed in the former Saint Sebastian School at 55 Green Street, just East of Main Street in the North End.

The center will focus on arts instruction for children and adults, with programs in music, dance, and visual arts including photography and video. The building will also be an artistic home for artists and arts ensembles from the neighborhood.

'We want to be the artistic home for 'home-grown,' neighborhood-grown

ensembles," said Center for the Arts (CFA) Director Pamela Tatge, who is in charge of the project.

Tatge said that the Green Street Arts Center will ultimately also sponsor apprenticeship programs targeting middle and high school youth, teaching them employable arts such as graphic design, video editing, sound recording

and photography.

Tatge said that the project is also a

boon for the University.

"Really this is the moment for Wesleyan to be involved, and it will be an extraordinary opportunity for our students who are by nature active and

Students, page 6

Cardinals ride Camels out of NESCAC tourney

by Marc Lapointe Sports Editor

As the minutes ticked away Tuesday night, Leo Jones '02 had plenty to talk about. But to counter the jeers and chants of "over-rated" from the home Conn. College crowd, Jones merely pointed to the scoreboard and smiled. When all was said and done, the senior captain of the Wesleyan men's basketball team had 22 points and 11 rebounds in leading the Cards to a 75-61 upset over third-seeded Conn. College in the quarterfinal round of the NESCAC tournament.

"This was our most complete game this year by far," Jones said. "I loved the intensity. The crowd talking and the players talking just adds to the fun.

The Cards, despite trailing at the half by two points, dominated play in the second half. An 11-4 run in the first four minutes thrust Wesleyan into the lead, 38-33. Jones and Bryan McBeth '02 then drained consecutive threes, Chad Gordon '03 put back an offensive rebound and Kahree Brown '04 beat his defender to the hoop on a hesitationdribble, giving Wesleyan a double digit lead 45-34.

Keala Mills '04 (13 points) also

contributed with strong baseline drives resulting in two buckets and a trip to the free-throw line. This lead proved insurmountable for the Camels, as they never put together a significant run.

"Mills was very important and Brown made some strong drives," said Lynn Ramage, the Camels' head coach. "When Jones hit those long threes I knew we were in trouble.'

Excellent Card defense and rebounding caused frustration for Conn. College who shot just 19-61 from the field. Alternating between 2-3 and 3-2 zones as well as some man-to-man defenses, Wesleyan prevented the Camels from establishing any offensive rhythm by aggressively challenging every three-point attempt and limiting penetration by Conn. College guards.

In the teams' first match-up on Jan. 26, the Camels connected on 11-21 three-pointers.

We definitely knew what we had to do defensively," Gordon said. "We came out so hard we got a little winded in the beginning, so we needed to fall back into the zones and the box-andone on their guards."

"We had a lot of trouble with the 3-2," Ramage said. "They made us

continued on page 20



field...

A pre-frosh learns about the University at the Admissions office this past weekend.

See how the University plans on changing the look of Andrus

Miss Jubilee? Check out these photo highlights...

The first Argus political crossfire columns...

Page 12

Page 17

Page 5

One-sided Said lecture did more harm than good

I staunchly disagree with virtually every opinion Edward Said has concerning Israel/Palestine. His lecture was slanted and one-sided, not the objective work the University claimed. The students walked into the lecture wanting a certain opinion, and Said fed it to them. All the students present are going to lean much more towards Said's side. It will now be even harder for students such as myself who support the state of Israel to outwardly indicate our beliefs.

To begin: The treatment of Palestinians in Israel. Said describes them as treated like foreigners living within the land, as enemies, as secondclass citizens. But what of the reverse situation? What of the Jews in the surrounding Arab countries? What of the countries where there aren't any Jews, having moved long ago in response to anti-Semitic pogroms and been absorbed into Israel (an action which the Arab nations have not done for the Palestinian refugees)? It is unfair to talk of the injustices dealt towards the Palestinians in Israel when the reverse remains unstated. And of the Palestinians' fear, sitting in their homes, waiting to be bombed? Well, what about the average citizen of Jerusalem's fear, terrified to get on a bus or sit down at a coffee shop? Is their plight unimportant because their government makes mistakes? The Palestinians are innocent victims? Well, most of the Israelis killed at the December shooting on Ben

Goisman is a member of the class of

between the ages of 14-20: children. Are they less innocent?

Edward Said showed us the various proposals designed at returning land to the Palestinians. What he didn't show was the Camp David plan that ceded 98% of the territory in the West Bank, including parts of Jerusalem, which was then outright rejected by Arafat. Said can't talk of peace through concession while the current Palestinian Authority, in all its corrupt and peace-hating glory, still exists. And wouldn't the Israeli Government be much more likely to stop its bombings of the West Bank if the terrorist attacks ended? The territory captured in the '67 war- a war started by surrounding Arab nations-helped secure Israel's borders against countries that remain a constant threat.

As for his comments on the American Media: Mainstream newspapers don't often call the West Bank "occupied territory." However, those same newspapers are the ones that place the stories of soldiers killing Palestinian rock throwers on page 1 and the stories of Israeli children killed in suicide bombings on page 8. And it is those same newspapers that create purposefully wrong captions designed to make the IDF look like monsters. An example: the photo that appeared in the New York Times last year depicting an Israeli soldier standing angrily over a bleeding and unconscious man. The caption identified the man as a Palestinian and the scene as the Temple Mount. In fact, that man was an American Jew whom the soldier was protecting from a Palestinian mob that attacked him. The gas station in the

Yehudah Street in Jerusalem were background clearly excludes the Temple Mount as the attack site. An act of such poor journalistic integrity as this can only be purposeful. Said believes the American media is pro-

Said believes it is every American's duty to be on the side of the Palestinians since American weapons and helicopters are being used against them. He says that we all should care about this issue. He also calls it "moral cowardice" to not take a side in this issue. He wants you to draw a clear inference: that we are cowards if we're not involved, and that we're morally wrong if we don't sympathize with the Palestinians.

Look, I'm not saying that human rights aren't being violated in Palestine. They certainly are. However, we should know both sides of the issue if we are going to care. Lastly, you should know that Said is not the pristine Columbia professor he appears to be. It has been proved that he lied about his origins. He grew up in Cairo, not Jerusalem, and the only reason he was even born there was because his parents were on vacation there at the time (in fact, he stumbled and stuttered through the part of his speech concerning his childhood). Also, Said was photographed in 2000 in Lebanon throwing stones across the Israeli border at IDF soldiers. Professor of peace? A brilliant speaker he may be, but please take his words and ideas with the cynicism that is characteristic of the truly liberal.

Many things conspicuously absent from Said's one-sided propagandistic argument

continued from page 3

Palestinian narrative alone, Said intended for those of us listening to reach a position in which a concrete, one-sided moral verdict felt not only comfortable but necessary.

I his invitation to anoint a true victim and a true oppressor is problematic based not only on the standards of discourse enshrined in the academy, but also by dint of the arguments contained within Said's speech itself: he took pains to demonstrate that "Israelite History" is one of many competing ancient histories situated in the same small area of land and implored us not to overlook others. On what possible grounds, then, should he encourage us to judge the conflict after the presentation of any one historical narrative?

It seems as if, on Said's view, the historical condition of the Palestinian people is sufficiently terrible to lead to absolute condemnation of Israel. And this may be the case. But there has never been, on any historical matter, one decisive account; those who claim one narrative as decisive are ordinarily regarded as dogmatic and propagandistic and met with doubt, yet Said's one-dimensional display earned him ovations.

And it was not even a very well crafted narrative. I count myself among those who support the creation of independent and viable Palestinian state,

yet I do not feel as if such a position coexistence and peace. But when justifies grotesque manipulations of historical fact. Examples abound within Said's narrative:

Said's narrative presented aggressive, colonialistic Israelis and dispossessed Palestinians as the only major parties involved in this conflict. How justify the exclusion of the half-dozen Arab nations who launched a series of wars aimed at Israel's annihilation? The Palestinian historical condition cannot be sensibly understood without reference to the several bloody wars fought among nations in the region—in fact it is a direct result of these. Yet Said presented just such a doctored narrative in order to promote an unclouded moral

Also conspicuously absent from Said's presentation was any discussion, or even mention, of Yassir Arafat. It seems baffling that the father of the Palestinian national movement (as well as the father of modern terrorism) would be excluded from any Palestinian narrative; the exclusion makes more sense, however, once one discovers that Said is a virulent critic of Arafat. As a result of his opposition, Said made the strategic and manipulative choice to simply wipe Arafat from the annals of his Palestinian history.

The most disturbing view embedded within Said's historical account did not emerge until the question period after his speech. Said spoke movingly of asked about the validity of a Jewish state in the future, Said clearly expressed his hope that the future of "historic Palestine" will hold one unified nation for both the Israeli and Palestinian peoples. Though this view sounds peaceful enough, it indicates that Said opposes the two state solution and, by extension, the continued existence of the Jewish state of Israel. No sovereign nation, including Israel, can countenance existential threats, including those hidden behind a façade of coexistence.

I could go on listing conspicuous omissions from Said's historical account; I could also trumpet a thousand counter-narratives. Neither course would help break the death embrace which now binds the Israeli and Palestinian peoples. History is a brutal mechanism of great injustice, and Jews and Palestinian are both its bastard children. The most morally exquisite narrative will not change that fact. I applaud Said for his ceaseless determination to convey the narrative of his people to the widest possible audience. But I caution everyone against the false and damaging notion that any narrative— be it Zionist or Palestinian—can ever foster an atmosphere of peace anywhere on this earth.

Said's Zionist media argument flawed

By David Dreilinger

What is inhibiting a populist upsurge in support of the Palestinians in the United States? Last Tuesday, Edward Said provided us with a succinct, definitive, and entirely inappropriate answer: the American media and government. Said accused the media of intentionally obliterating the truth, of purposely obfuscating the essential injustice of the situation in Israel and the Palestinian Territories. To make matters worse, according to Said, the United States government is complicit in this vile conspiracy to deny Palestinians their basic human rights and destroy their intrinsic need for national self-determination. The bias and immoral cowardice of these impression-forming entities account for the lack of support for Palestinians in the mainstream American political

We've been presented with a pair of dubious accusations, but it is worth listening to Said's rationale. Why is the United States involved in a public opinion war against the Palestinians? Why is America so insensitive to the needs of an oppressed people? Unfortunately, Mr. Said neglected to elaborate in his lecture. He felt no need to explain to his audience exactly why and how they, as Americans, are victims of an elaborate process of indoctrination and subtle propaganda designed to dehumanize and vilify the pacific and innocuous Palestinian. To find his explanation of how such a thing could occur, one must look to his independent

Said patiently explains in the journal Al-Ahram how US policy is in effect dominated, if not completely controlled, by a small minority of people, the most powerful minority in the US- the American Zionists. The Zionists, in fact, also control the American media; Said complains that his work could not have appeared in any American paper and if there had been an interview the questions would have been adversarial, hectoring, [and] insulting. Said is referring especially to New York periodicals,

Dreilinger is a member of the class of 2004

informing his reader in no uncertain terms that New York is the citadel of Zionist power. The American government and media, both controlled by Zionists, are the main factors contributing to collective Palestinian misery, because of their conspiratorial, self-interested attempt to keep the public

It would be a lengthy but rather easy task to disprove this flawed argument to show how the American media is in fact overly sympathetic to the Palestinian struggle through their writing, photographs, and asymmetrical allocation of airtime to advocates of the Palestinian cause. However, the most disturbing aspect of these accusations is that they have made their way into the realm of appropriate discourse. The boundaries of what can and cannot be argued have blurred to such an extent that no one blinks an eye, indeed gives a standing ovation to, a man who proposes that the Zionists control the media and the United States

It is hardly a stretch to equate these problematic accusations with the prototypical anti-Semitic argument of the last two centuries. The sophisticated historical evolution of anti-Semitic treatises on Jewish hegemony, including such luminaries as the benighted Henry Ford, argued persuasively and falsely that Jews control the money supply, thus assuring them control of the government and the media. Said has carefully replaced the word Jew with the word Zionist, as anti-Zionism has become a legitimate and appropriate discourse. Said has blurred the boundaries to such an extent that it is hardly surprising that the motivations behind the 330 anti-Semitic acts in France alone (many perpetrated by Muslim youth) throughout the past 16 months have been justified with the same arguments with which Said critiques Zionism.

I hardly intend to accuse Said of racism, and as far as his intentions are concerned, I'm willing to give him the benefit of the doubt. It is, however, impossible not to criticize what has become the legitimization of anti-Semitic activity under the shallow guise of anti-Zionism.

notes from the diaspora

continued from page 3

Indian people are knowledgeable of the violent past that brought their people to the islands of their nativity. However, the nature of the slavery that existed on the sugar plantations of Jamaica was different from the conditions endured by slaves in North Carolina. Contrasts are also evident in the struggles faced following the emancipation of Black people in these places.

Whereas the Post-emancipation era for African Americans meant fierce racism, Jim Crow laws, lynchings, segregation, symbols, policies, and institutions all created to keep Black people in America subordinate. People of the Caribbean were faced with different dilemmas. Haiti, the first colony to gain its independence placed a Black man in the position of Prime Minister and strived to gain stability for the nation after the abolishment of slavery.

As decades passed so would the institution of slavery in other islands of the Caribbean. Although many of the islands shed their colonial masters later, the Black people there had instrumental roles in the development of the society. The issue of racism was hardly an after thought. So when West Indians migrate to the United States, in search of "opportunity", they are unaware of America's dark history with its Black

They are unable to relate to the Civil Right Movement, arguments about Affirmative Action, holidays and a whole month dedicated to remembering those who sacrificed for racial equality in the United States. Culturally they see this nation through different eyes. West Indians do not share the same pains, songs, and memories as African Americans. This is a reality, but not the fault of anyone.

Somewhere between the continued endeavors for racial equality and plans for Black History Month, there is a need for dialogue to commence. It is time that West Indians and African Americans stop comparing each other's histories and start making it [history] together.