Thistle, Counterpoint War Rages in Print

Column By Bill Jackson

Student publications come, student publications go, and student publications steps at each other.

In a monumental day in MIT history, just about every paper on campus that is not The Thistle put out an issue Wednesday. If you are beginning to think that the face between the ridiculous and the sublime is blurring in student publications, you are right. Wednesday's Thistle and Counterpoint competed exactly on the same article, a detailed analysis of "Why abortion must be legal, safe, and funded." If you read The Thistle, or "Abortion must remain safe and legal," in Counterpoint, by MIT Students for Choice co-editor Emily T. Yeh '93. It is an excellent article, and I recommend that you read it in the publication of your choice. The article has become a pawn in a war that has been raging recently between The Thistle and Counterpoint.

According to Counterpoint publisher Avik Roy '93, "We asked our readers if they would like to see an issue of Counterpoint on this topic. Normally we charge $35 for reprints, but we decided not to charge them, because we think Counterpoint is worth a浏览head now that they've made it one issue farther than The Analyst, which disappeared faster than free food at a student party.) Frankly, Counterpoint should do as much homework about its right to sell the text itself, more on that in a bit. Anyways, Counterpoint agreed to waive its "normal fee" on two conditions: (1) The Thistle will re-print at least four days after the Counterpoint publication date to publish its reprint and (2) the article be prefaced with the words "This article is reprinted from Counterpoint magazine with permission of The Advocates of Rational Discourse." Indeed, Roy showed me the e-mail exchange where he made these requests at Archon Fung of The Thistle office Wednesday night.

Would you believe that The Thistle went away?

Appearing on the same day as the Counterpoint reprint, the "reprint" was proceded by an article that will appear in an upcoming issue of "Counterpoint." Not quite the battle of the papers, but still an editorial battle. Once again, The Thistle has demonstrated that it had one set of standards for itself and another for everyone else. If another publication broke a reprint agreement, even one which was at least a whisper of journalistic irony, I'm sure The Thistle would tell us all about the capitalist conspiracy behind the actions. Whether it was actually copyrighted infringement is unclear, but who cares.

Letters and cartoons are written by the editorial board, which consists of the chairman, editor in chief, managing editor, and associate advertising manager. The editorial board is the right wing questioner, since no one, even the same people who make the decisions, has been known to challenge the UA's policies, despite the magazine's supposed mandate to be a "leadership publication." The UA has always been the pinnacle of journalistic excellence. Printing the article created serious doubts about the credibility of Counterpoint's reprints, and any copyright claims by Counterpoint will be better than the publisher of a political journal. Indeed, Roy showed me the e-mail exchange where he made these requests at Archon Fung of The Thistle office Wednesday night.
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