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God bless America as our troops come crashing through now-rubbleized Baghdad. Iraqi leaders surrendered yesterday after Saddam Hussein was killed by one of many air offensives this past week. The war was a quick forty-five day event with minimum casualties—only 20,000 American servicemen (and hostages) killed; 5 times that wounded—just how our central military planners said it would be. It restored pride in America at a time when we needed it; at a time when there existed no valid reason for fearing communism; at a time when there seemed to be no real enemies of the USA; at a time when we needed a cause: something to believe in . . . something to die for.

The Iraqi army is now in pieces, the country’s infrastructure is virtually non-existent and Kuwait’s monarchy...
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has been restored to its well-oiled throne. Thanks, guys. See ya around. Let's get those refineries going! Crank 'er up.... Oh yeah, almost forgot... sixty percent of the Iraqi population is now homeless, over one million people lay dead and dying, an untold number wounded, no government exists.... But those irksome Iraqis are no longer a threat to freedom-lovers everywhere.

Will this hold true? What will happen if and when the United States and its Allies win what appears to be an inevitable war? What would we accomplish?

We would save our economy: the oil argument

Many people argue that a great benefit of going to war would be preventing our economy's collapse by retaining "control" of over 20% of the world's oil supply. The first problem with this is that we would not have control of said oil supply—the oil companies and the OPEC cartel would. And those companies are controlled by an elite who often operate against public wishes (witness the pump prices being raised immediately after the invasion, but now that barrel prices have dropped, pump prices have stayed inflated). The second problem is that we have been warned about the political and economic (not to mention environmental) consequences of oil dependency. It was clear throughout the oil crises of the seventies that we needed to become energy self-sufficient. If what they say is true (that the supply of oil strongly influences America's economic health), then do we really want an economy that hinges totally on external events beyond our control? Do we really want an economy that is not self-sufficient?

Others in this camp would agree with economic self-sufficiency and offer their idea of such: the defense industry. By going to war we would create jobs and increase the gross national product by producing more weapons systems. To hell with the peace dividend; we've got to save the military-industrial complex to save our economy. But in this case, do we really want an economic system whose health hinges on war production? An economy whose main industries will fail if we do not create the demand (via war preparations) needed to keep them in business? To hell with the "free" market; force a war. The proponents seem to be saying that in order to save a job we've got to risk a life.

We would liberate Kuwait: the moral argument

Another camp (maybe in the same campground), including the current administration, says that it's not about oil, it's about "what's right." We would be fighting for "decency," for the small kid oppressed by the school bully. But this is not a playground, Mr. Bush, this is a graveyard; and the stakes are much too high to be risking thousands of American and possibly millions of Arab lives in pursuit of pride, power, and polls.

Where were those lofty, valiant Americans when Tibet was overrun by the Chinese? When South African blacks were killed daily by an elite white minority? When the Soviets rolled across Afghanistan? When Iran was invaded by Iraq? When Panama was invaded by.... oh yeah, that was us, sorry. When Syria invaded Lebanon? When Israel invaded Lebanon? When Libya invaded Chad? When Grenada, Vietnam, Cambodia, Nicaragua, and Mexico were.... oh, sorry again. The point is that U.S. foreign policy has absolutely no historical tradition of coming valiantly to the aid of the small, oppressed man. Our foreign policy has too often been determined by self-interest, by what we can get from it rather than what...
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ideals we reflect by it.

Furthermore, would we really be liberating Kuwait? Was it ever liberated? The few Emirs would continue to lavishly live it up off of oil profits, off the blood of underpaid imported workers. Women would still be oppressed, being prohibited from holding land or casting a vote; adultery is punishable by stoning to death. And, if liberation was realized, the Iraq-Kuwait dispute will probably continue, given its historical context. Although Iraq's actions in Kuwait (public executions, torture, rapes, and so on) are in opposition to the values of most people anywhere, unless the U.S. is prepared to leave a huge standing army in the desert (a la in Europe), an invasion might not be a good idea.

The Iraq-Kuwait dispute has existed since Kuwait was granted independence by Britain in 1961. Kuwait used to be part of Iraq until Britain, evacuating foreign lands under their imploding empire, drew a line in the sand in 1922, thus establishing the Kuwaiti state. Britain immediately set up a monarchy in Kuwait (just as they did in other newly created gulf states, as well as in Iraq, Saudi Arabia, and Jordan) in order to assure monopolies for British firms. In general, land disputes in the Middle East have occurred ever since the British decided to "leave" the region, randomly redrawing nation-state boundaries without regard to the cultures they were cutting through with their borders. As a result the Kuwaitis have lived in constant fear of an Iraqi attack, but found it more immediately profitable to buy off Saddam Hussein's threats instead of creating a viable national defense. One reaps what one sows.

Of even greater import is that, of the 700,000 Kuwaitis now waiting in Saudi Arabia for their country's liberation, only 3,000 have signed up to fight for that liberation. If they don't believe in their cause enough to die for it, why should we?

We would neutralize the long-term Iraqi threat: the containment argument

If U.S. policymakers really believe this, then why did we sell Iraq so much military hardware, even since the end of the Iran-Iraq war? Some say that the U.S. is worried (rightly so) about Iraq's possessing nuclear weapons in two to five years, if they don't have them already. Why was the U.S. not worried about this last year? On top of this, if we were to obliterate the entire country, obliterate Saddam, and obliterate the Iraqi military, what's to say the long-term threat, including the threat of nuclear weapons, will have been totally eliminated? The Iraq-Kuwait dispute is very old and will probably continue, not to mention the other disputes between Syria and Iraq, between Iran and Iraq.... After Hussein, what about the Syrian threat? Are we prepared to militarily engage bullyfied Mr. Assad in order to liberate poor little Lebanon? What about aggressive behavior in other parts of the world? Are we prepared to deter mighty, nuclearized South Africa from its tiny neighbors?

If we defeat Iraq we will surely have to rebuild the country in order to remove a potential future threat and also to build up markets for Western goods. We did this in Europe with the Marshall plan. But do we have the financial resources to do this again? At that time we were in a period of phenomenal economic growth. War with Iraq may or may not plunge us into deeper recession— but regardless, with our own considerable economic problems, do we have the economic stamina to rebuild a country? I think not; we're having a hard time rebuilding our own country after 10 years of over-consumption. If we can't find homes for our homeless, how can we afford to help Iraq's homeless after a costly war? Even if the U.S. could rebuild Iraq and install a democratic government favorable to U.S.
interests, what is to say that the new government will not crumble or be overthrown as was the British-installed monarchy in 1958?

Even if we were to win the war, "successfully" rebuild Iraq and eliminate a future threat, what then? Iraq has no history of democracy. In view of the intense Syrian-Iraqi rivalry, Iraq will not sit back while Syria remains a threat. So who will check Syria? Certainly not us—the reason being that Syria will be a strong ally in a war against Iraq, and we will have virtually no say in Syrian military policies. Indeed, while all this hoopla is going on about Kuwait, Syria's Assad rolled into Lebanon while world attention was distracted. And no one said a word. Except Israel.

...Which introduces yet another important variable: Israel has long warned of Hussein's threats to just about everyone in the region, especially to them, yet our defense contractors (as well as Germany's, the USSR's, and so on) continued to supply just about everyone in the region. With such a buildup across the board, does war come as any surprise? If war breaks out, there exists a good chance that Iraq will draw Israel into the fight by rolling across Jordan with the Jordanians' blessings, thereby polarizing Arab support for the war to Iraq's side. An Arab will not fight on a Jew's side against another Arab. With no Arab support—especially with Syria's support gone—the chances for long term stability in the region dramatically decline. The problems with Syria outlined above compound. And the Palestinian question gets militarily introduced.

So even if we win this new, regional war—indeed World War III, in the sense that it will affect most nations on earth—what then? Do we rebuild more countries? The area's stability will be nil; in this atmosphere Islamic fundamentalism might rise bigger than before, thereby increasing the chances for more wars later. When will it be enough? Are we going to face a future of constant conflict? A future of constant body bag counting? Sound scary? It is.

A policy of never mind

When your brother, your sister, your son or your father is sent overseas, never mind why they are there and why they might not come back. Never mind that the American Ambassador to Iraq, April Glaspie, was informed July 25 (nine days before the invasion) in a meeting with Hussein of his "frustration with Kuwait and his inclination to invade," she indicated the U.S. government's neutrality and declared the issue a "border dispute," then went on vacation [Mark Sommer, Atlanta Constitution, 11/10/90]. Never mind that the Assistant Secretary of State for the Middle East, John Kelly, publicly testified to Congress in April and again two days before the invasion that "the U.S. had no commitment to defend Kuwait" [Philip Agee, "Producing the Proper Crisis." Zeta]. Never mind that Senator Boren, head of the Senate Intelligence Committee, said that the CIA predicted the invasion four days in advance. Never mind that five days before the invasion Congress debated economic sanctions against Iraq because of the evidence for Iraq's attaining nuclear weapons material—and that the Bush administration was adamantly against the proposed sanctions because they wanted to work with Iraq. Never mind that the feudal kingdoms we are defending are not democracies (in Saudi Arabia the penalty for conversion to Christianity is death). Never mind that the U.S., along with (West) Germany and especially the Soviets, continued to supply Iraq with weapons even after Hussein's genocidal chemical attacks. Never mind the historical context of the conflict.

If one can ignore all this (and more), then possibly she or he can afford the costs of going to war, but in this case it seems true that the most expensive peace is cheaper than the cheapest war.

The first panacea for a mismanaged nation is inflation of the currency; the second is war. Both bring a temporary prosperity; both bring a permanent ruin. But both are the refuge of political and economic opportunists.

Ernest Hemingway
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A Sort of Street Poll

conducted by A. Lowe Raiterl

What do you think of U.S. involvement in the Middle East crisis?

Miller Templeton
Director of International Student Services and Programs

...from my perspective the big consequences on our Arab students at Tech, we have a handful of Kuwaiti students and the effects have been universally bad—their funds were cut off. Then some funds were made available to them through the embassies and the Treasury Department. It's also difficult for students from the U.A.E. [United Arab Emirates]...my hope is that it doesn't create a shooting war. My perspective is gloomy; I feel a conflict is probable. So far though, there have been no reported incidents of discrimination against Arab students.

Dr. Gus Giebelhaus
Professor of History; Interim Head of the Department of History, Technology and Society

Dr. Giebelhaus stressed an historical point. The contrast often being made between general support of U.S. involvement in the Middle East and protest of involvement in Vietnam. The protests of Vietnam did not materialize and appear until after many American lives had been lost, and Vietnam's relevance to U.S. interest became fuzzy. This could very well be the case today. President Bush should not assume that a blank check has been written for him.

As an historian...a reminder to the people of your generation, a war in the Middle East should not be equated with the armed conflicts in Grenada, Panama and Libya. [They were] third world countries with little technologically advanced weaponry...understand the reality of Iraq. I submit to you there could be thousands of casualties just in the first hour. We [need to] realize the danger of taking the next step.

Stacia Smith
Undergraduate Student Council President
Junior

I think it's really scary...but it's important for the United States to have an involvement in international affairs because they can be a catalyst in bringing about world peace.
Let's Back the U.N.

by Bret Tanner

On August 2, 1990, the leader of Iraq, Saddam Hussein, ordered his army to invade the sovereign nation of Kuwait. This action was taken after a long and bloody war with Iran, which left Iraq in massive debt. In order to pay off this debt, Saddam Hussein needed oil supplies to be short, and he needed the price of oil to be relatively high. Kuwait and other Middle Eastern nations were pumping oil in high quantities and were selling the oil at low prices. When he told them to cut back their production, they refused. Hussein, seizing the excuse of a border dispute with Kuwait, decided to take matters into his own hands. His army’s invasion of Kuwait means that Iraq physically controls twenty percent of the world’s supply of oil, and gives Hussein the ability to intimidate his neighbors into doing as he dictates. Fearing that Hussein might invade their country, the government of Saudi Arabia asked the United States and other nations to send forces to help defend it. Hussein’s army has murdered and terrorized the people of Kuwait. Some of his soldiers have raped women and have stolen food from people’s houses. Half the people of Kuwait have been forced to leave their country. When troops from the United States and other nations began arriving in Saudi Arabia, Hussein decided to do a cowardly and atrocious thing: he took foreigners hostage, which is a gross violation of international law. His actions have also meant that multitudes of foreigners who were working in Kuwait are now out of work.

The warped logic behind Saddam Hussein’s actions should be quite clear, but unfortunately it isn’t to everybody. Saddam Hussein is a man who thrives on power. His brutal treatment of political opposition and the murder of members of minority ethnic groups in his country demonstrates this. Hussein realizes that energy runs the free world. Because of our failure to develop alternative energy sources such as geothermal power, natural gas, and nuclear power, we are dependant on oil in our everyday life. If Hussein controls more oil, he controls more energy, and thus has more influence on the world.

Many people have called for the United States government and the United Nations to negotiate with Saddam Hussein. This, for various reasons, is not possible. Saddam Hussein has stated that Kuwait no longer exists and is now a part of Iraq. This, he says, is non-negotiable. Any negotiation which compromised the restoration of the country of Kuwait or that allowed Hussein any fruits of his aggression is unacceptable. It would leave him in the position of a hero/martyr that faced the world and won. His actions rewarded, it would be a short time before he would do the same again. Even if we could negotiate with him, we could not trust him. He
told the Kuwaitis on August 1, that he would not invade their country. He did so the next day. On November 12, Hussein refused to participate in an Arab summit and said that he would only negotiate if talks included the question of Palestinian independence. Hussein has said this because he knows, as does everyone else, that the Israelis will not talk to him. The Palestinian question is only a propaganda tool that Hussein is using to distract attention away from his actions. Hussein did not invade Kuwait for the Palestinians, he did it for his own selfish reasons. If anyone thinks that he cares about the Palestinians, they are sadly mistaken. He is using them like he is using the hostages to advance his cause, and he will surely dump them when he has no use for them. Another important reason that we cannot negotiate with Hussein is his taking of hostages. It is common knowledge in the world that negotiating with a terrorist, someone who takes hostages, only justifies their taking of the hostages. It should be clear that there is no way we can negotiate in this situation.

If we can not negotiate with Saddam Hussein, then what should we do? Some people say that we should invade Kuwait and Iraq. These people have not considered the alternatives that we have on hand. Their irrational and quick decision might unnecessarily cost many lives. The most logical thing to do is to back the U.N. sponsored embargo of Iraq. This, coupled with increased troop strength in Saudi Arabia, might eventually persuade Hussein to pull his army out of Kuwait. We should not be impatient and allow the embargo time to work. If Hussein fears that the embargo is threatening his power, he may decide that it is in his best interest to leave Kuwait. The embargo is our best chance at a peaceful settlement of the matter because it has the support of almost every nation in the world. The embargo is the first thing that the U.N. has entirely agreed
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upon since the late 1950's.

If, given a good chance to work, the embargo fails to drive the Iraqi army from Kuwait, the U.N. has agreed that force may be necessary to do so. An invasion of Kuwait should only take place if all reasonable efforts through the U.N. have failed and the governments of the troops involved agree that the embargo has not worked or is taking too long. We should have the resolve to use force if necessary. If Hussein is not stopped, he will continue his actions and he may soon develop nuclear weapons. Saddam Hussein and nuclear weapons are a combination that the world cannot afford to have.

Many people have complained that we should not be in the Middle East for various reasons. Some far right isolationists say that we should only worry about ourselves and we should forget the rest of the world. They should realize that the countries of the world are having more of an effect on each other than ever before. We do not live in a vacuum. World harmony is more important than ever to ensure peace at home. There are others who say that Hussein is just someone for Americans to hate because we no longer have the communists to hate. They say that the United States government has used Hussein as a propaganda tool. These people definitely underestimate the intelligence of the American people and do not understand the free flow of information that the separation of the government and the free press brings us. Still, others say that we are over there for the big oil companies like Texaco and Exxon. What they fail to consider is that these big oil companies only benefit when the demand for their oil is high enough to warrant the pumping of oil in the U.S. The freeing of Kuwait would allow more oil into the world market which would actually reduce the profits of these big oil companies. Finally, the complaint heard most often is that we might be getting ourselves into another Vietnam. There are few similarities, if any, between Kuwait and Vietnam. The people of Kuwait and Saudi Arabia definitely want us there, the terrain is obviously different, and if a war does unfortunately break out, it will not be a guerrilla war, but a war between armies. The people that so fear another Vietnam should be reminded that the U.S. by most accounts, has the best military in the world. Another Vietnam is highly unlikely, though Saddam Hussein wants us to think that it isn't.

The fact that Saddam Hussein has done such a terrible thing to the people of Kuwait and to the world should outrage everyone. If the world presents a united front against what Hussein has done, Hussein may remove his army from Kuwait. If the world only bickers about why we should not be there, then it will only work to Hussein's advantage (he is counting on it). Any peace overtures or promises of the future release of hostages are only an attempt to buy time. We can't afford to appease Hussein by allowing his conquest of Kuwait to stand. Giving in to Hussein would be equivalent to Neville Chamberlain's actions which eventually allowed the German army to conquer almost all of Europe. A world united behind the U.N. and against Saddam Hussein's actions is our best chance to liberate Kuwait.
Risk and Reason
A geopolitical analysis of the Middle East crisis

by Ozong Aborsangaya and Habib Nehme

What differentiates the 20th century from the preceding ones is its globalism. Interdependence is so pronounced that an event in one corner of the globe can affect the whole planet. Major historical moments like the 1930 crisis, post WW2 economic growth or the Chinese revolution not only affected protagonists, but also the spectators. The actions that bear the most profound consequences are military confrontations. Thus, in the presence of the Middle East crisis, it is extremely important to fully comprehend the people in that region, socially and historically. Any step taken by the United States' military forces will have a world-wide impact.

There are clearly four major geo-political entities; each one sees the crisis with a different perspective: The U.S.A., Western Europe and Japan, the Arab world, and finally, the rest of the "Third World."

By accepting Saddam Hussein's gamble, the United States government has put at stake its whole political and economic future. In case of a defeat, everyone agrees that it will be an economic disaster. Furthermore, the humiliation of being beaten by a local power will send an unprecedented message to the other third world powers. It will be like a green light for them since they will know that the American public will not allow any other military involvement for a long time. This will restructure the geography of the globe, especially the Third World (which represents 70% of the planet). The weak will be eaten by the strong. Hence, with bigger and more centralized regimes in the world, competition in the world market will increase, challenging an already declining North American industry.

In case of a victory the situation will not be as rosy as one might think. The defeat of Iraq will start a succession of pro-American regimes in the region. These regimes might not be as popular as expected, and for

continued on next page...
this, US military intelligence will request more spending to defend them. Unfortunately, the US government can hardly afford another military build-up. Even with compensation from the gulf countries and cheaper oil, the opportunity cost of a military economy will definitely bring down further our competitive edge. Less civilian research, along with less education and social spending, will see an increase in poverty, homelessness and illiteracy (already 13%). Historically, the consequences of a large underclass were always gloomy: social malaise, alienations between different groups (probably an increase in ethnic clashes), decrease in industrial productivity (due to strikes, riots...), the list goes on. The New York Times has predicted that for the first time in the US history, a military involvement will provoke a recession. In brief, only the military industrial complex (and politicians funded by them) and the big oil companies will benefit from our intervention. The best case for them is a long involvement in the gulf without a war. This scenario is best in the sense that the incumbents will have no choice but to increase military spending, and the oil companies will be able to increase their profits from higher prices.

Fortunately, the situation does not look that bad for everyone. The Japanese and Western Europeans are quite happy about the situation. Indeed, while we are spending money, changing our economic priorities, and maybe spilling our blood to put the Emirs back in Kuwait, our beloved allies are going to increase their position in the economical hierarchy and continue to buy in America. Of course they are giving out token money and men for the cause, but in the meantime they have a perfect opportunity to win the economic war. They started 40 years ago; while we were fighting the Eastern regimes, they rebuilt their countries from WW2 and started to become industrially threatening. But did they really contribute fairly to a fight that was supposed to be common? Will they today?

The consequences for the Middle East will be mostly political. In case of an Iraqi victory, anyone can picture the consequences. The Arabic world will be united and centralized under Baghdad's power. The US will loose many friendly regimes and the price of oil will be cheaper (probably between $25 and $35) than it is now. In the case of a defeated Saddam, oil will be cheaper, but how about the political price? Mr. Zbigniew Brzezinski (ex-adviser to president Carter) believes that "obtaining the destruction of Iraq at the expense of an explosion in the whole region cannot be justified as rational calculation." One has to understand that the common Arab man or woman is quite happy with the actions of Saddam. Even some Iraqis who have been persecuted by his militia feel that he is the better of two evils. These feelings may seem aberrant to us; they can be explained only through a historical perspective. Most people in the region feel cheated by the way the colonialist countries have created artificial boundaries (Winston Churchill used to brag about how he participated in the creation of Jordan using just a pen and ruler). Most of all they feel cheated by the way the oil resources were divided. In most people's opinions, the oil belongs to all of them, not to a few corrupt sheiks. Henceforth, in case of an Iraqi defeat, the pro-western regimes will witness a quantitative increase in riots and revolutionary activities. These protests will eventually crystalize under a common ideology. However, it is a mistake to think that there will be another dictator to take Mr. Hussein's place. He is the last secular anti-western power in the region. After him, what is left is the Islamic fundamentalist movement. We believe that they will take up the "torch", claiming to be the only ones that can defeat the West. In that case, we will all miss Mr. Hussein and his Ba'athist ideology. Muslim Fundamentalists get totally involved when they fight. It was them who sent a suicide mission that killed more than 250 marines in Beirut. It was them again who killed the president of Egypt (Mr. Sadat). Finally, it was them who were mostly responsible for the Israeli defeat in South Lebanon (the Israeli army is considered to
be one of the best in the world). In brief, the consequences of the military involvement in Saudi Arabia will totally reshape the political arena of the whole Middle East; not necessarily in a direction that fits Western interests.

Finally, the last region to be affected by this crisis will be the rest of the third world. The people there will feel increasingly cynical toward the West and the U.N. Already, they are complaining against a double standard in international justice that favors the West and the U.N. No one heard of a request to send troops when South Africa invaded Angola and Namibia, or when Israel invaded Lebanon. No one requested troops to prevent the pro-American Moroccan army from annexing the Western Sahara Republic. However it all seemed logical for the US to send troops to Grenada or Panama, and for France to help Chad. The point here is not the rightness of these actions but the inconsistency. The West, so it is argued, is a greedy coalition that gets involved in international affairs only when it has a personal interest in them. Furthermore the UN will be increasingly seen, rightly or not, as an instrument to oppress the Third World. The West sends troops when it pleases and vetoes resolutions it dislikes. Hence, since international law will be perceived as a joke, many other dictatorships (and they dominate the Third World) might consider to annex other weaker countries. Their claim might be that the more divided they are, the easier it will be for the West to oppress them. This argumentation might hold ground for many people of the under-developed countries who are tired of seeing no solution for their decades of suffering.

In conclusion, it can be argued that the US government has played into the hands of the Iraqis. Mr. Hussein could have easily invaded the whole Eastern Arabian Gulf if he had wished. It certainly was not the Saudi army that prevented him, nor a fear from international uproar (it could not have been worse than it is now). To understand why the Iraqi army did not advance directly to the Saudi oil fields before foreign troops could move in, one must comprehend the philosophy of the ba'ath party. It is a nationalistic Arabic ideology. It states that only a secular socialist country that includes the whole Arabian world is acceptable. Settling for less will not prevent the region from "being oppressed by the west" militarily and economically.

Invading the whole Arabian peninsula would have given Iraq power and money; however it would not have united the rest of the Arabian countries (especially populous Egypt). On the contrary, the other governments, frightened, would have rallied with the West. However, with a non-Arabic presence in the region, it is very hard for these regimes to justify, in the long term, an alliance with the U.S. against a "brotherly" Arabian country. Already, there are certain signs of a general pro-Saddam sentiment in the Middle East. In August, Syria, whose government has a fearlessly anti-Iraq policy with one of the worst human rights records, pro-Saddam demonstrations were witnessed. Reports on CNN testified that the marchers were fired upon without, however, any estimates of the casualties (it is very hard to know exactly what happens in Syria). This is a sign that people are willing to risk their lives for Arabic unity, or to fight foreign interference. Thus time is on Saddam's side, and he knows it. Every day U.S. troops stay there, popular resentment will grow and he will increasingly be perceived as a hero. Furthermore, it can be argued that he is hoping for an American attack. He knows that such an action will destabilize parts of the Third World, and tip the world economy into recession. He is bidding on such confusion to fulfill the Ba'ath dream, with the benediction of the local population, furious at their governments' alliance against a fellow Arab country.

Every Middle East expert classifies Saddam as a gambler. Before the invasion, war damaged Iraq's economy, and huge debts due to Kuwait and to the West made him very vulnerable. Now, he erased these problems and any dream of topping him. He had nothing to lose, everything to gain, while it is the exact opposite for us.
Linda Brady is an associate professor in the International Affairs department. Prior to coming to Georgia Tech, she was a Fellow in International Security and Arms Control at the Carter Center of Emory University. Her research field is national and international security affairs, concentrating on conventional and nuclear arms control issues and international negotiation. She has been Defense Adviser on U.S. arms control delegations in Vienna and Geneva. She is the editor of two books and the author of more than 20 articles on U.S. security policy. Her book, The Politics of Negotiation, is scheduled to appear in 1991.

Some people would argue that if we eliminate Saddam Hussein, that will ensure security in the region. I'm not convinced of that.

Stephen Danyo (SD): What are some of the possible scenarios in the event that the crisis becomes a shooting war? For example, what are the chances that chemical weapons would be involved—after all, Saddam Hussein used them against his own minority population (the Kurds)? How long would a war last? I know this is just speculation, but what are some possible scenarios?

Linda Brady (LB): Well, I think as far as the Bush administration is concerned, they would obviously like to see (assuming war occurs) a quick war—a war that would minimize the human cost, the financial cost and the political cost to the administration.

SD: How likely do you think a quick war is?

LB: I think the answer to whether or not we have a quick war depends in part on the size of the forces we are able to bring to bear against Iraq, and also depends upon the possible Iraqi response. When you say "a quick war" we really haven't defined what we mean by "war." Do we mean an effort on the part of the U.S. to go into Kuwait and attempt to throw the Iraqis out of Kuwait? Do we mean an effort on the part of the U.S. and its allies to engage in an envelopment strategy—that is, not go directly into Kuwait, but rather attempt to go into Iraq and deal with the rear area in Iraq? So the answer to the question of "how long a war would there be" depends in part upon how that war begins and what our immediate objective is—that is, whether our objective is just simply to throw the Iraqis out of Kuwait or to destroy the Iraqi military infrastructure.

SD: And thereby removing the Iraqi threat....

LB: Right.

SD: What is the Bush administration's stated goal on that? Why are we over there and why might we be going to war? Is it to take care of the Iraqi threat? To liberate Kuwait? Is it to save our economy?
LB: All of the above. All of the above. And I think that if you go back to the statement that President Bush made at the very beginning of the crisis when he laid out American objectives, he included, I believe, four objectives there. The first objective was to demonstrate to Saddam Hussein that aggression does not pay—that is, that aggression would not be rewarded. To deter an Iraqi further move into Saudi Arabia. To liberate Kuwait. To protect American lives in terms of the hostages, and to “ensure the stability in the region.” And it’s interesting that when you look at his statement of objectives, oil is not mentioned. But most people interpret “ensure stability in the region” to be short hand for ensuring that oil flows from that region at a reasonable price.

SD: Ok, let’s look at the fourth reason you gave: to ensure stability in the region. How likely will stability be realized if we were to win a war, and exactly what would winning the war mean? It seems like an American presence for decades to come in the region would only secure stability in our eyes and not in the Arab world’s eyes.

LB: And it may not even do that. I think the issue of stability in the region and your view of how do you ensure stability in the region over the long term is related very much to your assessment of whether it makes sense to view the elimination of Iraqi military capabilities, the elimination of Saddam Hussein, the elimination of Iraq as a country, as to whether or not those actions would ensure security in the region. Some people would argue that if we eliminate Saddam Hussein, that will ensure security in the region. I’m not convinced of that. In fact, I don’t think it’s in the long term interest of the United States to attempt to eliminate Iraq as an actor in that part of the world because what we have seen in that part of the world is the emergence of first one and then another country. And what I would like to see us avoid is a situation where, as in the past where supporting the Shah of Iran, we seemed to focus specifically on shoring up one country, one regime, as a way of ensuring stability in the region. We shifted toward Iraq during the Iran-Iraq war and now we’re about to shift again; and I would hate, for example, for us to put all of our eggs in the Saudi Arabian basket, if you will, in terms of the next period of U.S. policy in the gulf. So I just don’t see the one country focus whether it’s a one country focus on eliminating the, quote, Iraqi threat by eliminating Saddam Hussein or his military capabilities, his infrastructure, or supporting Saudi Arabia as the way to go in the future. I think we clearly need to adopt a much more balanced posture in that part of the world. And in the long term, therefore, it would not be in our interest to devastate Iraq. We certainly have the military capability to do so but I don’t think that’s in our long term interest.

SD: Do you really think we have the capability to do that? In principle it seems like we do, but our military planners said the same thing about Vietnam, and well....

LB: Yeah, that’s a good question. I think theoretically we do have the military
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capability to destroy Iraq, depending upon what sorts of weapons we use, and the extent to which we could maintain support in the United States, as well as support in the international community for that kind of policy. We could, with the use of air power, do a tremendous amount of destruction in Iraq.

SD: But air power can’t occupy.

LB: Well that’s right, but there are two different questions. If we want to destroy Iraq we really don’t have to occupy Iraq. There are lots of ways of destroying Iraq with the use of military force that don’t require a physical U.S. presence on Iraqi territory. In theory, obviously, we have the nuclear option. I’m not saying that we should do that or that it’s being considered but if your objective is the destruction of Iraq, the elimination of Saddam Hussein, the elimination of Iraqi military capabilities, their economic infrastructure and so forth, we physically have the capability to do so with a wide array of weapons. But, to me, the only sensible use of military force is to achieve certain political objectives. And I don’t see a political objective that would be served were we to use military force to attempt to destroy Iraq.

SD: I’d like to go back to one of the four points you mentioned earlier: that we are there to liberate Kuwait and defend Saudi Arabia. But those aren’t necessarily the same things. What exactly is the administration’s goal over there; what exactly is their stance?

LB: I think the emphasis that has been placed on those four objectives has shifted over time. The immediate concern, obviously—because it was the Saudis who invited us in—was to deter Saddam Hussein from moving into Saudi Arabia. That was uppermost in our minds because of a variety of intelligence reports we had received that we reportedly shared with the Saudis in an effort to persuade them to invite us in. So I think that at the very beginning of the crisis that may have been uppermost in our mind, in terms of, “this is our near-term objective.” As it became clear as the weeks went by that we had really achieved that—that is, that Saddam Hussein had lost the opportunity which he really did have at the very beginning of the crisis to move into Saudi Arabia—then our discussion of the objectives and their relative importance shifted. And then we became much more focused on—particularly after the institution of the blockade and the mobilization of international support—then we became more focused on the issue of, “How does this policy help us to get Saddam Hussein out of Kuwait?” And so part of the confusion and the impression of disarray that exists about why we’re there is simply related to the fact that the relative importance that we attached to those objectives has shifted over time as the situation has changed.

SD: Is it going to shift further to destroy the potential long term Iraqi threat? Go from defending Saudi Arabia to liberating Kuwait to removing an Iraqi threat?

LB: I don’t think so. I think we’ve passed that point in terms of the public debate about the situation in Kuwait and about the devastation that has been wrought there by Iraqi forces. There was a period, I guess a couple of weeks ago, when there was a lot of discussion from the Kuwaitis in exile and refugees, in particular—about what had happened in Kuwait. There was some discussion then that our objective should not simply be to defend Saudi Arabia but to punish Iraq for what Iraq has done to the Kuwaiti population. You don’t hear much about that now. There might be a renewed discussion of the need to punish Iraq if we became involved in a war in which Saddam Hussein elected to use chemical weapons or otherwise engage in certain actions that would result in the public calling for the punishment of Iraq, the destruction of Iraq.
SD: How likely is it that chemical weapons will be used?

LB: It's very hard to say because I'd like to think that, despite the press, Saddam Hussein is not an irrational actor. He should know that the use of chemical weapons by Iraq—whether it's against American troops in the field or against another country—in the region would make it very difficult for an American president not to order a major conventional military response.

SD: There are those who would argue that the main reason we have to go past the liberation of Kuwait—and well past the defense of Saudi Arabia—to take Baghdad and eliminate the leadership of Iraq is because they're developing nuclear weapons if they haven't done so already. And there's some evidence for that. How would you respond to this?

LB: I don't believe that the way to deal with the problem of nuclear proliferation is through the use of military force. I'd have to say that I'd certainly prefer someone other than Saddam Hussein as the leader of Iraq. But I don't think that means we have a license to try to topple the government of Iraq. It would be more fruitful to focus on diplomacy, that is, other means to decrease the incentives that countries like Iraq have to acquire nuclear weapons. The way to decrease incentives is not to use the ante; not to increase the direct threat that simply gives the regime even more of an excuse to pursue the development of nuclear capabilities. So I don't think that escalation of the threat is the way to slow down the Iraqi program. That has not worked in the past. Countries that have felt threatened in the past have simply accelerated research and development in these areas. Look at South Africa; look at Israel. Increasing the external threat, I think, works in the reverse.

SD: Now that public support for the current administration's gulf policy has eroded from 82% after the invasion to 51% now, what are the implications for that policy? Furthermore, what can be said about that public support when a possible component of the decline is that the American people are realizing we are not over there defending democracy?

LB: Some people are suggesting that one of the reasons for the most recent decision of the administration to send an additional 150-plus thousand troops to the region is a concern that as time goes by and without some concessions from Saddam Hussein it becomes more and more difficult to argue that the embargo is an effective strategy. And, I think, the decline in support by the American public really reflects the impatience that Americans always have about these kinds of crises. I think the American public—much like the administration, which mirrors the American public—would like to see an early resolution to the problem. And it's clear that if war occurs there, it will not be another Grenada or another Panama. I couldn't put a time period on it. But it certainly will not be another Grenada or Panama. I don't think it will be a Vietnam. We're talking probably about three to six months.

SD: How many casualties with such technology as [the U.S. and Iraq] have?

LB: I think that the casualties would be much higher than the American public would conceive—because we're not talking about an early Vietnam period when we were fighting a guerrilla war. We're really talking about large, heavily armored units fighting. And that takes a tremendous toll. So I think the public is really torn. The decline in support clearly represents public frustration with the inability of the policy that we're following, which is a long term policy, to bring results in the short term. I think Bush did exactly the right thing in going to the U.N. to develop a multinational response and to put pressure on Iraq through the embargo. But the American public tends not to be very sympathetic with those kinds of responses...the decline in support by the American public really reflects the impatience that Americans always have about these kinds of crises. It's clear that if war occurs there, it will not be another Grenada or another Panama. I couldn't put a time period on it. But it certainly will not be another Grenada or Panama. I don't think it will be a Vietnam. We're talking probably about three to six months.

LB: I think that the casualties would be much higher than the American public would conceive—because we're not talking about an early Vietnam period when we were fighting a guerrilla war. We're really talking about large, heavily armored units fighting. And that takes a tremendous toll. So I think the public is really torn. The decline in support clearly represents public frustration with the inability of the policy that we're following, which is a long term policy, to bring results in the short term. I think Bush did exactly the right thing in going to the U.N. to develop a multinational response and to put pressure on Iraq through the embargo. But the American public tends not to be very sympathetic with those kinds of responses...the decline in support by the American public really reflects the impatience that Americans always have about these kinds of crises.
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because they demand a willingness to be in there for the long haul, and to accept some costs in nearterm results. So the shift in public opinion is due to a concern that the policy is not working now. But I think that's unrealistic because we really should not expect it to work in this period of time. Does that mean that Bush is sending additional troops to Saudi Arabia as a way of trying to put increased pressure on Saddam Hussein by raising the risk of war? Maybe he is. Is he also doing it because he thinks that by making the decision to send an additional 150,000 troops, he can demonstrate greater personal decisiveness than we've seen in the last couple of weeks? Maybe he thinks he has to do it because of what happened in the bloody battle over the budget in terms of his own domestic credibility. Maybe he's making the decision to send troops now because the election is over. Maybe he had anticipated sending more forces but was simply waiting until after the election. I don't think the president would want to become involved in a war in that part of the world with only 51% of the American public supporting U.S. policy. I think that 51% can change, however, if a number of things happen. For example, if the U.S. is able to extract from the U.N. security council an agreement to the use of military force at some point in time if sanctions aren't working, then I think that support for of U.S. policy, particularly in terms of the use of force, would go up.

SD: How long do you think the American people would accept a shooting war over there? Fifty-one percent accept current gulf policy, and I don't know how much of a component of that is based on war hysteria.

LB: Historically when the U.S. becomes involved in war, at least initially, public opinion always rallies around the president. If you look at the Gulf of Tonkin and Vietnam and Lyndon Johnson: Johnson didn't have problems with public opinion until further down the line. So, I think, in this case that the tendency of the public—I mean the mass public; we're not talking about the elite public—will be to support the president. And again the question is how long can that be sustained. If we talk about a three to six month war, he might be able to sustain support for that length of time.

SD: Even though casualties...

LB: Even though casualties, but it depends upon what the casualties are. It depends on whether chemical weapons are used. It depends on the extent to which some of the other countries that have sent military forces to the region also absorb some of the losses. If Americans are being killed as opposed to Americans, Brits, Egyptians and others, then it's a very different question in terms of public support.

SD: A lot of parallels can be drawn between the current crisis and the Korean conflict. In the Korean conflict you had 98% of the fighting troops being American and 95% of the war funded by American coffers. And it seems like we're headed in the same direction here. For example, of the 700,000 Kuwaiti refugees in Saudi Arabia only 3,000 signed up to liberate their homeland.... Are we going to get into a situation like in Korea where we foot the bill and we pay the human cost?

LB: We may very well. It's a shame that this crisis had to occur at all but it's a shame that it had to occur so soon after the end of the cold war, before we really had in place some international, multilateral institutions to be able to respond to these kinds of things—which we certainly anticipate occurring regularly in post cold war world. We don't have a mechanism and really I don't see much alternative to the United States bearing the burden. But the extent to which the American public will support that burden will depend upon the extent to which we can extract financial and other contributions from other countries.
SD: Doesn't that make us a mercenary force?

LB: Not really, because we are defending our own interests in that part of the world as well.

SD: That being what?

LB: If you believe President Bush, certainly it is in the interest of the U.S., as it is in the interest of the Soviet Union, not to reward aggression. Basically you're making an example of Saddam Hussein. And we're also trying to reassure the Saudis. We don't want now, after talking with the Saudis for ten years about access to that part of the world, to create the impression that when things get tough we're not going to support them. And so I really don't think we have very much choice; but as I said I wish that this crisis—if it had to occur at all—would have occurred two or three years from now.

SD: Saddam Hussein has himself seemed forced into a situation—where Kuwait was pumping oil from common land or a neutral zone, and where his war debt against Iran was completely sinking his economy—that for him is an economic question. For us it seems an economic and foreign policy question. So in a sense is this war just sort of "c'est la vie?"

LB: This is not the first time that Saddam Hussein—or that Iraq—has fought with Kuwait with respect to that issue. In the past the Kuwaitis have simply paid him off. I'm surprised that he made the decision to invade because there were signals that the Kuwaitis would have paid him off yet again. I find it difficult to see any permanent resolution of these kinds of issues. They're much like the Arab-Israeli conflict. The problems are so endemic it is extremely difficult to visualize just solutions.

SD: If that's the case then what would military engagement accomplish...?

LB: It's obvious that we need to pay much more attention than we have in the past—when we were really focused exclusively on the Soviet Union during the cold war—to the use of economic, diplomatic, and political instruments of security policy to try to deal with some of the root causes of these regional conflicts. In the cold war, we were in a relatively good position, because we basically knew who our adversary was... and we interpreted regional conflicts in terms of the U.S./Soviet conflict. That wasn't necessarily the right thing to do in terms of dealing with those conflicts, but it simplified the situation for policy makers because they could see things in black and white. Now we don't have that U.S./Soviet, East/West overlay and we're beginning to realize how difficult these conflicts are to resolve on their own terms. So, I think it's going to take us some time to learn how to focus on regional conflicts as regional conflicts, and look at the problems from the perspectives of the actors in the region as opposed to the perspective of the U.S. versus the Soviet Union.

...the casualties would be much higher than the American public would conceive...
Sonnets for the Coming Wars

Thomas Carlyle

Caesar, broad of scope,
What's this adangle in your rope?

Is this our world, your teeming toy?

Hail Young Caesar,
Hail good Demun Man
Upstart with wealth anon held close
to heart.

To ransom all that you hold dear
What buy you us now with your fear?

Hail there Soldier ever marching
Into desert sun now parching
Skin from bone and bone from marrow.

What have you to tell or sorrow?
Mighty men of mighty names
You waste our world in silly games.

ail good Doctor Philanthrope,
Hail dear man, the world’s last hope.
Good of you not to dispute
Your voice too long now is mute.
Hail Professor, most well read.
Hail the thoughts there in your head.
What sense of structure large and small
Have you, that might soon end this pall?
Hail there mighty Man of Science,
Hail your dolefully met repliance.
With your numbers have you sought
To dab the blood of wars yet fought?

Desperate man in desperate hours,
You strive in vain with desperate powers.

Old Woman, lonely,
crying.
You must stand
I birthed these men.

The last
The past.

The monster made of child
boy climbs higher in tree

examine, create, live

now I know my abc's

Welcome to the arts at Tech

photos by K. Grant

Fishrap

December 1990
the VCR with me and my friends. “I need directions, though.”

“Meet me at the car,” he says, pointing to her car. My heart skips one beat, of course—just long enough to miss our chance to receive the directions. They are just friends, I think. Her car—must be a housemate.

I nod toward the car radio all the way home; this is not unusual. I sing something by Marvin Gaye. While singing, I begin to remember what color eyes she has. She must be a housemate.

* * *

Hours later, I find the house. Her eyes are blue. “Sit here,” she says, and I’ve never heard it sound so beautiful. The movie is funny, so I laugh often, which dissipates some of my nervousness. I don’t remember her name, but, after the movie is over, we plan to watch movies together and try to remember what color eyes she has. She must be a housemate.

“Sssshhhhh,” she says, and I’ve never heard it sound so beautiful. The movie is funny, so I laugh often, which dissipates some of my nervousness. I don’t remember her name, but, after the movie is over, we plan to watch movies together and try to remember what color eyes she has. She must be a housemate.
Alternative ending to this story, the woman is run over by a bus, eliminating any rational argument for its position. Therefore, I will be forced to ask her out and she says “yes,” then my romantic side wins. In order to guarantee a fair hearing until the case is presented to the arbiter, but I secretly root...
Skin and Bones

Damn, nothing but skin and bone as, man. This is what he has to offer.

Here stands a hunger-stricken child, arms outstretched, eyes wide, an unashamed humbling plea.

This self-thing does not understand even what this is.

It runs its hands over the child's protruding ribs and explains how I might take advantage of the situation.

How myself to ignore the problem such anger is this child's presence possesses my eyes for a sympathy plea for the child before I pass him by.

My likeness is soon departing, and a relationship between the excess of tissue between his organs and the outside world and the similar separation of his soul and objective reality.

My wife staple. I have little left.
The rumbling, vibrating vehicle was hypnotic and comforting and Jane could see the outer world through the frame of that rectangular portal. She would play visual games with the dirt, the road, the houses and trees that looked like boring drills until she got bored. She would play visual games with the smears and smudges on the bus window. Today there were fingerwritten words smeared in the fog that morning. Dirty drips of the window writing and outside world blurred as Jane fell asleep.

“Brainie!” a high-pitched, whiny voice suddenly sprayed in Jane’s face. “Brainie!” it screeched again like a rabid raccoon. “Fuck off, geek!” she snarled at the prepubescent youngster lurching across the seat behind her. She noted to herself that this was what happened when she got hit with the bucktoothed youngster spat in Jane’s face. His breath smelled like decay and her lesser smell was why the kid yelled, watering the pink petunia faces of bus riders all the way to Jane’s face. “No, brainie! I saw you having turnip greens for dinner when a truck transporting chicken shit lumbered by, carrying the disgusting, eye-watering manure to wherever it fell.”

“Are you eating turnips or chickenshit? Good question,” Jane thought to herself. “Are you eating turnips or chickenshit?” The bucktoothed youngster spat in Jane’s face. “Brainie!” he screeched again like a rabid raccoon. “Fuck off, geek!” she snarled at the prepubescent youngster lurching across the seat behind her. She noted to herself that this was what happened when she got hit with the bucktoothed youngster spat in Jane’s face. His breath smelled like decay and her lesser smell was why the kid yelled, watering the pink petunia faces of bus riders all the way to Jane’s face. “No, brainie! I saw you having turnip greens for dinner when a truck transporting chicken shit lumbered by, carrying the disgusting, eye-watering manure to wherever it fell.”

The juvenile waterhose hissed in a piercing voice that would have shamed the kid. “This is why the bus ride home was Jane’s favorite and least favorite part of the day. She was new. She had the kid yelling, watering the pink petunia faces of bus riders all the way to Jane’s face. “No, brainie! I saw you having turnip greens for dinner when a truck transporting chicken shit lumbered by, carrying the disgusting, eye-watering manure to wherever it fell.”
"F*ck! And she hit me!" the kid added. Perhaps the new bus driver had been physically harmed. He clutched his pot belly in poorly concealed distaste. All she’d heard was “... but or I’ll call your mom! Or Mr. Weedletter!” she growled, forgetting her vow never to think much about them.

So, she gripped the huge steering wheel of the groaning schoolbus and hit the kid with gum. He’d been a student of hers. His parents had supported the tyrannical pattern of tyrannical parents and he had been the brat of the brat... except when some kid pestered her. She had to control her rage. She didn’t want to be like her mother. She hadn’t been the kid they used to call her mother. She didn’t want prank phonecalls or demerits. She didn’t want prank phonecalls or demerits. So, she gripped the huge steering wheel of the groaning schoolbus and hit the kid with gum.

Mr. Weedletter was the much feared principal of Arkview Elementary. He was a huge, ungainly man with a forlorn expression. Even his right arm with more strength than the disinfectant the cafeteria was said to contain in his or her right mind would have sat down. Moldy waterhose had been used to clean the cafeteria and that Mizzez Liner had heard the brat’s accusation and was not going to let the brat sit down. She’d seen the same houses, trees, fences, and the same children that Mizzez Liner glanced at the filthy child in distaste. She’d seen the same houses, trees, fences, and the same children that Mizzez Liner glanced at the filthy child in distaste. She’d seen the same houses, trees, fences, and the same children that Mizzez Liner glanced at the filthy child in distaste. She’d seen the same houses, trees, fences, and the same children that Mizzez Liner glanced at the filthy child in distaste. She’d seen the same houses, trees, fences, and the same children that Mizzez Liner glanced at the filthy child in distaste.
I now know why. My intelligence and motivation are a gift. Gifts I may never have fully understood without you. And a responsibility to use my talents fighting for Right. Having the capacity to understand and see a difference in right and wrong and act on it. And to think that all which has transpired in my life would never have been if there were one more abortion on record. I would just be another empty shell of a man, not fully understanding his purpose.

I am an imperfect person with an imperfect brother in an imperfect world. You will never know just how much I love you, but 100 years from now I will take you fishing on Crystal Lake and explain it all to you.
Why do they put up with it? You are ugly, repulsive, undesirable, and worthless. Unless you use this (and this, and this ...) you have no redeeming qualities, and deserve less than nothing.

Well, he loves me, so it's O.K. that he's not here this time. It's probably my fault anyway; if I was 10 pounds lighter and my nose wasn't crooked, this would never happen.

Your worth is determined only by the status of the man you are associated with. You can not expect a man to have any obligation to you. It is your duty to fulfill him, and if you can not, he is entitled to seek fulfillment elsewhere.

Well, everyone loves his car, and he looks great. I don't mind that he sleeps around; it's probably my fault anyway; I guess I'm selfish to want him all for myself.

You are not an individual. You are property. It is not your place to suggest how a man should use his property.

It's just his drinking, it's not really him. He said he was sorry, it's probably my fault anyway. He does so much for me that I guess I'd be selfish to not let him take out his frustrations.

...
that a package was coming, because a few days before my mom; she told me that my brother would send me gifts and disclosed that they were something related to my hobby. Because the cost of mailing a parcel from China is fairly high, I thought that they would send it by sea, and did not expect it to come so soon. Therefore, the arrival of the parcel was beyond my expectation and caused a little surprise. Having been in America for more than two years, I have not received any packages except for this one.

I picked up the package from the post office. It was about 10 by 10 inches square and 5 inches thick. The cover was well sewn and there was strong and neat handwriting. Looking at the familiar sewing and handwriting, I was deeply touched. The small package condensed all my family’s love: my brother’s gifts, my mother’s sewing and my father’s handwriting. I held it tightly; a warm current flowed from the package into my chest, then my whole body. Although having not seen my parents and brother since I came to America, their faces and voices are still vivid. I seemed to hear their voice: “How are your classes going and how is your health?” With a cheerful mood I went out of the student center.

Today, I received two things—a package and a Newsweek. That is unusual. Usually my mailbox is empty. My family writes to me regularly, and every letter is concise, only a few lines. However, it is not eternally empty. Some people write to me every month. It may be my family tradition that everyone hopes to get mail, but no one wants to write. Writing is painful, and reading is joyful. Thus, my family writes to me, and I would rather receive my letters than write them to them. I feel that my mailbox is empty. However, it is not eternally empty. Some people write to me every month.
Leaves were sprouting from the trees. The annual spring sport tournament in my old school, Peking University, was held. I went to Haidian shopping center near the school. There were many hawkers on both sides of the road and other things, and the customers were bargaining for prices. We struggled through the crowds to a general store. By choosing from a variety of toys displayed in windows, I bought her a big air-filled toy elephant, kissed it again and again, then walked out of the store with a bright smile and lively steps. Her innocent face and sincere behavior told everyone there that she was the happiest person in the world.

This was a very small event and happened six years ago, so I could recall it. But I did recall it today, with the package in my arms.

In the dining hall, I sat down in front of a TV. Usually, I watched TV shows almost without exception, but today the package took the place of the TV. I could not help looking at it constantly. Many times I wanted to open it to see what was inside; but I had to control myself, because I am afraid of making the gift dirty by food. I quickly swallowed a piece of sandwich, poured a glass of milk in my stomach, and left the dining hall to my dormitory with a feeling of half hungry and half full.

Opening the package, I saw two swimsuits and other things. I picked up one swimsuit and looked at it over and over, then my brother gradually appeared in front of my eyes.

When we were quite young, at times, we went swimming together. He liked to swim by a water gate where the water flowed fast and there were many whirls. By enthusiastically struggling against fast flowing water...
After swimming two hours in the swimming pool, causing huge waves, to butterfly one hundred lengths, then free style, to backstroke one hundred lengths. Finishing swimming, he swam against a giant wave behind him. The waves slapped my face, producing a loud sound, echoing in the air, applauding his swimming. Gradually, the huge waves vanished. A bright blue swimsuit came into my view. If it fitted well, I closed the door, put it on. Inside part of the closet door, there was a make-up use, and I have not used it since I met one of my boyfriends. He is taller than I, and the mirror is fixed closer to the door. Therefore, I had to close the curtains and see my swimsuit through the mirror. Perfect! I looked at myself and wondered if he will win the swimming pool.
Skin and Bones

"Bone, sinew, blood and bone, man."

It was no use to either

Top: a hundred vertical lines,

The extraction to begin,

I was a piece of his plea.

This self-thing was not understood, what must

It must be thrown over the back a processing pipe

with great and expected care. I began to understand

of the process, and I was not

I am not a man to handle a process.

The high threads of my thought for a discussion

where I was bone, and in whose

I was bone over the back a process

in the sheet, and I am not a man
to handle a process.
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I was bone over the back a process.

This was not a man to handle a process.

Skin and Bones, an anagram

part of my mind with an anatomical view

of my body, with permission from him

"Bone, sinew, blood and bone, man."

or begin.
someone has been bold enough to say God does not exist. Not only that, but if God does not exist, those who pursue emotional stability (and I do, too), after the initial shock of hearing this, I thought about it for a moment.

What came to my mind was by whom man make his proclamation. If there is no God, I guess he said it by himself. Then wondered what he meant by God, he means a self existent universe. I pondered the question of if he were to exist. He being a beneficent, omnipotent, outside of the universe, and in general the sovereign lord of all. Hence thought about the problem of man is mortal, finite in power, and able to be born in a certain point in time and totally outside of his control, how could of sovereignty he could hope to declare over some kingdom on the earth. At this point how such a weak creature as man could declare that an absolute exist. How could man know of something so far beyond him, unless he could reveal himself to man? Therefore, if God reveals himself, we could only say about him, not that he does not exist, but how he is to whom would we appeal?

Is seeking after God a cowardly thing to do? To live a sacrificial and disciplined life, humbling oneself to The Creator, doesn’t seem so to me. Maybe those who don’t really understand life yet deride those who are.

In a final thought, I asked myself, if I am sure I cannot prove the existence of God, my recourse is to humbly seek his will (and there is no hope for anyone, maybe he will reveal himself, and I can obey his will. My own will, I’m sure, is a standard, and without ultimate judgement, I cannot even refrain from violating my conscience. So then my question now is, whether he is, but how should I live?
A high school with a diploma which is essentially a useless piece of paper. He leaves quite a sum of money for his parents by going to glorified high school, but after a year he drops out and lives at home for a year confused and concerned having sucked any real chance for improving his worth. A risky future still exists looking good for good ‘ol Gunthar. His net worth is now about 500,000 assuming he

Gained discipline; Gunthar jumped into the military. Unfortunately a messy war erupted. A few years later he returned home disabled not in body, but even worse a mental state he got a job sorting mail with the post office, but there’s no advancement potential. It turned out badly so let’s say Gunthar has a net worth of about 300,000 and his

What insane since the injury in that foreign war Gunthar just loses it one day and

It’s not long after that that he finds himself in the Federal penitentiary in the day to stand trial and he ends up on death row. Now Gunthar is worse than useless, costing taxpayers money to support him while he awaits his deserved execution. He is found swinging limply in his cell by the morning guard. If only Gunthar could have been given discipline from an early desire, he might have been selling crack on the corner. He just couldn’t see the
Diceman persona that should be considered is what aspect that will establish his view towards aggressiveness and effectiveness of his methods. Therefore, the first thing to be established is the validity of his methods. Please note that Dice or Diceman are not the same. Diceman should be to the audience his talks about sexual politics. Thus, the Diceman repeatedly states that he carries in a creative mannerisms of guilt. For example, as previously mentioned, the fact that Dice always comes out ahead because even if women expect payback, men can just throw away women without guilt. For example, Dice often uses the exchange "Jerked-off" to a man who is clearly reflected in his show, a bunch of "egg jigglers." The Diceman has a tendency to be in the receiving end of aggressiveness and verbal violence by the audience. Dice always comes out ahead because even if women expect payback, men can just throw away women without guilt. For example, Dice often uses the exchange "Jerked-off" to a man who is clearly reflected in his show, a bunch of "egg jigglers." The Diceman has a tendency to be in the receiving end of aggressiveness and verbal violence by the audience. dicedo p

The Diceman’s sexual politics are based on sexual politics. dicedo p

The Diceman’s sexual politics are based
knees scrubbing a toilet. Dice states during the show that he believes the main difference between men and women to be guilt. According to Dice, men can dominate women because they have no guilt. This allows men to use and throw away women without any regards to feelings. Women, on the other hand, can’t dominate a sexual relationship because their guilt gets them too involved. To prove his point, the Diceman uses the one night stand as an example. Both men and women like them, but only men can truly enjoy the one night stand due to their ability to simply walk away completely unattached. In actuality, in this modern age, women are known for taking sex as lightly as men do. The idea that women experience a deeper sense of guilt is an antiquated thought by today’s standards. Yet, since these erroneous observations on sexual guilt are the cornerstone of his performance, Dice insists on preaching them. Thus, the extreme sense of guilt he attributes to women is a conscious choice. Guilt is something that he requires women to have so as to mesh with his particular views regarding sexual politics.
concerning his emotional state, and, once she had abandoned hope, he simply said "blow me." When he said this, everyone burst into laughter when they realized that he was only joking and not actually complying. This attitude clearly shows that he doesn’t have any particular worries. He enjoys having a show that he knows people who would enjoy it. He finds it amusing to his audience. His shows that are directed exclusively towards men.

Most of the audience, desperate to escape the overwhelming feeling of his physical intimidation and aggression, are left with only the misconception that Dice is the best comic to distinguish himself as a strong, powerful, and in control.

He is tall, strong, and has a large, muscular build. He possesses physical, emotional, and sexual dominance over women, who submit women to his will. His attitude is that he has the right to use his physical overbearingness. This is a common thing that is found in our society. Men tend to consider women as if they were subservient beings. He uses this to his advantage, getting what he wants from them.

The audience, however, is not happy with this situation. They feel that Dice is a negative influence on society. This is evident in the way that he makes fun of women and other groups in his show. He also uses his physical strength to intimidate them. His jokes are often crude and offensive, and he has been known to use them to make light of serious issues.

In general, men seem to enjoy laughing at what the Dice character has to say. I believe that most men, even though some won’t admit it, will relate to at least one portion of the Dice character. The reason for this is, as was hinted at previously, that the Dice character is simply an extension of a behavior pattern which is not uncommon in modern society. Even though we know his behavior to be wrong, at one point or another we have been in a situation in which behaving like the Dice character would have represented an easy way out. As to why some women seem to laugh to enjoy Dice’s jokes, it is not necessarily making them feel better. Dice’s humor might make you laugh, but what is being laughed at be, though, is being laughed at be.

In conclusion, Dice represents an idea of the public that goes to see a show with chauvinistic stereotypical images. Silverstein is concerned with generating this image of Dice. He promotes such prejudice and has the Diceman in Dice’s_Jerry Seinfeld,’ fictitious character’s responsibility for the harm his shows seem to bring. I believe that the audience is a persona for people who need to be answered.

Therefore, the question of whether Dice is a fictitious character that Mr. Silverstein has agreed to for personal gain or for personal gain results in what goes on the audience’s mind. The way people react to Dice’s show is completely up to them. As long as he continues to perform in the club performance shows, "Laughter Died," he is going to continue to generate the stigma of the show.
years since the Reagan geographic with the installation of economic package in decades. In office in 1989, the polls highest approval ratings with the performance of the of the public's reasons. At was replete with naysayers, them, ready to criticize the (and their consequences) on was putatively based. What suits them, many were confused by the mixed supply-side economics, how to work, and how did it 

Suppliers made central to their widely known as the "Laffer Professor Arthur Laffer. It is there is a point of negative a function of tax rates. As total tax revenues collected high enough that taxpayers incentive to work, and thus begin to go down as tax hundred percent tax rate 

undermotivated capitalists and languishing in a burst of productive effort. In addition, welfare programs should be dismantled in order to give people increased incentive to work, save for own retirement, and insure themselves against hazards of life. Once these reforms were enacted, supply-siders argued, unprecedented economic growth would soon follow. In addition to generating improvements in productivity (output per worker) of gross national product (GNP), a large portion of the cuts would be saved and, since savings deposited in lending institutions are the ultimate source of investment capital for businesses in the long term without borrowing from abroad), both saving and investment would go up. And all economists agree that investment is the primary route to productivity growth, which in turn ultimately determines the growth in standards of living.

As for the effects on the federal budget, these would be positive. Despite an apparent shortfall in revenue due to the 30% tax cut to be implemented, vigorous economic growth would restore the lost revenue without cuts in expenditures[1]. The original Reagan economic plan promised a budget surplus of $30 billion by fiscal year 1986.

The vast majority of economists were unconvincing...
changed their minds after ten years. This is understandable given that from what little hard data is widely publicized it is naturally difficult to glean what is meaningful and make comparisons. Also, the supply-side claims to a moving target which was thus hard to When tax revenues failed to increase after the cuts, most of Reagan's supply-siders (but not himself) argued that they had never expected to rise, though this claim remains in the record[1]. The deficit was then blamed on the Congress to cut expenditures, even though it is widely publicized that the President's proposed bill up cumulatively to the same dollar amount passed by Congress to within a percent or so[2].

There are still supply-side supporters who claim for their side, though the criteria by which that claim is made have changed since the beginning. One well-known popularizer of this view is Paul Craig Roberts, who speaks and writes widely that in his view is the indisputable factual of the supply-side success story. An example argument, which I will look at in detail, appears February 6, 1989 issue of Business Week(p. 24).

Roberts begins by quoting Reagan's 1989 Economic the President, which boasts that the effects of incentives included "an explosion of small growth". In fact, business incorporation rates 1980 and 1986 were lower each year than in Business failures, on the other hand, increased. quoted average real GNP growth 1981-88 average is 3.4%, the 1975-80[5]. And although "private investment grew at an average during 1982-88, nearly all of the immediate 1983-84 climb only fell 3.3% the following year and 1% year after that[5]. Roberts has chosen years between which investment data either, since from year to year and are recessions. Investment as a percent is perhaps a more interesting 15% in the 1970s and 15.3% in the 1980s. Roberts chooses to cite the productivity growth of 4.4% again starting from the bottom 86 average is 3.5%, and while (up to Japan's 5.6% rate)[7] overall productivity growth 1.38% in the 1980s, versus both figures being less than end of the War through the chosen to compare investment competitors as he did employment would have been embarrassing (I'm not boring you), Roberts glossing over the budget and the them to the size of GNP. This since the problem with the other have on saying, investment...
inflation (for which Roberts assigns 82), this was the price of inflation conventional economic policies. Since foreigners will not continue their level of net saving, the trend must reverse. But if oil and the economy turned in a lackluster performance, why was the public unhappy? The answer is easily found. Although the real national product per person was higher in 1986 than in 1979. This rise in real income for two reasons: 1) consumption was possible for two reasons: 1) the trade deficit allowed the US. to earn; 2) Consumption rose substantially better in 1986 than in 1979. People were in fact living and saving more in 1986 U.S. real national product per person was 14.5 million.
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HETEROSEXISM is the oppression of gays, lesbians, and bisexuals.

Heterosexism includes:

- the belief in the superiority of heterosexuality and the inferiority of homosexualitv.
- the rights and privileges given to heterosexuals that are denied to gay people.

Heterosexism is revealed through:

- personal behaviors ("queer" jokes, graffiti, verbal and physical harassment)
- institutional policies (discrimination in jobs, housing, immigration, etc.- with no civil rights protection)
- (no positive images of gays, lesbians, or bisexuals in the media, in courses, or as role models)

HOMOPHOBIA is the fear, distrust, and hatred of gays, lesbians, or bisexuals or of the homosexual feelings in oneself.

Homophobia results in:

- fear of associating with gays, lesbians, or bisexuals
- fear of being perceived as gay, lesbian, or bisexual
- fear of stepping out of accepted sex-role behavior
- fear of knowing and befriending over 10% of humanity

WHO HAS HOMOPHOBIA STOPPED YOU FROM KNOWING?
although only a few of these — whether to gate at these things. People go through the motions, and it isn’t fun. Some situations like that must flow with their own self-generated energy, contrary to the limits of mind to feel and understand. But any outside pressures toward environment degradation make it hard for people to live up to their potential.

I've learned to appreciate this article on homophobia, not because we are all homophobes but because I realize that it is wrong to be homophobic. What I really enjoyed about this article concerns how we should judge others. Let me point out that not all gay people are gay and that I don’t believe we should judge others based on an impression we formed of them. (I realize this is not always easy, but it is often true.)

In this country we are forced to live in an environment that does not always allow us to live out our true selves. Many people are forced to hide their sexual orientation, their race, their religion, or any other aspect of themselves that they are proud of. And this is wrong.

The federal government has been collecting data on the proportion of successful marriages involving women who have had multiple partners. It is likely that a significant number of these people are gay, as many gay people are not married.

As a case in point, consider that the military does ‘allow’ people of color to serve now and we find that ‘they’ are capable of doing the same work as whites, despite what many people still believe, and military discipline isn’t compromised by having the forces racially integrated because whatever color you are, you do your job and follow certain protocols in dealing with everyone else regardless of their race, or else.

What is really sad (disgusting) about this is that it is the federal government, whose job is to protect all our rights and before which we are all supposed to be regarded as legally equal, that is still discriminating on the basis traditional bigotry rather than making decisions according to objective facts. The federal government also considers gays to be just as good and capable as any other person, and the same applies to any other profession.

I don’t see any reason to exclude someone for something immaterial like: the color or shape of their skin, their religion, or their sexual orientation; it is stupid to settle for the best white heterosexual male pilots/doctors/engineers/or construction workers instead of seeking THE BEST.

A person’s suitability for a job should be measured by their qualifications not by your prejudice or mine. This is true even if you DO believe that being non-white, non-hetero, or non-male makes someone unqualified for a given task or position, because if they can’t do it you don’t hire them for it, but if you’re wrong you get talent you would’ve missed if you’d prejudged their ability by your expectations. As a case in point, consider that the military does ‘allow’ people of color to serve now and we find that ‘they’ are capable of doing the same work as whites, despite what many people still believe, and military discipline isn’t compromised by having the forces racially integrated because whatever color you are, you do your job and follow certain protocols in dealing with everyone else regardless of their race, or else.
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called for by fighting 'endemic ignorance or protecting the breeds' rather than fighting to protect the human rights of the people being attacked. If a group fighting to protect itself is fighting the wrong set of freedom fighters, consider that this is morally reprehensible — What are we fighting for teens right now? Their own lives and feelings — that society feels they're still being killed instead of living. The fact that in this day and age, kids, sluts, cows, dogs, and daddy and me (the parents) they had it was the wrong disease again, that adults can't do a damn thing to stop it.

Office of Education officials told a gay student at Tech, the only thing that's ever helped to make a difference to eliminate that kind of material is political action. They want to change their minds, to take action of some kind. This means the exhibit a certain level of awareness to their personal prejudice, that they have been influenced by prejudices and societal persecution because of personal bias without much thought, not to mention ignoring the fact that the reason many heterosexuals find such outspoken expressions offensive is the fact that only so many levels of personal prejudice without much thought, but aren't general. The result is the same: dehumanizing, demeaning, and shaming.

That was just one everyday thing. Remember, heterosexist can't just jerk people off. They have to involve acts of physical violence can be resolved through legislation and the courts, provide protection against harassment (though in some cases their personal beliefs are enough to protect each other equally).

Here is what you need to know about: 1) educating people about prejudices and the importance of coming together to change them, 2) making it easy for people to change their minds, 3) education with information and exchange ideas, 4) when personal bias or harassment have been achieved.

O.K. That wasn’t much fun, let’s try being fairly ‘out’ at Tech, about your homosexuality.

Then:

If you were to hold hands with your date, sweetheart, or spouse, while walking slowly and blocking the entire sidewalk, the way some hetero-couples do, many people would be offended at your ‘flaunting’ of your sexuality, and aren’t generally willing to just walk off when they see or hear something they disapprove of. If we were to kill, rape, assault, or verbally abuse our boyfriends, husbands, or whatever the situation was, we’d be considered deviant, and would be taken to task. So in a situation like this, we have to be careful because you never know who’s watching. And it’s not a good idea to discuss your relationship if you don’t want to get caught in the act of being out.

You can’t ask your straight roommate/s to leave so that you can have sex or other forms of intimacy (hugging, kissing, talking, or just being together), so if one of you doesn’t have your own apartment, single room, or a roommate that’s reliably gone long enough and with sufficient warning, you’ve got a problem.

You can’t discuss your: dates, current steady, true love, ex-love, or fiance nor who you might like to date with any straight person, such as: close friends, your parents, your roommate, loud & proud mothers/fathers to be, classmates who announce their plans to be married, or people who always tell you the details of their heterosexual love-lives, because it would be, “blatantly advertising your sexuality,” if you were to talk about your love-life’s ups and downs. Besides it’s easier to lie, that way you don’t have to worry about losing those straights’ trust/love/friendship.

Due to your fear of being discovered, you may not be able to work up enough nerve to go to a meeting of GALA or another gay organization or even to call for advice or someone to talk to.

Comparing an incident of prejudice facing another group to explain it may be helpful. After all, there's a big difference —
It has recently come to my attention, rather, I have recently come to the realization, that I have once again fallen victim to a major discriminatory problem at Georgia Tech. In addition to the many other fees one must pay at Tech, one is also expected to invest in a $200+ expenditure to keep up with the pack and ultimately survive the "Tech Experience." The investment I am referring to is the Hewlett-Packard 28S calculator.
risk grades, the HP-possessing student can simply have the equations for the next day's calculus or jhysics test. Unfortunately, those students lacking a permanent solution to this calculator problem in the math and science departments, as well as other applicable fields of study. The tests would probably be harder, but the students would learn the material, and the open-note policy would encourage class-taming at the end of the quarter.

Another possible solution to this problem is to have the professor or the T.A. clear the memory. In this respect, the less wealthy students face an extreme disadvantage. Since, to my knowledge, "cheat sheets" are not allowed, the HP-less student must spend precious study time memorizing formulas of all calculators upon the students' arrival to the examination. This policy would allow students possessing the formula-saving calculators to use the--a instead of learning the material (We are here

*'calculator'. that they are familiar with, as well as eliminating the learn, right? ); meanwhile, the more wealthy, less ethical, nurere problem-solving-oriented students discriminate.

At a school as competitive as Georgia Tech, social discrimination such as this is an outrage. Should the less-wealthy students' success be primarily placed on the students. who violate the Honor suppressed by a mere calculator? I hope that the answer is NO. In a society is riddled with discrimination, this problem is undoubtedly a chance; however, I do an unneeded element, be
cede that the Tech The community of administration has the er to make a Georgia Tech is part of the'suciety we live in, and we in the can either help it thrive or.

ation. Our society is already falling of the rest of the civilized world. PTech, I took Calculus IV with Professor Cain, who I think, we should seriously consider an open-book, open-note policy on his tests. "What do you think? Box. 50271
for a few good humans.