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For all practical purposes, the war is over, at least from the U.S. perspective. Many of the views expressed herein are therefore immediately out of date. We continue to run these opinions on the war by Georgia Tech students for two reasons: 1) being an open, egalitarian forum, we lack the flexibility to conjure up any issue that will follow the world's events within the week; 2) the sentiments of the Georgia Tech community on the war are still important to the ongoing debate within our community; what students believe the war to be about is still of the utmost significance since Georgia Tech alumni play a highly visible role in the nation's status quo. . . . Read up. . . .
Killing Time in the Persian Gulf

by Steve Donkin

It is doubtful that many of the hundreds of thousands of men and women now fighting in the war with Iraq know for certain why they are there. Likewise, those here in the U.S. (and on the campus of Georgia Tech) who are waving their flags and chanting their support are probably equally in the dark concerning their country’s decision to waste dollars and lives on an obscurely justified military venture. We are of course familiar with the standard reasons issued by our elected leaders, and the people in general seem to accept them as logical justification for war, despite the almost comical ineptitude with which they were initially announced, then modified, then retracted and replaced with new reasons to keep pace with ever-changing public opinion polls.

However, some seldom discussed facts exist which may serve to provide alternative views on our current offensive presence in the Persian Gulf. Consider, for instance, that, in his recent State of the Union address, President George Bush revived the previously moribund issue of increased funding for the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI). Like so many other aspects of our bloated defense budget, SDI was being called into question concerning its usefulness in a post-Cold War world. There was talk of limiting weapons contracts and collecting a “peace dividend,” and there were worried looks on the faces of investors and entrepreneurs who made their livings manufacturing tools of mass destruction. Now those same faces are smiling, and their feelings are perhaps best reflected in a recent speech to defense contractors made by Milwaukee investment banker Jim Roberts, which began, “Thank you, Saddam Hussein” (quoted in
Of course, the history of U.S.-Iraq relations did not begin with the invasion of Kuwait. Exploring that history offers more food for thought concerning our current role in the region. There exists a 1976 report of the House Select Committee on Intelligence Activities which describes a plan concocted in 1972 by then-President Richard Nixon and then-National Security Advisor Henry Kissinger, the purpose of which was to enhance Iran’s dominance in the Middle East. Back then Iran was still run by the Shah, a brutal monarch who also happened to be a staunch U.S. ally. The idea was to provide covert aid to Iraq’s Kurdish rebels, who were fighting for their independence, so as to bolster this destabilizing element within Iraq, which was a chief rival with Iran for regional supremacy. As detailed in the report, the U.S. officials never intended to see the Kurds prevail in their struggle, but “they preferred instead that the insurgents simply continue a level of hostilities sufficient to sap the resources of our ally’s neighboring country [Iraq].” When Iran and Iraq finally settled a long-standing border dispute in 1975, the U.S. immediately ended its assistance to the Kurds without warning. The next day, Iraq led an all-out offensive against its troublesome and totally dismayed rebels, who have been helplessly imperiled ever since. It is indeed ironic that the U.S. accuses Iraq of using innocent people as pawns in deadly games of international deceit, when our own history has shown a similar disregard for the people when larger causes are to be served. This shameful story of American double-dealing is eloquently described in an article by Christopher Hitchens in the January issue of Harper’s.

The green light given Iraq by the U.S. in 1975 to attack the Kurds may be compared to the green light given five years later for an attack on Iran, which had by then fallen far out of U.S. favor, having deposed the Shah and replaced him with a fanatically anti-American regime. In reference to our allegiances during the Iran-Iraq war, former President Ronald Reagan was recently quoted in the Atlanta Journal as saying “I have to say we committed a boner with regard to Iraq and our close relationship with Iraq.” What Reagan flippantly referred to as a “boner” ended up costing hundreds of thousands of lives. He went on to say that “we took action not to continue supporting them,” which is totally untrue, as the U.S. continued to support Iraq to varying degrees politically, economically, and militarily right up to the invasion of Kuwait.

The latest in this series of green lights for Iraqi aggression came in July 1990 when U.S. ambassador to Iraq April Glaspie told Saddam Hussein that we in the U.S. “have no opinion on the Arab-Arab conflicts, like your border disagreement with Kuwait.” The U.S., through CIA reports, certainly knew the invasion was going to take place well before it happened, yet we allowed it anyway. The plan back in July probably did not include war, but that was because we probably did not expect Iraq to be quite so greedy and annex the entire country of Kuwait. When Iraq pressed forward and did this, the war option turned out to be not just the only effective response, but also a response that could address many problems at once. Perhaps our leaders felt this to be a good testing ground for a new generation of untried killing methods, as well as an easy way to reassert our leadership in the world (military leadership, that is, since we no longer have economic or even moral leadership), and simultaneously get rid of yet another pesky Third World tyrant who was getting a bit too independent for our taste.

Whatever the reasons we are over there, they are certainly not those being repeated again and again by our president. If our troops are over there to restore a nation to its rightful leadership, then surely they would also be in Latvia and Lithuania repelling the Soviet aggressors. If they are there to end the brutalization of innocent people, then surely they would be in El Salvador, Guatemala, China, Turkey, and Syria, all of which, along with many other countries, have been cited by Amnesty International for human rights abuses. If they are there to achieve peace and stability in the region, then they would certainly not be there in an offensive posture, but rather in a negotiating posture, as Saddam himself has called for on numerous occasions. No one knows the real reasons Americans are killing and dying right now in the Middle East, and in a country that professes to hold liberty and freedom above all else, that is indeed a tragedy.
I Protest

Torrence N. Fike

The setting is 19th street in San Francisco. Here one Khan Serbitiv walks through Golden Gate Park where he eyes some strange goings ons. Khan is a grocer in a small Iowa town and has come here for a grocers convention. He's never been to a really big city before, especially not a West Coast big city. As he nears the commotion, he sees a group of people holding signs, burning things, wailing, screaming, dancing, gnashing their teeth, and beating on either drums, pails, or other percussion pseudo-instruments. He has seen many strange things on his stroll, but this tops all. He is so curious that he overcomes his initial apprehension, and approaches one member of the crowd. The man he approaches is Woody Stock.

Woody has a Ph.D. in International Studies from Stanford. He did his dissertation on a people called the Tsi' Nummok. The Tsi' Nummok live in remote regions of the Tibetan Plateau, and Woody believes they are the first people to have established pure socialism. When Woody got out of school he had trouble finding a job, so he became a “starving artist.” His specialty is erotic ant farm sculptures. He has been cited by Greenpeace for his pioneer work in biodegradable art. As Khan approaches, Woody stops beating on his bongos momentarily to set a United States flag on fire.

Khan: Excuse me, sir. Could you tell me what's going on here?

Woody: I am Woody, brother of man, child of mother earth, and in my own time completely biodegradable, with few chemical additives. I'm protesting the war in the Persian Gulf.

(Khan pauses a moment for reflection on this.)

Khan: Pleased to meet you. My name's Khan. I'm new to town, and I haven't seen a demonstration like this before.

Woody: This is nothing. You should have seen the ones we had back at Stanford. We didn't consider them a success unless they called out the National Guard.

Khan: What did you protest against back then?

Woody: Oh, we protested against every form of bourgeoisie injustice imaginable: logging, drag net fishing, nuclear war, nuclear power, fossil fuel, the arms race, SDI, Reagan, big corporations, Apartheid,
hydrocarbons, fluorocarbons, Jesse Helms, acid rain, industry, rain forest depletion, chemical excretion, hunting season, prisoners of conscience, prisoners unconscious, Robert Bork, homelessness, the invasion of Panama, the NRA, capital punishment, drug laws, fertilizer, Moral Majority and the plight of the baby seals, to name a few.

Khan: Wow, that's an impressive list. I didn't hear abortion in there.
Woody: Abortion! That's one of the few things we protested for!
Khan: You mean you want to save baby seals but not baby humans?
Woody: Hey, that's the woman's right to choose! Haven't you read The Constitution?
Khan: It's been a while. I'll have to go back and reread it. Anyway, tell me why you are against the war in the Persian Gulf.
Woody: I'm against it because it is another form of fascist Amerikan aggression. George Bush is going to war to keep oil prices down so that we don't have the Reagan Recession we've been waiting years for. This is his version of a thousand points of laser guided light. He must opiate the teaming masses, so they forget his lies and his pro-rich policies. He's going to cause chaos in The Middle East, so he can drive his gas guzzling speed boat and shed his weasel image!

(The crowd screams maniacally, "No blood for oil! No Blood for oil!")

Khan: I don't believe President Bush is doing this just for popularity or selfish interests. He probably sees some global security concerns. If we didn't intervene now what would happen when Hussein went for the rest of the Persian Gulf? And then when he has nuclear weapons? We could not tolerate a dictator controlling that much of the world's petroleum reserves and threatening our allies in the region. He is a madman who will gas his own people. What will he do to others? I agree that we should lessen our dependence on oil, but we will always be somewhat dependent on it. You can't grease your bearings with solar energy.

Woody: Ah, but it was the US who gave him the weapons to carry out his aggression and therefore we are fighting the monster that we created!
Khan: I haven't heard that.
Woody: Didn't you see the report on Firing Line?
Khan: No, I haven't, but how many Iraqi F-15s, F-16s, F-18s, F-111s, F117s, M-1A tanks, or Stinger missiles have attacked US forces? The weapons that Iraq has used to attack our forces are of French and Soviet origin. If they did somehow have our weapons then why are we losing less fighters percentage wise than if we were holding intensive training missions.

Woody: Yes, but we financially supported Iraq. They took our cash and bought weapons from the Soviets. It's all in the family for the global military industrial complex!
Khan: I believe we were helping Iraq with farm support. I'm sure we didn't give them a blank check with the memo "for weapons of mass destruction to be used with impunity." They may have misused some of our support. Maybe you should work for the election of more foresightful leaders if you think we dole out money with little discretion. We could protest together against this. You could protest things like support of third world counties, and I'll protest against domestic pork barrelling like the Lawrence Welk Museum, in South Dakota.

Woody: I'm not against spending, I'm against currency in general. It's Amerika's capitalistic lust for currency that caused it to arm its third world puppets, so that they can subjugate their teaming proletariat. Then Amerika rapes these nations of their labor and resources, which Amerika processes and sells for currency! We are planting the seeds of our own destruction! Can't you see, the corporate industrial complex supplied Iraq with weapons, since without third world slave nations, it will atrophy and die!
(Khan pauses for another moment. He had never heard anything like this on Crossfire.)

Khan: Let's assume, even though I see no evidence of it, that we have supplied Iraq with a significant quantity of weapons. Let's even assume that there was no good reason to supply the weapons, such as an alliance or the stability of the region. Suppose we were the exploitative capitalists that you say. That doesn't mean we shouldn't fix our mistake. If you agree that Hussein must be stopped, then what we did in the past is a moot point. Use your knowledge of the past to elect responsible leaders in the future.

Woody: We should have given peace a chance. We needed to all visualize world peace!

Khan: What more could we do? We tried every diplomatic channel available. You know that.

Woody: We could have worked out a deal.

Khan: What kind of deal, half of Kuwait? What percentage of the gulf will he want in a deal when he has nuclear weapons? What kind of message would a deal send to other third world belligerents?

Woody: We could have given the sanctions a chance.

Khan: President Bush, based on our intelligence, felt that the sanctions could not be enforced for an extended period of time. Congress debated and decided he was correct. What you might want to protest is the fact that President Bush said he would invade even if he didn't get Congressional approval. Anyway, our Arab partners agree with our actions.

Woody: The only reason we have the Arab support is because we bribed them.

Khan: Come on now, Woody. Our coalition was formed before any monetary deals. Besides, what other than sheer terror of Iraq would cause the Arabs to align with an Israeli ally. One Saudi official said he would allow Israel access to Saudi air space if they would attack Iraq.

Woody: We aren't fighting for a democracy, we are fighting for an oppressive emir.

Khan: It's a sad fact, but we can't play the policeman of the world, rescuing everyone who is not under a democracy. This is a global security issue. Even so, ask the Kuwaiti people who they would rather have as their leader.

Woody: You don't understand. This was all orchestrated by the US military industrial complex. Without the Soviets the military will die and we will have no reason for guns or nukes.

Khan: I seldom fall for conspiracy theories and wishing nuclear weapons away is true folly.

Woody: You don't understand; it is nuclear weapons and The Cold War that have briefly halted the downfall of capitalism. The last evil will be done away with! Revolutions are beginning around the world as we speak.

Khan: I'm not schooled in Marx, so your reasoning confuses me. How does your theory explain Big Macs in Red Square. Capitalism seems to be your general scapegoat. Put the blame where it belongs: on corrupt men. You will have corrupt men in any economic system. Out of the economic systems available, I say capitalism is best. You might have some ideal theoretical system in mind, but show me one in practice that gives such opportunity and such a high standard of living. Even our "poor class" is richer than most of the world's population.

Woody: I cite the Tsi' Nummok people. They have given up all possessions, religions, creeds, weapons of war, and have developed the perfect socialistic society. With no private ownership and everyone working for the common good of the people, they have achieved communal bliss.

Khan: Well Woody, you seem awful miserable in this country. You think our government and economic system are inherently evil, you protest almost everything, and you burn the flag that some see as a symbol of our freedom which allows you to protest. Why do you stay in such misery? Why don't you go join the Tsi' Nummoks and live in communal bliss?

Woody: If I did that then I couldn't get any more NEA grants.
On Not Forgetting the First Amendment:
Or Why I Have Not Written an Article about the War

by Richard Wallace

Several days ago, I sat at lunch with another contributor to the North Avenue Review discussing one of the most disturbing domestic responses to the U.S.-led attack on Iraq—the contention by many supporters of the Bush administration's acts and policies in regards to the war that all Americans should either "get behind" the president or keep their mouths shut. Protesting the war, they argue, when not appealing to jingoistic rhetoric, will only give Saddam Hussein the impression that the U.S. is not committed to winning this conflict and, therefore, may prolong the conflict, conceivably leading to the loss of additional American lives. (Interestingly, the lives of Iraqis are seldom mentioned.)

During this discussion, I was asked by my lunchmate to write something about this issue for the NAR. For days thereafter I thought hard about how I would structure my forthcoming article. Surely, I thought, I will want to bring attention to the inherent contradiction in supporting both a war and saving lives. Next, I reasoned, I will want to make reference to the constitution, which guarantees every American the right to assemble and to speak freely. Then, realizing that what will result after the freedoms of speech and assembly have been curtailed can be nothing less than tyranny, I decided that Jefferson's proclamation that citizens have not only the right, but also the obligation, to challenge tyranny is also pertinent. Finally, I thought, a few references to countries that prohibit political protest will seal my argument. After all, few Americans would voluntarily exchange their freedoms for the violent oppression that exists in, say, Chile or El Salvador.

When I finally sat down to write the article that I had developed in my mind, however, my argument seemed so obvious that it need not be published; most Americans do not question their freedoms, do they? Those who argue against the right of fellow Americans to state their opposition to the war cannot be serious, I thought. They must, in the grip of anti-Saddam hysteria, have lost full control of their mental faculties. Therefore, because free speech is both the right of all Americans and the backbone of democracy, I decided that I need not defend the right of anyone to protest anything.

Although I was pleased that I, like Madison, Lincoln, and King, had affirmed and reaffirmed the concept of civil rights, I panicked when I realized that, with the NAR deadline fast approaching, I was without any article to publish. Fortunately, however, I quickly decided to respond to the claim made by some supporters of the war that those of us who oppose the war are also "anti-troops," whatever that means. New topic in hand, I again set out to develop a foolproof argument in support of my position. First, I thought, I'll make the logical point that those who want to end the war, and thereby eliminate the possibility of troops being killed or injured, are clearly more in support of the troops than those who would send the troops into battle. It is, after all, those who protect and nurture us, e.g., our families and friends, not those who seek to place us in harm's way, e.g., our foes, who constitute our primary support network. Next, I thought, I'll point out that in France the families of the troops sent to the gulf are in the forefront of the anti-war movement. This will strengthen my first point, I reasoned, and no one will argue that these family members do not support their sons, daughters, brothers, and sisters.

Then, just as things were looking rosy for my new article, I realized that I had unwittingly stumbled into the same trap that doomed my first idea for an article on the war—I had, once again, chosen to argue for a position that was so obvious that to actually make the argument would insult the intelligence of most Americans, Tech students included. At this point, I noticed that it was getting late, and, as you can see, I would have to abandon the idea of writing something about the war for this issue of the NAR. While this situation bothers me intensely—what would have happened, for example, if Martin Luther King, Jr., had abandoned his quest for civil rights—I am glad that I will no longer have to be concerned with war supporters questioning the right of the rest of us to protest the war or claiming that protesters do not support the troops.
LOVE IT OR LEAVE IT

by Nick Hess

Happiness is mandatory. Are you happy?
--Paranoia

A few weeks ago - as probably all of you know - there was a pro-troops rally at the Student Center. The rally was very successful - nearly 200 students were there, as were flags, patriotic speeches, and cameras. All in all, it was a stirring display of the way American citizens can pull together during times of crises, and act as one. But there was a problem with this demonstration. Perhaps not to other people, but to me, it seemed as if the rally missed a critical, and disturbing, point.

The rally itself was two things: a rally, and a counter demonstration. The original organizers of the rally had been - annoyed? angered? - anyhow, bothered enough by antiwar activists to put together the rally. Perhaps you remember the flyers that they handed out prior to the rally: "If you don't like it, then - WHOOOSH! - MARTA to Hartsfield." And underneath: "Just Do It." Or perhaps you remember some of the speeches: "I think that this shows Saddam Hussein that we are all willing to stand behind our President...". The intentions are sincere and heartfelt. However, they are long on emotion and short on sense.

What are the implications of such statements? Or of editorials written in newspapers accusing the media of being actively unpatriotic, if not treasonous? Or of other editorials proposing that the Dekalb Farmers Market be boycotted until they remove the Iraqi flag, which hangs among the flags of many other countries their ceiling? The implications are clear enough - many people have spelled it out. Now that we are at war: (1) it is every American's duty to rally 'round the flag; (2) those who fail to do so or who criticize the war, or the decision to go to war, is unpatriotic (or seditious); (3) even paying attention to the fact that there are those who disagree with the war is in itself potentially treasonous - it saps morale, it questions authority, it emboldens our enemy and essentially weakens America. Love it or leave it.

That's missing the point. Actually, I agree that media coverage of antiwar protests probably makes Hussein more confident. He feels that dissention is the "weak underbelly" of democracies. But Hussein is a dictator, an ex-assassin who has gassed dissidents within his own country. I don't think that he understands what a democracy is all about. We need our dissenters. The fact that we have them, tolerate and accept them, is what makes us strong. We can change, we can see other viewpoints - this is what tolerance is about. We have people who disagree with the majority opinion, and who disagree with the leadership. We are able to function well with this dissent, because it is acceptable and correct to disagree, because an outlet exists to vent our opinions. If there was a military coup in Iraq, or in any other dictatorship, that would mean little to the ordinary citizens. We are free, and we will remain free for as long as we allow and accept disagreement within our society.

In a way, people who say "love it or leave it" miss the point of America in the same way the Revolutionary Communist Party (the one here, in the U.S.) miss the point. The RCP folks say that we actually live in a dictatorship. Somehow it never has never occurred to them that if they were living in a true dictatorship, their bookshops and organizations would not be aboveground. In the same way, those who think that disagreeing now is unpatriotic don't realize that in our country, disagreeing is one of our fundamental, and most patriotic, institutions. The antiwar activists are demonstrating because they care about the country, and the direction that it is heading. To say that demonstrators don't love America is to lie, both to one's self and to the world.
We Do What We’re Told

by Ed “Catfish” Gibbs

Our president tells us that we must support the troops, support the war, and support the flag. Our congress tells us that we must support our president. The generals tell us this is a war you can support, this is a just war. The talking heads proclaim from their televisions that the war is going great, so few of our boys are dying. The leaders of our country tell us there is no reason for dissent.

We do what we’re told. We go to work. We go to school. We listen to the president’s propaganda and dutifully swallow it. We support the troops. We support the war. We attack the media for complaining about the Pentagon controlling the news. We tell them we want censorship of the press, and we even like it. We march into the streets wrapped in the flag and declare that no one should listen to the anti-war protests: they’re just traitors.

If democracy is to continue as an ideal this war has to be questioned. No longer can we simply continue to do what we’re told. No longer can multitudes of Americans stand by as its government engages in its latest war. In support of the war the government has found its propaganda powerful. The words of wisdom from the mouths of our leaders can equally apply to the naked aggression of Iraq with their invasion of Iran in 1980 and the collateral damage born by hundreds if not thousands of Panamanians just last year. If we are defending these high ideals, must we not rush our troops to the threatened Baltic states and the rebellious students of China? The many ironies between what we’re told and the truth would seem enough to bring the entire wall of propaganda down. Still the wall of propaganda stands.

An apathetic populace is the sign of a declining democracy. The population of our country has largely become apathetic. They believe that one person can have no effect on the course of events. The celebrated right to go to the polls is a right half of us have given up in disgust. The great belief that the common man could change things has been shattered by years of defeats. In many ways it can be argued that the real powers behind Congress are lobbyists and large campaign contributors. Apathy has created a population to willing to do what it’s told. Apathy must be overcome and left behind as individual citizens rise up and reclaim our democracy. The power must return to the people.

There are certainly many dissenters out there even on this traditionally conservative campus. To voice your own opinions in opposition to your leaders is a brave step even in a democratic society. Yet this is a step that must be taken. Step from beyond the shadows into the streets and shout for an end to injustice. Go to one of those protests against the war. Pick up a pen and write to your leaders. Use democracy at its purest, face to face, in discussing with friends the injustice of this war. This is not the course of the apathetic citizens that simply go along with their government despite its evils. You can only be apathetic if you believe there is no hope. You must believe that things can be changed or learn to live on your knees.
The Muslim Students Association of the Georgia Institute of Technology, which consists of American Muslims and expatriate Muslims, calls upon all the parties in the ongoing war to come to an immediate cease fire and to remove all restrictions on the passage of food and medicine to Iraq. These actions are to be followed by an Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait, and the withdrawal of all non-Muslim forces from the Arabian Peninsula.

The rationale behind this position is the following two religious principles. First, the shedding of blood for personal or national aggrandizement is forbidden, and second, it is forbidden for a Muslim country to seek the aid of a non-Muslim country in fighting Muslims. Therefore, the MSA finds both the Iraqi takeover of Kuwait and the Coalition (i.e.: United States and its allies) attack on Iraq impermissible.

The MSA believes that the Iraqi government annexed Kuwait for personal and national interest. This belief is based on the history of the Iraqi government. Over the past fifteen years, the it has launched a religiously impermissible war against Iran and has practiced a policy of repression internally, denying the people of Iraq their religiously guaranteed right of participation in government.

Similarly, the MSA believes that the United States government, the principle participant in the anti-Iraq coalition, is not driven by concern for the principles of justice or the welfare of the people in the Persian Gulf region. It bases this belief also on the past history of the United States government, which has supported or neglected over the last 30 years internal repression in Egypt, Syria, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, China, Chile, Nicaragua, El Salvador, the Philippines, Iran, South Africa and South Korea. During this same period the United States supported or failed to respond to South Africa’s invasion of Namibia, Israel’s invasion of Arab territory and of Lebanon in 1982 and its continued occupation of some of these territories, the Chinese invasion of Tibet, the Vietnamese invasion of Cambodia, the Turkish invasion of Cyprus in 1974, the Syrian invasion of Lebanon, and the Iraqi invasion of Iran in 1980.

Nor do the governments of Kuwait and Saudi Arabia warrant the support of Muslims. Both extended significant moral and financial support to the Iraqi government for its war against Iran. Both monopolize decision-making power in their countries. Moreover, Kuwait was allegedly exceeding agreed-to oil production quotas and overdrilling an Iraqi-Kuwaiti owned oil field.

We further believe that the launching of the war was not to further the best interests of the people in the area, since the effect of the U.S. policy will be to perpetuate the governments of Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and other small, oil-rich states. The ruling elite in these states do not allow the people of the area to participate in decisions concerning the utilization of their oil reserves for fear of losing their elite status. They offer to the United States investment capital and to the U.S. oil companies lucrative management and distribution contracts in return for protection from the masses of people in the area (Walter Russell Mead, “The Gulf through German Eyes,” Harper’s Magazine, January 1991).

The United States government’s disregard for the lives, property, and ecology of the region is exemplified by its decision to declare arbitrarily, after less than six months, that the economic sanctions imposed upon Iraq were “ineffective” and thereafter to launch a total war against Iraq, whose government’s response has been equally callous. The Institute for International Economics (11 Dupont Circle, NW, Washington, DC 20036) concluded in a study released November 29, 1990 that the sanctions were going to reduce Iraq’s Gross National Product by 40%, a reduction almost twenty times greater than the average of the reductions that generated successes in previous cases of economic sanctions. Moreover, Zbigniew Brezinski, the U.S. National Security Advisor under President Carter testified to the U.S. Senate on December 5, 1990 that, sanctions are a punitive response to the [annexation of Kuwait] and should be maintained for as long as necessary; and in the process preconditions are being generated for the eventual resolution by the international community of the wider issues of [Iraq’s threat] to regional stability. (emphasis added)

In the same testimony, Mr. Brezinski refuted the claim that
Iraq’s nuclear weapons program justified abandoning sanctions and launching a war:

...Israel already has nuclear weapons and can thus deter Iraq, while the United States has certainly both the power to deter or to destroy Iraq. Deterrence has worked in the past and I fail to see why thousands of Americans should now die in order to make sure that at some point in the future—according to experts, some years from now—Iraq does not acquire a militarily significant nuclear capability.

Second, it is within our power to sustain a comprehensive embargo on Iraq to impede such an acquisition. Unlike India or Israel, Iraq does permit international inspection of its nuclear facilities. This gives us some insight into its program. Moreover, much can happen during the next several years, including Saddam’s fall from power. (emphasis added)

Of course, most damaging to the argument of those who wish to justify war on the moral ground is the response of the U.S. ambassador in Iraq, on July 25, 1990, mere days before the invasion, to the Iraqi president’s complaints against Kuwait and his implied threat to take military action:

We have no opinion of Arab-Arab conflicts, like your border disagreement with Kuwait. I was in the American embassy in Kuwait during the late sixties. The instruction we had during this period was that we should express no opinion on the issue, and that the issue is not associated with America. James Baker has directed our official spokesman to emphasize this instruction [Christopher Hutchens, “Why are we Stuck in the Sand,” Harper’s Magazine, January 1991].

Moreover, the MSA does not believe that United States had exhausted all possibilities for a negotiated settlement to the conflict. On August 12, Iraq offered to withdraw if Syria would withdraw from Lebanon and Israel would withdrawal from the Gaza Strip, the West Bank, the Golan Heights, and Lebanon. On August 23, a former high ranking U.S. official delivered another Iraqi offer to the National Security advisor Brent Scowcroft. Iraq offered to withdraw from Kuwait, and allow foreigners to leave in return for the lifting of sanctions, guaranteed access to the Gulf, and full control of the Rumailah oil field ‘that extends slightly into the Kuwait territory from Iraq.’ The U.S. and Iraq were to negotiate an oil agreement ‘satisfactory to both nations’ national security interests,’ ‘jointly work on the stability of the Gulf,’ and develop a joint plan ‘to alleviate Iraq’s economic and financial problems.’ There was no demand that the U.S. withdraw from Saudi Arabia or other preconditions. An administration official who specializes in Mideast affairs described the terms of the proposal as ‘serious’ and ‘negotiable’ [Noam Chomsky (Professor of linguistics at MIT, “Nefarious Aggression,” Z Magazine, October 1990).]

With these facts in mind, the MSA can only conclude that the principle motives driving U.S. government policy are a desire to maintain its neocolonial dominance of the oil reserves in the area, to maintain Israel’s military superiority over its neighbors, to justify exorbitant budget allocations to supplies of military equipment, or to achieve some similarly morally unjustifiable end.

The MSA calls upon all individuals to attempt to fulfill the moral responsibility which God calls each individual to assume, knowing that silence is complicity, to some degree, in the events of the status quo. It also calls upon all individuals to learn as much as possible about the ongoing war and its consequences through a variety of media sources and personal contact with people of different national and religious backgrounds, noting that villanization of the enemy has always been a tactic in war.

The elements of a long term solution to the problems of the area are two-fold. The first is effective participation of the masses in the decision making processes. However, the destruction and bitterness that will surely be left in the wake of this war makes such an outcome highly unlikely. The second is the settlement of the Palestinian-Israeli dispute. This would entail an immediate end to violations of Palestinians’ human rights violations, full self-determination for the Palestinians, and a complete Israeli withdrawal from all occupied lands.

Effective public participation in Muslim countries could unlock a great deal of human potential and creativity currently being stifled by feudal monarchies and dictatorial regimes supported by the governments of United States and other industrialized countries. The fruits of this blossoming would spread to all peoples of the world; for the fruits of human resources, unlike natural resources, are not a zero-sum game in which one party’s gains necessitate another’s losses. Muslims pray to God to hasten the day when the true human wealth of the Persian Gulf is tapped and not just oil.
The Acoustical Properties of Having No Soul

"Learning How to Cope with the War"

by Rafael E. Hidalgo

The United States of America is currently at war with another country. Everyday, more and more individuals are innocently killed over indifferent political misconceptions. It now seems obvious to me that most people have no real idea of how significant a backwards step for human civilization this war embodies.

One month after the fighting commenced, a strange side effect has manifested itself among the American people; suddenly, everybody is a philosopher. Everyone is suddenly willing to voice their views of the war and world politics in general. The sad thing is that the only thing they achieve with their misguided ramblings is to openly display their high level of ignorance. From my point of view, it is pleasant to see some individuals gain interest in world events, but not in this manner. In general, it is an unfortunate situation to see people so misguided. Trying to interpret this phenomenon, I reached the conclusion that the root cause of their ignorance lies in their inability to understand what it means to exercise free will as benefactors of America's commitment to freedom of choice.

America and freedom are two terms so often used together that most people have learned to disregard the importance of their relationship. As Americans, we enjoy the birth-given right of freedom of choice. This is power. It gives us control of our daily existence, as well as influence on what happens in the world around us. This power is often misunderstood, though. People have become so attached to the materialistic aspect of freedom that they have forgotten to exercise the even more important control over their wills.

Being in control does not mean having the capability of making decisions; it means understanding why we make those decisions. The freedom to inquire into the nature of our everyday existence is something possessed by all of us. Yet, most people don't seem to possess the incentive to explore this aspect of their freedom. There seem to be several reasons why the ordinary individual waves these rights. The first is the previously mentioned idea of people disregarding the intuitive aspect of freedom because they overemphasize the importance of materialistic freedom. Another reason is that people are afraid of assuming full control of their lives. This would imply an increased responsibility that most people would rather not deal with. Finally, many people are simply unaware of their lack of control over their own existence. This is probably the scariest reason of all. Individuals are often so involved in complying with their everyday routines that they don't realize how futile their illusionary sense of control is. The consequence of this unawareness is that people don't develop the necessary familiarity with their inner feelings necessary to cope in modern day society. They are, therefore, unable to fend for themselves, and turn too often towards others for guidance.

For example, the weekend after the war started, churches around the country experienced record attendances. What were people expecting to get from religion? More than anything, I find
it is hypocritical for someone that hasn’t gone to mass in years to suddenly expect to receive something from the church. Also, President Bush later decided to use this church going trend to his advantage by declaring a national prayer day in the name of the troops in the Gulf. People were therefore manipulated into relating their church attendance with support for the war effort. This exemplifies why it is essential for people to inquire deeper into the reasons behind their actions and the resulting consequences. By looking for help from a form of higher power, such as religions, the individual only stands to be deceived; this in turn makes him/her vulnerable to those that have a better grasp of reality. In other words, the belief that a part of your being needs a sense of guidance that can only be provided by an external source often makes people end up submitting their wills to the control of others. This supposedly existing unknown side of one’s being is often referred to as the human soul.

The human soul is simply a characterization of all within us that we do not control. It is a vague attempt at crossing the gap of knowledge between the physical world and the psychic unknown. Therefore, the more acceptance we have of its existence, the more drastically our vision of reality will be clouded by misconceptions.

The only way by which a person can become a true contributor to society is to assume full responsibility of being. This implies dismissing such concepts as possessing a soul that can provide heavenly guidance every once in a while. Only then will the true individual be disclosed to the world. And, as such an individual is sure to find out, this marks the emergence of the louder inner voice. No longer will your actions feel like whimpers in the midst of the large noise of today’s troubled society. Quite the contrary, the actions of a person in full control of his will are always clearly heard above the general tumult. The true individual will always be more significant than the misguided one because only he can be expected to make a difference.

These are very troubled times; it is at times like these that people are required to make choices. One can either let himself/herself be carried away by the vortex of anxiety and deception produced by a confused society, or one can search for the inner voice that will provide the volume necessary to stand in the middle of the vortex and dare to try and understand what is actually going on.

War is not the game that some people make it out to be... Give peace a chance.
After the Gulf: The Future of American Force Projection

by Scott D. Orr, box 31030

In January of 1980 President Jimmy Carter enunciated what came to be known as the Carter Doctrine, a pledge that any move to seize control of the Persian Gulf oilfields by an outside power (i.e., the Soviet Union) would be considered a threat to the United States’ vital national interests and would be countered by all necessary measures, up to and including military force. In so doing Carter committed U.S. military capabilities in an area of the world where U.S. capabilities were practically non-existent. To address this discrepancy he ordered the formation of the Rapid Deployment Joint Task Force, a fast-reaction force to be capable of placing troops and aircraft in the Gulf beginning within days of the start of a crisis (in particular a Soviet invasion of Iran).

The Rapid Deployment Force (later the U.S. Central Command) provides a good example of addressing a severe American weakness, the near-total absence of U.S. military forces in the Middle East, by applying a traditional American strength, the tremendous logistical capabilities of the U.S. military. Using then-current capabilities (this issue is examined in detail in Thomas McNaugher’s Arms and Oil), the U.S. would have been able to airlift the entire 82nd Airborne Division in about three weeks. The 82nd, acting as a spearhead and delaying force, would have been followed within three more weeks by an airlifted light division (the 7th or 9th Infantry), a sealifted heavy division (probably the 101st Air Assault), and a partially prepositioned Marine Amphibious Force, with one or more other divisions to follow as reinforcements (the 24th Mechanized Infantry, the 6th Air Cavalry Combat Brigade, and whatever else the services could scrape together). The prospective U.S. strategy (in the case of a Soviet invasion) was for early-arriving light units to fight a delaying action in the mountains of west central Iran in order to buy time for the arrival of mechanized forces.

Though these force-projection capabilities were greater than those of all other nations of the world combined [underline “combined”], they were considered inadequate, and by the time of the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait increased emphasis on airlift and sealift capabilities made it possible to deploy the 82nd Division and an MAF in two weeks, two more divisions (one heavy, one light) within two more weeks, and a second heavy division a week after that (according to McNaugher’s estimates). Operation Desert Shield proved the reality of this capability in the most rapid deployment of major forces in military history. Though not used against exactly the threat for which it was created, the RDF has proved (logistically, at least) its efficacy. What Next?

Whatever transpires in the Persian Gulf, the RDF, or something like it, will undoubtedly be called on in the future to meet threats to American or, given the end of the Cold War, international security. With the withdrawal of U.S. forces from Europe and the Philippines, the “Rapid Deployment Force” (as opposed to the Central Command, which has responsibility only for the Middle East) will consist, in essence, of the vast majority of U.S. military assets—this trend can already be seen in the current movement of several Army divisions from Europe to Saudi Arabia. Possible missions include U.N.-sanctioned military actions (such as the invasion of Kuwait) and peacekeeping forces, as well as (indeed, perhaps instead of) more traditional operations. To accomplish these missions the U.S. must be prepared to project combined arms forces quickly anywhere in the world.

Military missions suitable for rapid deployment forces are those of medium to large size (smaller operations would be handled by special operations forces and seaborne Marine Assault Units). Though missions differ, force requirements fall into two basic categories. The first of these categories is in the traditional mold of the U.S. Army and Air Force: large mechanized forces.
Situations in which these heavy forces will be required are limited, militarily, to large-scale open warfare, and, geographically, to flat, open terrain (which, except for the Arab countries, tends to be where the most industrialized, powerful, and generally stable countries are located). Though mechanized units would be spearheaded by airlifted airborne and light infantry divisions in these situations, armor would provide the bulk of ground combat capability. The second category of force requirements is for medium- to large-sized light forces, capable of operating in difficult or confined terrain (in other words, Central and South America, Central Africa, Southern Europe, Southeast Asia, and various insular nations and protectorates). The units required for these operations would be those otherwise used to spearhead mechanized forces, but in this case the airborne, light infantry, Marine, and (in lieu of tracked armor) air assault and air cavalry divisions and brigades would provide the majority of the firepower. Although high-tech air and mechanized forces have proven highly effective in the Persian Gulf war, this should not lead to the misconception that these forces will be so useful in all situations. Unless war breaks out in Eastern Europe or, once again, in the Middle East, the most probable scenario for a major crisis requiring the deployment of U.S. forces is one in which light units will bear the brunt of the military burden.

Required Capabilities

The service most directly affected by the need for rapid deployment capabilities will be, of course, the Army. As indicated above, most threats to U.S. security will be fundamentally different from that presented by the traditional scenario of a massive Soviet invasion of West Germany. Furthermore, these new threats will be more militarily and geographically diverse. This means that, assuming the Soviet threat dissipates, the U.S. will need a somewhat smaller, lighter, more flexible, and more mobile Army. Ideally, this Army would be built around a core of airborne and light infantry divisions, supported by air assault units and a few mechanized divisions. This would allow the Army to move most of its combat strength quickly through airlift, while retaining heavy units for use in those situations, mentioned above, where they are uniquely valuable.

Additionally, it would behoove the Army to revive the light motorized division. Given the useful blend of light infantry flexibility and strategic transportability with mechanized tactical mobility offered by this sort of unit, the recent decision to disband the 9th Infantry Division (Motorized) seems foolish.

The Navy and Marines have always played a crucial role in force projection, and will continue to do so in the future—the U.S. is fundamentally a maritime nation. However, this should not be taken as an endorsement of the Navy's current force structure. A large portion of the U.S. fleet is devoted exclusively to the destruction of enemy surface ships and submarines. There are only three navies in the world capable of posing a serious threat to even a single American Carrier Task Force (one of fifteen): two of these navies belong to U.S. allies (Great Britain and France); the other belongs to a crumbling shell of a superpower. Provided the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. can restrain naval forces, especially submarines, through mutual or unilateral measures, the U.S. Navy should be trimmed, eliminating missile cruisers and attack submarines in favor of retaining aircraft carriers, which are much more flexible (especially in attacking land targets—like Libya) and absolutely critical in rapid response situations, due to their sea- and air-control capabilities; helicopter assault carriers, carrying the Marines which often constitute the first ground-force response to a threat, should also be retained.

Of course, the Navy's fast sealift capabilities, which currently consist of eight SL-7 30-knot transports, must be augmented. This small fleet of fast ships is capable of carrying one heavy (armored, mechanized infantry, or—for practical purposes—air assault) division; if a major crisis were to precipitate in Europe, for example, now that the U.S. plans to eliminate its POMCUS sites under the CFE agreement, the ability to move several such divisions across the Atlantic quickly would be necessary. Even the Navy's slow sealift capabilities, important in resupplying major operations, are somewhat lacking, and should likewise be enhanced.

The Air Force's capabilities, by definition, are capable of rapid deployment, but the utility of these capabilities in a new era is dubious; right now, the Air Force focuses on air superiority and strategic bombing missions. Since most nations of the world lack significant air forces, the ground attack mission (which the Air Force absolutely detests) will increasingly become the most important one (of course, many believe it always has been, a view that has recently been vindicated in Kuwait and Iraq); in a shooting war, a B-2
would probably not be worth as much as a squadron of F-16's, which would be somewhat cheaper. Even an F-15 is an expensive way to drop bombs. If the Air Force purchased fewer interceptors and strategic bombers and more multi-role fighters and tactical bombers, like the F-16 and A-10, it could have the same number of planes with a smaller price tag. Given even these conditions, the utility of air power is limited—smart bombs would not be nearly as effective in jungle warfare, where it is difficult to find the enemy, as they are in the desert. Likewise, strategic airlift must be increased. If the U.S. is to rely on quickly-deployable light infantry divisions for ground-force projection, it must have the transport aircraft to move those divisions. Strategic airlift is, indeed, a sine qua non [this is Latin—underline it] of a rapid reaction strategy.

Organizationally, one important refinement can be suggested: if rapid deployment capabilities are to be used around the world, planning for their use will not be focused in one command (as it is now in CENTCOM). Area-specific contingency plans will be drawn up by each of the U.S. military's Joint Commands around the world. However, to simplify operations in any contingency, the logistics elements of the various services (particularly the Military Airlift Command, the Military Sealift Command, and the Traffic Command) should be more firmly consolidated under the unified Transportation Command. Under the present arrangement, the Transportation Command (formed in the 1980's to replace the Joint Deployment Agency) has responsibility for planning emergency deployments, but its authority over the various transportation assets is somewhat questionable, leaving open the possibility of delays resulting from fragmented administrative responsibility.

Finally, the U.S. must sort out its basing arrangements. In part, this problem would be solved by a changed force structure: if the U.S. relies on a small Army to respond all around the world it will prove unnecessary and quite probably impossible to man the sort of forward bases it now favors. At any rate, domestic political pressures within host countries will force closure of many of these bases, a process that can even now be observed in the Philippines. Though new possibilities for bases may present themselves (for example, Vietnam's current offer of Camranh Bay), contingency basing arrangements such as those reached in the early 1980's with Persian Gulf nations, combined with prepositioning of equipment (both strategies were implemented successfully in preparation for the current Gulf war), would be more flexible and politically feasible than traditional bases. Of course, if this option is chosen the services must purchase more transportable infrastructure (collapsible airfield, port, housing, and storage equipment) so that bare-bones facilities can be transformed quickly into fully functioning bases.

From Theory to Practice

The armed forces will not like this plan or any one like it (i.e., one that involves changes). Resistance from military quarters can be expected to be intense. However, the changes outlined above are not so much a prescription for what should [underlined] happen as a description of what will [underlined] happen. With downward budget pressures and the apparently imminent passing of the Soviet threat, mechanized forces in the Fulda Gap supported by air superiority fighters and nuclear attack submarines begin to look increasingly useless. Although it does so slowly, even the U.S. military adapts to reality, and reality (budgetary and strategic) dictates a smaller, more flexible force capable of fighting in places armored vehicles cannot reach.

However, one factor aside from harsh reality might commend lighter forces to military leaders. Many of the changes recommended above (for example, emphasis on light infantry, tactical fighters and bombers, and transports) involve much cheaper equipment than current forces (armor, attack submarines, and B-2 Stealth bombers); this means higher manpower-cost ratios, which means, under restricted budget conditions, more manpower. And more manpower means more slots for officers—if the various officer corps want to look after their own, as they typically do, labor-intensive forces might come to look very appealing. It therefore seems that if the U.S. armed services are to be prepared for the 21st century, change towards small and flexible forces is necessary, and just as importantly, possible.
Has the Nation forgotten the Bill of Rights? Have we forgotten freedom of the Press? The founding fathers abhorred the idea of a standing army on the grounds that it was a terrible threat to freedom. Yet now we have a huge standing army deployed overseas and the military controls the press. Thus the threat to freedom has been made real and the freedom of the press is the first casualty.

Something is sleeping in the hearts of the people. For the most part they agree with censoring the press, and they want more. They wholly believe that the press will recklessly endanger the lives of US servicemen. This sort of dogmatic attack on a constitutional right cannot be allowed. The wants of the majority cannot be allowed to squash the basic rights of the minority. If this is to happen, than a totalitarian dictatorship much like that of Iraq’s will prosper here in the land of the free and the home of the brave.

The first problem to be attacked is that of government propaganda. Though we accuse many other nations of fanning the flames of propaganda we also resort to the same device. People must begin to question the statements of the government and realize that at best they often contain half-truths and lies. The reports from within Iraq that are heavily censored should be examined with a
demanding doubt, yet so should the reports coming from pool reporters in Saudi Arabia. If journalists in Iraq are severely limited surely Western journalists under effective martial law are no less limited. Despite the fact that the Pentagon can claim it is protecting lives, cannot the truth be released even if a few days late. The military cannot answer this question. The press during the Vietnam era were not under such ludicrous conditions, yet somehow they didn't leak enough information to endanger the war efforts.

Why does the military want such strict control of the press? Their contention is that they want to do all they can to keep things secret which will in turn save the most lives. Of course a much more likely reason is that they remember the press and the nation that turned against them in Vietnam. They've already shown their willingness to hide the truth from the press in Grenada and Panama. Indeed there are disgusting reports of mass graves of civilians killed in the invasion of Panama while the military declared collateral damage, as they like to refer to the deaths of innocent civilians, was light. The military sees that if if it can hide the horrors of war especially the visual ones then the public will support them in their grand endeavors. With basically only positive reports fed to the public their support at home will be insurmountable. The censorship of the press is much of what George Bush means when he says that this will not be another Vietnam.

What is the military really trying to hide? One of the problems of censorship is that since we know little or nothing of what is really going on we must assume the worst. The military is certainly hiding the deaths of Iraqi civilians. Indeed when they speak of the collateral damage it is always qualified as light or very light. The term collateral damage itself is a dehumanizing term applied to the people of Iraq. The innocent civilians killed and wounded in Israel are never dismissed as collateral damage. We empathize with the people of Israel, but we trivialize the much more numerous deaths of innocents in Iraq. It is also possible that the not all the sorties over Iraq are aimed at solely military targets. Maybe we have been on a campaign of bombing the cities of Iraq. Modern warfare often means inflicting terrible damage on civilian populations until one side has had enough. It is not unthinkable that even American deaths are being hidden or that combat deaths are being moved into the category of non combat deaths. The truth is hidden from us, and it could indeed be an ugly truth.

Why do the leaders of our nation want to withhold the truth? The logic that the public needs to be protected from reality with censorship is not a view you can find in the Constitution. By letting the military control the free press the leaders of our country have insulted every American. If we believe in the Jeffersonian ideal that the people are the ultimate sources of freedom and democracy, then our leaders have betrayed us. They have decided that they know what is best for America. They fear that the common man would not agree with their ideas, and so they will simply avoid telling him what is going on. Since the interests of our leaders correspond with the wealthy in society often at the expense of the rest of Americans they need to convince the average US citizen that what rich want is what everyone should want. They do not give the common man credit for any intelligence or any place in democracy. In the end much of the leadership of our country believes in the rule of the elite. Wars are always ugly affairs, but our leaders would prefer for us to forget that and leave the affairs of the country to them. This is a government which doesn't respect the common man enough to let him form his own independent opinions.

The public must be behind the press and its guaranteed freedoms or risk establishing a frightening precedent. Are we willing to let the government control the press, able to publish only what it wants us to hear. This will lead only too quickly to attacks on publishing in general and then freedom of speech and assembly. We are risking an Orwellian future. To eliminate this we must free the press of the Pentagon's unreasonable control. People must begin to doubt the overwhelmingly positive reports. We must demand all of our rights as demanded under the Constitution and not be swayed by arguments of special circumstances that must suppress our rights. We must remember that everyone lies, and that is the only truth about this war.
A Just War

is just a war

Justifying a rape,
a murder, a theft...

A Just Cause

is just a cause,
something to rally behind,
anything man, anything...
just give it to me,
man, me need it,
please...
me don’t know just where to go

A Just man

is just human
justifying causes

justifying war

justifying justice
In Defense of Desert Storm

by Allan W. Yarbrough

AT THE DEADLINE MEETING of the North Avenue Review, my fellow editors, confronted with a half-dozen essays in monolithic opposition to the presence of United States armed forces in the Persian Gulf, sought someone to “balance,” as it were, this issue’s focus on the conflict in that part of the world. The task fell to me, and I therefore write in defense of operation Desert Storm, the military mission to liberate Kuwait from her Iraqi invaders.

This is no small undertaking. All wars, it is said, are popular during the first hundred days. This realization ought to temper the wonder with which we all regard the tremendous outpouring of support for the American military and its commander-in-chief. The profuse display of flags, yellow ribbons, and banners that prophesy the inevitable defeat of Saddam Hussein, is a testimony to America’s ability, in times of crisis, to put aside their petty differences and assume the burden of world leadership that history has bestowed upon her.

It is not easy, amidst the exuberance, to sit back with detachment, examine the situation objectively, dispassionately, and write the words that must hold true after the 100 days, after the enthusiasm has given way to the bitter reality of war, and after the point when bravado gives way to duty, and enthusiasm to the grim determination necessary to bring about the New World Order.

WHAT, THEN, IS THE NEW WORLD ORDER that we are defending? Let me take pains to say what it is not. It is not a vision of universal democracy. Both Kuwait and its neighbor, Saudi Arabia, are monarchies of a strongly theocratic raison d’être, not democracies. Nor is this war about freedom. It is true that Kuwaiti people enjoyed a certain ordered liberty before it was taken from them by the Iraqis, but this, too, is not the point.

The New World Order is a concept of collective security in which no country is permitted to do to another what Iraq has done to Kuwait. The end of the Cold War opened the possibility that the great powers of the world, working through the United Nations, could guarantee the smaller nations the ability to conduct their business in peace, free from ruthless dictators embarking on a course of imperial expansion. The Iraqi invasion of Kuwait was the first, perhaps the inevitable, test of this order. The prelude to World War II is the lesson of today’s leaders. When the League of Nations acquiesced in Mussolini’s seizure of Ethiopia, it destroyed the credibility of that organization. The ghost of Munich, where the European powers surrendered Czechoslovakia to the Nazis, also haunts the memories of those now determined to see that the tragedy of WWII never happens again. The lessons of history shows clearly that the appeasement of a murderous tyrant might prevent a small war in the present only to guarantee the necessity of a big one in the future.

WHAT, THEN, OF OIL? I approach this question from a unique perspective, for when the war first began, I, too, believed that the sole purpose of this war was to guarantee the West’s access to the oil of the Middle East. Before August 2 of last year, Iraq controlled 10% of the world’s known oil reserves. His invasion of Kuwait earned him an additional 10%. The subsequent invasion or extortion of Saudi Arabia, Oman, Bahrain, and the U.A.E. would have given him control over oil reserves exceeding 50% of the total in existence. With such control he could wreck havoc on the industrialized economies of the West, extorting monopoly prices for the energy on which they rely, or worse. Saddam Hussein would be able to completely destabilize the world oil markets, preventing long term adjustments to alternative energy sources. Saddam Hussein must be denied this kind of power.

But as August gave way to September and October, reports of life under Iraqi occupation began to leak out of Kuwait. We heard reports of the rapes, the tortures, and the summary executions carried out against the Kuwaiti people. We saw the films of Hussein gloating over the Western hostages caught in Kuwait during the invasion. We heard the Iraqi announcements that the hostages had been located next to military installations known to be targeted by the alliance. The outbreak of war saw the pointless destruction of the remaining Kuwaiti infrastructure.
by the Iraqi invaders, and the incalculable ecological damage wrought by their pumping of oil into the Persian Gulf truly constitutes environmental terrorism. To top it all off, we watched as Hussein began employing his weapons of mass destruction, not against the military forces of the alliance, but against their civilian populace, and not against theirs only, but also against Israel, a non-combatant country Hussein murderously tried to turn into a "crematorium." The evil of Saddam Hussein seems bound only by his capabilities, and has transformed this war in a way that Bush's often goofy rhetoric never could: from a war of economics to a clash between right and wrong, between the forces of light and the forces of darkness. "This is our Armageddon," wrote Leon Uris of the Berlin Airlift. Forty-five years later, Desert Storm is ours.

"WHAT, THEN, ABOUT ISRAEL?" The question was first put to me by a friend from that part of the world, and has been asked in my presence and elsewhere hundreds of times since. It implies, of course, the moral equivalence between the Israeli occupation of the West Bank and the Iraqi occupation of Kuwait.

Alas, the question also shows that the hatred of the Jewish people was not satiated by the gas-chambers of Auschwitz and Belsen. Anti-semitism, it seems, has proved the 20th century's most enduring ideology. The second world war may have changed its locus from Europe to the Middle East, but it did not destroy it.

The modern state of Israel won its recognition in 1948 by a vote of United Nations General Assembly. Immediately thereafter, the nations of the Arab world launched a war against it, clearly stating their intent to "drive the Jews into the sea," to "feed them to the fish of the Mediterranean." They attempted this objective several times until 1967, when at the end of the Six-Day War, a defeated Jordan sued a victorious Israel for peace. It was thus that Israel came into possession of the Jordanian territory known as the West Bank of the Jordan river.

Since that time, the Israelis have been secure on their Eastern frontier, and for a very good reason: the mountainous terrain of the West Bank gives them an excellent view of advancing armies, and forms a natural "tank trap" should anyone ever attempt to attack it again. Since 1967, the Israeli positions there have proved an effective deterrent to further invasion.

The occupation has not been easy, however. The Israelis permitted the Jordanian residents of the West Bank to continue to live there, unmolested by all but the terrorists of the Palestine Liberation Organization, who regularly torture to death anyone perceived as "collaborating" with the Israeli presence. The PLO continues to mount terrorist attacks on Israeli civilians, while cynically stirring up rock-throwing mobs that provoke the police into the use of force, incurring the well-scripted indignation of the world.

Make no mistake: an Israeli surrender of the West Bank will not bring about peace in the Middle East, and certainly has nothing to do with Iraq's invasion of Kuwait. The demands of the Palestinians for their own state is merely a cover; the Palestinians already have a state in Jordan, 70% of which is Palestinian. The demands of the Arabs that Israel surrender the West Bank is part and parcel of their continuing efforts to destroy that country. We should not cooperate with their murderous designs.

WHAT, THEN, OF THE PEACE MOVEMENT? It is interesting to reflect that George Bush has met almost every condition that the political Left ever dreamt up for the employment of military force. We have: a murderous international pirate committing genocide against the small, peaceful country he invaded; a U.N. resolution, supported by the Soviets, condemning the invasion and authorizing military action to remove him; a Congressional declaration of war; the existence of a long-standing American interest in that part of the world; and the (failed) attempt to find a peaceful solution. Now that liberals are confronted by the conflict that, by their own standards, should be worth engaging, what have they to say? "NO BLOOD FOR BIG OIL!" goes their cry. Never mind that "big oil" is the principal, though unintended, beneficiary of the dismemberment of its Kuwaiti competitors. This irrational chant is the rallying cry for all those disaffected by American society.

Not everyone opposed to the war meets this description. Men of honor and principle, such as Patrick Buchanan, Joseph Sobran of National Review, Congressman Robert Dornan, Dick Williams of the Atlanta Journal Constitution, and others, have expressed serious reservations about our Gulf policy, questioning whether or not this is an undertaking worthy of American treasure and blood. But all these men instinctively understand that when the shooting
begins, the arguments must end, and that victory, however pyrrhic they believe it may turn out to be, depends largely on the cohesion of the national will.

And of the others? We have Molly Yard and the feminists coming out for Saddam Hussein on the grounds that his country is more sexually egalitarian. (Mass-murder, it seems, is okay as long as it is gender-neutral.) We have the racial groups dedicated to the argument that blacks and Hispanics shouldn’t support the war because America is still racist. We have a bevy of left-wing groups that view the conflict as an invitation to resume the politics of class warfare. The anti-war movement seems to be a clearing house for everyone united in his contempt for America, who can’t bear the sight of the country raising its head in pride. But I need not elaborate: they speak for themselves in this very magazine.

WHAT, THEN, OF THE FUTURE? That the alliance will free Kuwait and vanquish Iraq, there is no doubt. The military forces bequeathed to us by President Reagan have performed as advertised. The effectiveness of our Air Forces in countering the invaders both in the air and on the ground has wildly exceeded even the rosiest expectations, and early news of the incipient ground war gives us every reason to believe that our infantry will be similarly effective in driving out the remaining Iraqi invaders.

The news from the political-diplomatic front is similarly optimistic. Hussein’s call for an Islamic jihad against the West failed to materialize, as did his call for a war against Israel. Arab nations participating in the alliance have forged stronger diplomatic ties with the rest of the world, while those opposing it have only contributed to their own marginalization. George Bush was wise to ignore the advice of those who argued that economic sanctions would drive out Hussein; sanctions have never altered the policies undertaken by a tyrant, as those recommending them well knew. Whereas the PLO sees in Saddam Hussein the opportunity to bring about the final destruction of Israel, the peace movement saw in him the chance to once again cast America into an abyss of despair, self-doubt, and timidity. Instead the U.S. has shown itself to be a steadfast ally, and the one nation capable of world leadership, much to the disappointment of our enemies.

There remain, however, small dark clouds on an otherwise boundless horizon. The war will not resolve the territorial disputes that are the remnants of long-dissolved empires, both colonial and indigenous. Furthermore, I am at a loss to justify the actions of the West in that part of the world during the past decade. One of the other articles in this magazine makes an important point: Saddam Hussein is a monster of our own creation. We equipped him with both his military arsenal and the national-socialist ideology that told him how to use it. He is indeed our responsibility, and there is no guarantee that we won’t do it again. Already, we repeat our mistakes. We cozy ourselves to Hafez el Assad, acquiescing to a tyrant whose butchery knows no equal other than Hussein himself, and thus lay the seeds for yet another conflict.

But it does not follow that the military action which we have undertaken must bring about the long-sought Millennium in order to be justified. WWI and WWII both failed to create the ever-lasting Peace on Earth, but each in its turn was necessary. That the nations of the world are more adept at waging war than waging peace is hardly an argument against war. To ask that any contemplated military action bring about the an ever-lasting Peace on Earth is to ask for conditions that will never be.

We wish people would behave reasonably. We may wish people would live in harmony. We may even wish people would conform to the liberal vision of homo economicus, the rational man engaging other rational men in mutually beneficial exchange. Alas, such does not describe the real world. In the real world, people do not always behave rationally; they are often driven by envy, hatred, jealousy, and lust for power. They are inflamed by enmities that have existed time out of mind. Enforcing a any kink of world order, new or otherwise, will require the occasional exercise of military force. Such is the world we live in. Such is the world to which we must adapt, or perish.

“May you live in interesting times,” goes the ancient Chinese curse. This is our fate. May God be with us as we go.
Dr. Reid: This war is so complex that one has to approach it on a number of different levels. One level for investigation is American domestic politics. Another is the international power structure. I won't deal with those. Another perspective is the regional perspective, the perspective of the Arab world, which is what I'm going to concentrate on.

In that third perspective, you could approach it from the level of the different states and their involvement. You could also approach it from the level of public opinion. I'll touch somewhat on both of these.

The Arab world is divided into two camps. One is allied to various degrees with the United States and its other European allies. The other, which for the most part did not approve of the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait, but sees the threat in the massive American buildup and the fury with which the war is being waged against Iraq.

What I want to do is speak of factors which have made Arab countries lean one way or the other. One point is that this is in part an Arab civil war. The Arab world—and this includes everyone who speaks Arabic, the 22 countries from the Atlantic Ocean to the [eastern borders of Iraq]—they themselves talk about the Arab nation in the singular. [This] reflects the feeling that the Arabs were a single people and that they were artificially divided up into these states that they now have. And although attempts at Arab unity haven't worked out very well in practice, the feeling is still there.

So what factors determine into which camp an Arab state would fall in the current war. The first level you could look at is the rivalry within the Arab world. This leadership is economic, cultural, military and political. The big player here is Egypt, which for much of history has been one of the big players, going clear back to pharaonic times. Iraq is also another big player. You go clear back to the earliest civilizations, to Mesopotamia, where Iraq is today. Both had enough populations compared to their neighboring areas that they were automatically big players. Syria somewhat weaker, is caught in between the Egyptian and Iraqi power centers but it has its own aspirations to being the leader of the Arab state. For both Egypt and Syria, then, a major factor which has led them to ally themselves, not without misgivings, with the United States and its regional allies, is this regional rivalry for leadership with Iraq, which has emerged so strongly in a military and political way in the last decade. Egypt was in the doghouse, I guess you could say after signing her peace treaty with Israel. She is trying to reassert her position in the Arab world.

Number two after the rivalries is the fear of Iraqi expansionism. All of Iraq's neighbors are afraid of it, both Arab states like Saudi Arabia and Syria—even Jordan, although she has allied herself loosely with Iraq—and the non-arab states such as Turkey and Iran—Iran particularly since it fought an 8yr war with Iraq and is afraid of Iraqi expansionism. So if you were to color in the map you would find that there is a geographical factor involved here. The further away you are from the Iraqi threat, the more likely the position that Iraq is championing certain Arab causes that have been neglected, so you have the north african states with the exception of Egypt—Libya, Tunis, Algeria, Mauritania, and even Morocco, which is part of the coalition—have very strong pro-Iraqi sentiment. Maybe I should not say pro-Iraqi as much as
anti-American. They tend to see this as a new wave of western imperialism. The states that are closer to Iraq on the other hand and feel a direct threat tend to go in the other direction. Obviously the Kuwaitis who for the time being have lost everything, the Saudis, the Syrians—these are all in that category.

The third point to mention about this alignment is how strong the memory of western imperialism is in this region. The US and Europe and the Israelis have a very vivid memory of Hitler and the Hitler analogies started flying thick and fast early on in the way it was presented to the American public that [Saddam Hussein] was the ultimate embodiment of evil.

But Hitler does not ring a bell one way or the other for most Arabs. WW2 was really a European civil war as far as they are concerned. Their memory is of being conquered, held down and exploited by the British and French who are of course our principal western allies in the war. They see it as an indirect kind of Western imperialism that would dominate the region. That’s pretty strong in all states on both sides of the conflict.

The Arab-Israeli conflict is the longstanding centerpiece in Mideast instability and will be for a long time to come. First [is] the Palestinian Arabs who lost their country in 1948 when Israel was set up and who have been fighting for self determination ever since. Then [there is] the question of Israel’s relationship with its neighbors. Egypt is the only one to have a peace treaty with it. This conflict is very closely tied up with the gulf conflict despite the determined attempts of our government to keep the two issues separate. They interlock in every area and a solution to one without seriously looking for a solution to the other is impossible.

Lastly [there is] the rich poor issue. This is an old tension in all society. There is a danger that this conflict is to make the world safe for the rich. I say that because the US is a rich country, the French are, the British are, our allies Germany and Japan all are highly developed, highly industrialized. Even the Soviet Union—which supported the UN resolutions although they’re not involved in the military side of it—is relatively developed. The Saudis, the Kuwaitis, the Emirates, all of these are oil-rich. Egypt and Syria are not rich, and that is why I say the rivalry role is much bigger in determining which side they join.

On the other side, some of the poorest states in the world are those which see Saddam Hussein as a kind of Robin Hood. This would include the Sudan, Yemen, Mauritania, Morocco on the popular level—Libya being a major exception. Another state which doesn’t fit this pattern is Jordan and the strong Jordanian backing for the Iraqis... That comes out of the Palestinian-Israeli clash and the tragedy which befell the Palestinians.

To conclude, then, in thinking about a peace settlement, one has to deal with these memories, not just our memories and analogies. And for the most part, I don’t think our leadership had done this properly on the right level and I don’t feel hopeful about the prospects for this coming out. But if we don’t deal with this we are in danger of the new imperialism big-power dominated world that the opponents of the US have put up as their reason for siding with the Iraqi regime.

Dr. Brady: I’m not an expert in the region but I am concerned about the long term impact in terms of peace and stability in the region. It was pretty clear if you look at the initial US and Coalition deployments early in the crisis, that the deployments were tied to limited objectives, both politically and militarily. President Bush spoke publicly about restoring the sovereignty of Kuwait and the defense of Saudi Arabia. Those goals i.e. the restoration of Kuwait and the defense of Saudi Arabia, clearly projected that if negotiations with Saddam Hussein failed, a limited conflict would ensue. We find ourselves now in a position in which we have deployed many hundreds of thousands of American troops, we have prosecuted the most intensive air campaign in history, and we are on the verge if it has not started already—I haven’t listened to the radio today—of a costly ground campaign. How did that happen?

The answer in my view is clearly not oil. The US and its allies have not sent thousands of soldiers, of whom my son is one, to defend the oil fields. Nor have we sent them to restore what many would argue is a feudalistic system or what was a feudalistic system in Kuwait. The reason for the overwhelming military presence in that part of the world is Saddam Hussein himself.

Publicly US goals and objectives have clearly shifted. However, privately, very early in the crisis many in the US government believed that a satisfactory and enduring solution to the problem was impossible without fundamental change in the Baghdad regime, a regime which possessed huge stocks of chemical weapons and which was clearly on the way to acquiring a nuclear capability.

Last fall, a member of the armed
services committee staff commented to me that we could take Saddam Hussein without the million man army or the million man army without Saddam Hussein but that we couldn’t take both of them because Iraq’s ability to intimidate would remain.

That point of view, which I think was shared by many in government, both on the executive side and in Congress, has clearly now become a public view. It is being expressed much more openly. US policy has obviously shifted from the limited objective, in which, as a military policy, we would be fighting a war that seeks to overthrow the enemy, destroy the military establishment and perhaps even eliminate Saddam Hussein himself. How did that happen?

Some would say it is because we overreacted, perhaps understandably, in the early period, after committing relatively small numbers of troops, we became concerned that they would be vulnerable on the ground in Saudi Arabia. Then we went to a very rapid and some would say uncontrolled escalation of our presence. That presence itself—the size of that presence—pushed us towards the policy of pursuing unlimited objectives. In other words, we have the capability of pursuing unlimited objectives, so that pushes us politically to pursuing unlimited objectives.

Others, however, would argue that what has really pushed us to unlimited objectives, is our impatience and the impatience of some of our allies. The concern that we simply could not wait a year or two or three given the state of affairs in Kuwait. You’ve all read the reports of what has happened—is happening—in Kuwait, in terms of murder, rape, deportation, systematic violation of human rights, the violation of hospitals, the killing of newborn infants, the shooting of doctors—you’ve all read those stories. Many suggest that the Iraqi presence in Kuwait has pushed us toward a policy of focusing on unlimited objectives rather than limited objectives in prosecuting this war.

The argument that many people in the administration would make is that the fault lies in the personality of Saddam Hussein himself. Particularly, in three actions he’s taken over time. First, his use of human shields, which resonated with us in terms of our interests and the interests of our coalition partners. Second, the bombing of innocent civilians in Israel. The absence of an Israeli response to that has pushed us again to more unlimited objectives. Third, Saddam Hussein’s policy of dragging dazed and confused Coalition pilots in front of TV cameras in violation of the Geneva Conventions. All this, has helped to push us, in terms of public opinion, away from the limited objectives with which we entered this crisis, towards the unlimited objective of trying to deal with Saddam Hussein.

Whether this shift is in the long-term interests of the United States is clearly debatable. I think in the short-term my concern with the shift, is that if we are fighting for unlimited objectives in the Gulf, casualties will be very high and the war is likely to go on for a longer period than if we were pursuing more limited objectives. In the long-term, the results of pursuing unlimited objectives might be, as Don suggested, a lasting hatred of the US in the Arab world, and even more that, from the realpolitik side, a power vacuum in the region. The destruction of Iraq may leave us in the position in which we find ourselves five or ten years from now dealing with simply another actor, another country.

It may be easier to win the war if Saddam Hussein is no longer around. I’ve heard an Israeli official quoted on the radio as saying if Saddam Hussein lives, he wins. That is one perspective that is being offered. On the other hand, long-term peace may be more difficult to achieve without Saddam Hussein than with it. And so I would caution us to look at the shift from limited objectives to unlimited objectives. They may enable us to win the war sooner, but they may put us in the position where our long-term objectives are harder to attain.

Dr. Ray: First I would like to say that these panel discussions are a remarkably good idea. It seems to me that the discussions of the war on this campus are in danger of polarizing into pro-war and anti-war camps, with both expressing very simplistic views. There are several positions in the middle which are viable. Let me mention one, Senator Nunn’s position that the war would be justifiable at a certain time, a time which we have not reached.

It think now it is better to make our discussions relevant to the policy realities. The way I would like to approach it is by looking at three failures in our past policy. One is the failure to anticipate the Iraqi takeover of Kuwait. [The second] is our failure to read how Saddam Hussein would read Ambassador Glaspie’s conversation with him. I think it’s more appropriate to say that we sent him a garbled message which he took to be that signal. [The third] was the failure of many policy makers to anticipate the consequences of our very cynical position during the Iran-Iraq war, which was a ghastly and costly war [that was] permitted to go
on 8 years. Our position was basically “It couldn’t have happened to nicer guys.” Henry Kissinger interpreted our position to be that neither side should win.

I think that most of those failures can be traced to a real major blind spot in how the United States views the world. Ethnocentrism perhaps isn’t the right word, but we have a profound difficulty in understanding the situation in third world societies and the perspectives of their peoples. If we don’t make a serious effort to begin to understand those perspectives, we will continue to find the things we’re discussing now at increasingly higher costs.

Let me try to give some examples of to whom I’m referring when I say “we.” The people who make policy are in three groups. The central group is the President and his surrounding advisors. Then there are more peripheral policy makers such as the Congress. With them I would put the attentive, informed public, of whom I hope some of us in this room are a part. Then, [there is] the general public. I don’t mean to be elitist, but I’m trying to be realistic.

I think it’s important for the central policy makers to know something about the cultures and histories of various peoples across the globe. Now I’m not saying that Bush should go out and find out about Arab society and Arab history. At the same time, the United States has had for the last fifty years plenty of people in the national security bureaucracy who know about Arab and Persian culture. My hunch is, however, that our process does not let people with knowledge of foreign cultures into the central decision-making process very often. [If you recall], when the decision to help the French in Indochina in the 50’s was being made it was the European policy experts who made the decision, not the Asian policy experts. And there were on record Asian policy experts who wrote, in an extraordinarily prescient manner, that only someone totally ignorant of Asian realities would pursue such a policy, which we subsequently pursued.

I do think central policy makers need to be more informed of the perspective of the people [with whom they’re dealing.] On a secondary level, I think the peripheral policy makers, especially the informed, attentive public, needs to be better informed of these issues. Congress generally reflects the opinion of the informed public. It is crucial for the informed public to be much more informed, and to exert pressure on the policy makers. The peoples of the third world—the Arabs, Persians, the rest of Asia, Africa, and Latin America—have deep, rich histories, and there are many issues of concern to them. I think we’re really talking about a consequence of viewing the world as bipolar for the last 40 years. It’s very hard to view the world as multipolar. It seems to me that we really don’t have policies for many of these things. Don makes a key point when he talks about Arab resentment of the way the Western colonialism and hegemony, general third world resentment of the way the 20th century was lived. [We sometimes don’t realize] how strong that really is, but anyone who knows anything about these cultures knows that it is the case and it is one of the major factors shaping current political views.

I would say, what would you say about say about us in terms of that memory? I would say how very slightly conscious we are that there could be such a memory. I would say how very slightly conscious we are of people who feel that they have a rich history and that they have been humiliated throughout the past century. I don’t think it would be hard to [project ourselves in an effort to understand this], but we don’t make that effort.

The United States does not have a policy for many of these places, except when a crisis occurs which threatens our strategic interests and I do not think it can continue any longer.

It seems to me that there are a lot of issues that we are going to have to find a position on. For example, as thorny as this, the United States needs to have an activist position on the Israel-Palestinian issue, instead of saying we do not recognize the Occupation of the territories acquired in 1967 yet doing everything else that is de facto recognition of it. I know it’s very difficult to discuss this, yet it’s something we have to do.

Let me say a couple of other things. I would like to underline what Don said about rich-poor issues. There are a number of such issues which have triggered wars around the globe. Rich-poor issue in terms of North and the South, global rich-poor issues. These are the dominant issues in the third world, which makes up 80% of the people of the planet. I don’t think the United States even claims to have a coherent policy on rich-poor issues.

There are also rich-poor issues within the Arab world. They’re much more complicated, but Saddam Hussein, legitimately or not, can strike a chord in denouncing Kuwaiti and Saudi Arabian self-indulgence, Kuwaiti and Saudi Arabian arrogance, Kuwaiti and Saudi Arabian maltreatment of foreign labor force which they employ. I’m not sure what the American position on such issues
should be, but I know that not having one is going to be less and less possible.

It may be possible to not have a policy on these issues in the near future as we have in the past. It will not be possible to avoid it for long. Fifteen years ago, Robert Haufler argued that the division of the world between rich and poor could remain as long as the poor were powerless. However, in a short time, weapons of mass destruction would fall into their hands. When weapons of mass destruction reach the hand of nations with major grievances, the realpolitik view of American strategic interests will require major revision.

The fact that we did not pay attention to the Iran-Iraq war, I mean the attentive public and Congress—I assume the central policy makers did —has very real consequences. The Congress has no idea what the costs of a land war with Iraq would be because it did not attend to the last one. The Congress is surprised that Iraq moved its planes to Iran, even though during the last war it moved its planes to Jordan. It seems to me that the informed public and the Congress need to know a lot more about these issues.

Q. I remember talking to you (Dr. Brady) the day the war started and expressing my surprise that we attacked so soon after the [Jan. 15] deadline. You, however, stated that you were not surprised. Why did you believe that we would attack soon after the deadline?

Dr. Brady: I think that American decision makers probably felt that we should move sooner rather than later because of the rest of the world thought that we would delay a response in order to give Iraq more time to come to a settlement. Additionally, there were other factors like the moon, etc., that are always taken into account.

Primarily, however, we wanted to demonstrate that we were serious about the deadline. You can argue that the deadline never should have been set, but once the deadline was set, the US and its coalition partners really didn't have much choice except to take action once that deadline passed. Because if we had done that, the deadline would have been meaningless.

Q. (about Iraqi claims to Kuwaiti territory)

Dr. Reid: The Iraqi claims do have some basis in fact. During the 19th century what's now Iraq was part of the Ottoman Empire. The Southern province, whose capital was Basra, had claims on Kuwait which were recognized from time to time by the leading amir of the state. The point is there wasn't much there—this was before oil and there was nothing but fishermen and pearl divers—so the Ottomans had no incentive to garrison it. The British started getting involved in the 19th century to protect their routes to India, so [the British] would be a counterweight to the Ottomans. At times, the amir of Kuwait would play the British card against the Ottomans in order to gain more autonomy. In 1899, the tilt became all the way toward the British when Kuwait became a British protectorate and that sort of set it up. That meant when borders were drawn up in the Middle East, Kuwait would become a separate entity.

What validity historical arguments have is a matter of debate. After all, the British used to rule us but we don't recognize their right to come back and rule us. But [the issue you raised] is a fuzzy king of thing to pin down historically.

Q. (about Kurdish autonomy)

Dr. Reid: Well, the Kurds have been one of the biggest losers in the 20th century history of the Middle East. They didn't get their nation-state out of the reorganization of the borders. The territory in which they lived was divided between Turkey, Iraq and Iran, primarily. The Iraqi government has had on again off again fighting with the Kurds and lulls during which the Iraqi government would make arrangements to pacify the Kurds a little bit. That's a long-term problem I don’t see any ideal solution for. No one's pushing self-determination among the big states, but if we believe in that as a principle, then the Kurds are a major population group which ought to exercise that right. Our Turkish allies would be horrified if their ten or twelve million "Turks" were granted that right. Iraq is such an artificial state because of the way the British put it together—the Kurdish population, which never wanted to be in Iraq, and which lived on top of a lot of oil, then Sunni Arabs, one stream of Islam, and a block of Shi'Arabs in the south. The whole thing could fall apart quite easily, as has been suggested, leaving a vacuum.

Q. Dr. Jonathan Schneer (a professor in the Department of History, Science and Technology) at Ga. Tech: Linda (Brady), I was struck by you point that American policy is being driven in part by a focus on a single individual, namely, Saddam Hussein. Speaking as a historian, I know that individuals make history. But I also know as much as I know anything, that single individuals are not nearly as important in the ultimate sense as forces and powers and trends and so on. Is this concern for Saddam Hussein really driving American policy?

Dr. Brady: The problem with trying to understand what drives American policy is that most people who have
been part of the policy making process come out of it even more confused than when they came in. What drives policy varies dramatically—it depends upon the issues, whether or not it’s an election year, who happens to be President and what are priorities. I find it very hard to say that x and y and b drive policy or that they operate in the same way across issues across time.

With respect to the Gulf, I would disagree with what David said about us never having a policy in that region. During the Carter administration, we did have a policy. During the Carter and Reagan administrations, the policy was the containment of the Soviet Union. That was the concern which drove everything we did, the creation of the Rapid Deployment Force, the US Central Command—which was not designed to fight another Arab state but instead the Soviet Union. So we had a policy. We weren’t looking at the region the same way the regional experts were, and that was why we had such difficulties negotiating security agreements with these countries. We were going to the Saudis and telling them that the major threat to their security was the Soviet Union and they would look at us and laugh....I think Saddam Hussein has become a convenient symbol for the Administration to use, in terms of what our focus is—certainly after the Scud attacks on Israel and the pictures of the coalition pilots on TV. It may become useful politically to focus on Saddam Hussein. But I think it is clear that many issues and concerns affect policy formation, only one of which is to get Saddam Hussein.

Q. Some time ago, I attended a panel discussion similar to this one at Princeton, where they had five former Chiefs of Staff give presentations. At the end, the one thing that was common among all five was that they all said they spent the first three and a half years trying to correct the mistakes of their predecessors. What do you think are the chances that some kind of cultural understanding will emerge from the current situation?

Dr. Reid: I’m not hopeful. I see American policy as oriented towards Western Europe and now towards Japan and the Pacific. For the Middle East, the Arab-Israeli conflict and the oil have been the primary concerns. I think Secretary of State [James] Baker is a skilled negotiator, but his skill and his background is in American domestic issues. I do think the people in the US government who do know something about regional issues are often unable to get their views through the screen, into the inner circle. Their career often suffers if they are too far out of line with what’s coming up from the top. The only hope that I would have is a long-term education process for all of us. At Georgia State, for example, we’ve changed over to having one of the required courses being a world civilization course instead of a Western civilization course.

Dr. Brady: The problem is that if you are the decision maker and you are confronted with a lot of fires and you want to look long-term, then how do you know what questions to ask? You’re confronted with an array of information from the bureaucracy; what bits of information are those which you’ll need to know next week, next month, next year? How do you make those judgments? It’s hard to make them before the fact. Moreover, policy makers deal with a variety of issues, while experts deal with just one. If you’re a smart decision maker you go to the bureaucracy to find someone to help you deal with it. Before you know an issue is an issue, how do you know what to look for?
The Iraqi Nuclear "Threat"

by Ayman Fadel

When the administration claimed that Iraq might be able to manufacture a nuclear bomb within six months to a year, it failed to mention the assumptions the intelligence community used to come to this conclusion. Michael Wines writes in the November 30 New York Times ("US Lacking Solid Data on Iraqi Nuclear Threat") that it assumed "that Iraq will mount a crash program to build a bomb; that it will use its only known stocks of enriched uranium, which were inspected by international officials last week and deemed intact, and that Iraq possesses advanced bomb-making technology."

Moreover, the intelligence report upon which President Bush bases his fear of Iraqi nukes concludes that the resulting bomb would be low-yield, too bulky to deliver by missile or even by aircraft, and might not detonate.

Instead, most experts, according to Wines, believe that Iraq is "seeking to develop an independent ability to make many bombs, assembly-line style." Some suggest that Iraq is three to five years away from achieving that goal, while others estimate that it will take about a decade. If the blockade had been allowed to continue, this time period might have increased further.

According to Malcolm W. Browne (New York Times, November 28, 1990), Iraq is believed to have built some of the gas centrifuges necessary for separating fissionable uranium 235 from its inert isotope, uranium 238. Although it cannot have built more than a few so far, in two to ten years it might be able to construct the thousand or more necessary to produce enough bomb-grade uranium to manufacture 1 to 1.5 warheads per year.

This information indicates that we should not have feared an Iraqi nuclear attack this year; moreover, since international inspections of the reactor fuel recovered from the destroyed Osirak reactor occur every six months, we would have been able to react to any Iraqi move to manufacture a bomb from this fuel.

As for the long-term threat, there were many ways besides war to convince the Iraqi government that nuclear proliferation is not in its interest. The first would be to negotiate a regional nuclear free zone which would include the area's other nuclear power, Israel. The second would be for the nuclear powers of today to take seriously their obligations as signatories of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Besides subjecting non-nuclear countries to periodic inspections, the Non-Proliferation Treaty mandates that countries make widely available the technology of nuclear energy's peaceful uses. It also mandates that those countries with nuclear weapons make serious reductions in their arsenals.

Most importantly, however, is the necessity of a frank discussion of the United States' non-proliferation goals themselves. It is only a matter of time before all countries have the ability to produce nuclear weapons; will we have to fight wars continuously to make sure no more countries develop weapons we already possess in such large number, especially when such a policy will inevitably convince more nations that their independence is guaranteed only by the possession of nuclear weapons?

When the Soviet Union first developed nuclear weapons, nobody believed it could handle nuclear weapons "responsibly," like we were able to do. But at least the Russians are Europeans. Then, when China exploded its first nuclear device, we were faced with the frightening prospect of non-industrialized, non-European communists with nuclear weapons. To everyone's surprise, the Chinese have been able so far to avoid using nuclear weapons.

It seems reasonable to believe that every country that comes to possess nuclear weapons will discover the same limitations which have prevented the current nuclear powers from their use after World War II: the fear of retaliation, and more importantly, the destruction of the very prize one sought to gain from use of the bomb.
"We ARCO mining to kick your ass."

"BP is to be prepared. Failing that, strategy is to reengage. Our best solution is reached. Our best
vital interests in the Persian Gulf Mobilize to meet this threat to
Hussein for his actions. We will
"We shall not Exonerate Sadam"
Blood Tanned Sand

Masters of your own fate,
The yells and screams are faint.
Fighting for a lost cause,
You don't know where you'll fall.
Why fight for a home land,
You can all be one band.

Children die in a fire,
Border line crossed with barbed wire.
Country line scrimishes,
More people die with a murmur.
Dark bodies on the tan sand,
They tried their best for a last stand.

With a bomb blast and a cry,
Political parties kill another,
There's no way to save your brother.
Religious mad man screams you down,
Send fanatic followers for a last stand,
All for a fiery death on blood tanned sand.

In the dark
I cannot see anything
That is good
Sometimes
I don't want to see
So I seek the dark
Covers it all
Black silk perfection
With little pinholes for stars
And a big hole
For the moon.

C.A.

Sam Hooper
August 1986
As a college student, I didn't think that a national recession would affect me, but soon enough I found myself on a plane, flying home. Lack of funds was my excuse, and it wasn't a unique one; thousands of students were dropping out, their bonds inflated out of existence, their accounts in the red, their stocks nonexistent, or their parents just plain broke, like mine.

Nebraska had never been a very colorful or memorable state; it was just another patch in the quilt that made up the U.S. farm belt, but since the droughts had hit, it had become a wasteland, full of memories and empty grain elevators.

When my plane landed, a Continental 737, I trudged out to the terminal, dragging four bags and an old song in my head. My mom picked me up in our pick-up truck. She had packed me a sandwich which I ate on our two hour trip home.

All I could do was stare at the empty fields. Thousands upon thousands of acres of dust and dirt rolling away from the road, which was being captured by the dust, swallowed by it. You couldn't see the white lines on either side of the highway, and the shoulders were dunes of grey dust. Every now and then we passed a few acres of deserted farmland, the two year old corn stalks, each about a foot high, leaning in all directions. It was a scene of death; miles of rough, brownish-grey fields, the stalks half decomposed due to lack of water. They served one useful purpose: they kept a weak hold on the soil - the useless soil that had once fed a nation, as John Cougar once said, and didn't say anymore.

No one bitched about mortgages, because the banks had collapsed. There weren't any more farm auctions - no one was buying. The farms were in a state of mere human survival. The ham sandwich that I was eating was made with pork slaughtered over a year before and frozen; supplies were beginning to run out.

My mom kept a close eye on the gas tank, grimacing at the way our Ford guzzled gas. Exxon's prices had topped out at ten-ninety a gallon, and stopped only by the government's price freezes, but that had only caused plateaus in the prices; every month the prices went up a couple of cents.

I hungered for green. The sky was grey and overcast (0% chance of rain), the ground was grey and brown, and the asphalt was charcoal grey, a bright, double yellow line the only color contrast to be found.

The sun was a glowing, steel grey ball floating at the top of the sky. A delicate, pencil thin line of wavering heat defined the horizon. I made a game of counting the mile markers and signs. Nearly all of them were pocked with bullet holes, victims of the rage that lurked just beneath the surface of everyone's calm desperation.

"I'm sorry you had to leave school, John," my mother said with a ball of emotion choking her words, "But your father and I..."

"It's okay, Mom," I said, following the Nelson Farm to my right out the window. It doubled in my vision, but I fought the tears down.

We pulled into Ace Hardware at two o'clock to get some groceries. The market had closed down three months ago, my mom said, so Art Greenbaum had taken up the duty of supplying our area with food. His was the only surviving business within a hundred mile radius. Ace Hardware had become the local gas station/grocery store/farm supply store/bank/clothing store. Art was losing money in the process of keeping our little town, if it could be called that, alive. He was a great old veteran of two wars and numerous attacks on his livelihood. Art was small, stubborn nature, and bad jokes were a commodity in such times, and he didn't worry about pulling through this depression at least he didn't show it.

We pulled into Art's parking lot, our truck's wheels sliding in the dust and gravel, but safely bringing us to a stop in front of the store. Mom and I got out of the truck, and she handed me some change for our weekly paper. Dad had had the foresight to hock all of our luxuries like the TV, VCR, stereo, and air conditioner before the depression hit the cities, so the paper was our only source of news; we really didn't need one - all the news was either bad or distorted not to look so bad.

Art's dog was lying in front of the door that said, "Please Use Other Door." The mutt's ribs were showing through its matted, gray coat, but as we approached, it recognized me and my mom and wagged its tail in anticipation of some TLC.

"Hey, Sam," my mom said in an infantile, cutesy voice. Sam's tail wagged more vigorously.

I bent over and rubbed his stomach while my mom went into the store. The door's jingle chimed magically, reminding me invariably of Christmas, but it was June and hotter than a pig's balls on a tin roof.

Sam rolled over, exposing as much of his belly as possible when I rubbed it. I found myself speaking in that cutesy voice to him, so I thumped him a few times on the side and went into the store. Sam lay back down, stretching lazily first, and then resuming his nap.

Art and Mom were conversing about the price of gas, but she ordered our regular five gallons (to be delivered within four to six weeks despite the twenty cent price hike). For my trip, my mom had dipped once again into our savings in order to buy enough gas just to pick me up from the airport, let alone pay for the flight.

I walked over to the magazine rack where I had spent many teenage afternoon browsing over the Playboys, Pentouses, and Hustlers, and found it surprisingly bare. Only the old standards remained: Time, Newsweek, Better Homes and Gardens, and The Inquirer; they seemed mocked the stand's emptiness, barely filling one of the three, double telescopes.

I grabbed a Time and leafed through it, finding nothing of particular interest. The door chime twinkled in my ear, followed by the heavy fall of two pairs of engineer boots. I was reading the introduction to an article on "The continuing Middle East conflict" when my mom screamed.

I ducked out of instinct, and then slowly rose, turning toward the front of the store. Two people at my mom's side were each pointing out at Art's chest. One was wearing a long coat, so I couldn't see much of him.

The other was a tall, well built man in his early twenties. His dark, tangled hair and tanned face gave him a look of savage independence. He wore badly faded and worn jeans and a red flannel shirt open at the chest.
For You
You know I want you too much
I can taste the want
Roll it on my tongue and
Savor each agonizing flavor.

It's like an everlasting candy
gum-drop-never diminishing.
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"Hand over the money," the dark haired man said calmly to Art,
"and we won't hurt either of you."

My mom was whimpering in the blonde haired man's grip; he
had her by the back of the neck. Soon his gun left Art's chest and directed
itself at my mom's head. I kept dead quiet, watching Art's gripping
transaction as he emptied his barren cash register.

"The checks too, please." the blonde guy said. The serious, but
cool note in both men's voices led me to believe that they performed this
little act often. They were as smooth as method actors, not overplaying the
robbery for anything besides the deed at hand.

Art's complaining rose in volume and pitch until I could make out
what he was saying:

"Goddamn commie bumkins robbin' the people who feed you, and
then spittin' in their faces, and don't thank anyone, but take for granted
everything this country has given you, and givin' nothin' in return! I fought
for your spoiled butts in WWII and Korea, killing fine slanted eye folks for
your ungrateful benefit so you can do what? Rob me?" Art was saying this
while he methodically filled a paper sack with his cash.

The robbers merely stood there, taking his verbal lashing, not
wanting any trouble from the old man, just his money. Everything would
have been fine if our neighbor's truck hadn't pulled into the lot and parked
beside ours.

Things happened awfully fast after the robbers looked away
from Art, who took advantage of their surprise by pulling his 44-Magnum
from beneath the counter. The blonde guy yelled, pointing and firing his
revolver at Art, sending the old man into the potato chips, cigarettes, and
snuff racks. Art didn't even get off a shot.

My mom hit the floor, the dark haired robber had already gone
to the door, watching Mr. Harding pull his rifle from its rack in the truck's
back window. I felt like warning him, but I was too scared to move or speak.

The blonde guy took one look at my prone mother and joined his
partner at the window. Sam scooted away from the store with his tail
between his legs. Mr. Harding was out of his truck and just getting his rifle
loaded when the robbers threw open the front door and opened up on him.

Only four shots were fired: three from the robbers, all direct hits
through the truck's open door window, and one shot as my neighbor's rifle
fired, shattering the truck's windshield, making a three inch hole and
leaving a spider web of tiny cracks throughout its length.

The robbers re-entered the store, grabbed their bag of money,
and took a few bottles of water. I crawled on my hands and knees to the
front of the store as quietly as possible; I could hear my mother sobbing
and the robbers talking in short volleys of speech.

"Just stay down, ma'am, and we won't hurt you, okay?" the
blonde man asked sincerely.

I peeped over a sack of fertilizer out the front window. The
robbers got into a faded red '69 Barracuda with a black vinyl roof. It was
a beautiful, yet appropriate artifact from a better time when cars could
guzzel gas at their leisure and the drivers' pleasure.

The car spun its wide tires in reverse, peppering the store's front
with gravel and throwing up a considerable amount of dust. The red
machine turned in its smoke screen of grey dust, switching gears without
stopping and shooting a rooster tail into the air like a rocket taking off.

I went over to my mom, made sure she was okay, and ran out
the front of the store. Down the highway, the red Barracuda was speeding
away, leaving behind it a billowing cloud of dust that expanded, rolled, and
hung in the still, hot air for over fifteen minutes.

Sam walked painfully up to my knee and leaned against it a little.
I bent over and scratched his brown fur, but he returned to his napping
place, sniffed at the store's front door, whined for a few seconds, and then
reclined carefully. Sam's eyes blinked twice and closed. They never
opened again.
Skater Dude, Oh Skater Dude

T. Fike

Skater dude, you've got elbow pads, knee pads, and a helmet to protect you from a bump.
You're so cavalier as you do 720's or speed down a ramp you want to jump.
But skater dude, there's something I must tell you my little friend,
As Oedipus once learned, pride comes before downfall in the end.
So beware! There's one place unprotected; you may just fall and break your rump!
by Beth Morris
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Conversions
a mini-parable from a possible future

by Cary McKeown

I've changed, in frightening and evil ways but it was my
decision the only choice left, kill or be kill. You could say Doctor Morgan
recruited me for his plan, I suppose, but the really important transformation
had already taken place long before. The physical modifications he's
made are just the final details.

Ironic that I was happy when I was slowly dying of progressive
and irreversible muscle degeneration while now, when I'm stronger,
healthier, and tougher than any dozen bodybuilders put together, love is
only a memory and anger is what keeps me going on.

Love to hate... was the key change. THEY did that to Dr.
Morgan and I, that led to this; my body's been refashioned from
the molecular level on up, bioengineered enhancements have honed me to a
cutting-edge weapon.

I remember love and happiness. Jim, my husband and true-love,
who I found at long last and shared eight years with; you were my man
and I was yours. We both died when you were killed. Tommy, the raging
'old' queen who made our neighborhood a family and flamed a little light
and love into all our lives. David, the 'baby' everyone mothered, at
sixteen he'd run away from home and came into our lives with haunted
eyes and a big heart. How excited he was when he and Michael started
dating, he had to come tell us and there were hardly any shadows in his
bright eyes that night! It didn't matter that I was dying; everyone dies, I
had less time than most but I also had these friends and family, who made
my life full and complete. I had friends and family until others bashed and
broke everything I'd ever known that was good and pure; Jim and Tommy
and David and Joan and others everywhere—. The law said it was alright
to take that from us, the churches said it was a glory to God, and the People
... cheered. That converted me, Dr. Morgan learned righteous fury in this
way as well so the scholar and healer envisioned the weapons that were
needed. He took those who asked and reforged our bodies into tools
suitable for our wrath. We became avenging angels from Tom of
Finland's wet dreams or more subtle war machines, because like him we
all finally pleaded, 'Love and Hatred give me strength, someone is going
to pay for this!'

Now we've bashed and broken the old law, crucified churches
that preached hate and called it love, and the people are like Nietzsche's
worm oppressed by the iron fist of the ubermensch we've become. This
doesn't make me happy, but I hope that by the time we're through we can
make a truly free and good world, where boys and girls with eyes full of
bright love can only wonder why mine have so many secret shadows.
WILL LEAVE YOU SPEECHLESS

CAN YOU MAKE IT TO YOUR NEXT PAYDAY?

But Your Excellency, we've found a better way to put the world at your command.

This is heavy shit.

motherf*cker, one stinging shazam that cannot be ignored.
by Scott D. Orr

She walked in.
She was wearing a white dress with a long skirt and a smattering of lace, and with white pumps and white hose and her white skin there was nothing to distract from the color of her deep blue eyes. Except her hair. It was straight red hair pulled back in a girlish ponytail and tied with a bright red ribbon. She was the epitome of sweetness and light.
She walked in and we ignored each other; there is something exquisitely satisfying about mutual hate.

She sat down with a feminine flourish and leaned back and closed her eyes. It was a chance meeting and I was under no obligation to even recognize her, but unfortunately that didn't stop me from peering over the edge of the chasm.

"And how are you today, Angelina?"
She affected an expression of slight annoyance and replied, charmingly, "Is it any of your goddammed business?"
Encouraged by this response, I pressed further: "Are we upset today? Did we lose the election for president of our precious sorority?"
"They haven't counted the votes yet—I just don't want to talk to you."
"That's all right. I'm sure you smiled and lied through your teeth and they all loved you and elected you by a landslide."
She smiled. "Of course they loved me; I'm thoroughly lovable, unlike you."
"Indeed, you're the most lovable sliver of ice with which I'm acquainted."
She smiled a wintry smile and said, "Fuck you." God, she was beautiful.
I smiled back.
She inquired in her most genteel voice, "I trust they kicked you out of the interview?"
"Sorry, but I got the scholarship; I'm going to go to law school without paying a penny."
"It's a pity the money couldn't go to someone deserving."
"I know, but what can I do?"
She managed a pretty little grimace. She uncrossed her legs and leaned forward and looked me in the eye. "I hate you."
"I know. I hate you too."
She leaned back and closed her eyes again and was dead to the world, especially me. It was time, so I got up and left. One last glance at her face confirmed what I already knew: she was smiling.
oh
not you again
dirt is nice
but sometimes bugs crawl in it
my closet light
puts weird shapes on my wall
how do they
make jello anyway
oh
shut up

C.A.

by Beth Morris
SOMETHING LIKE A DREAM

by Zuzanna Thomas

You came when I was about to read a borrowed book. I got a little angry because I wanted to have the afternoon to myself; however, I tried to be polite, and I invited you in. Your hair and dress were wet, but you smiled so tenderly that those defects added to your beauty. You sat down on my favorite chair and looked at me.

I had known you only a short time, maybe one week, maybe two, but I was just an ordinary boy and wasn't interested in you. You were only my friend's sister, whom I helped to study math. Unexpectedly, you came without an invitation and also with no interest in a math lesson.

"Tell me something nice," you whispered into a hesitated silence and interrupted my thoughts. You smiled at me while I was looking at your wavy wet hair. I heard your words in my ears, but what should I have said to you? Should I have told you about my landlady, who had gotten angry with my late rent payment? Or about my intentions to read a book?

"Tell me something nice," you whispered and smiled at me again. What should I have said to you at that moment? I have a good mind to throw you out, tell you, 'Give me a break,' and not to think about you. I paused for a while. I noticed your eyes. I wasn't interested in them before, but in that moment I saw how beautiful they were. They were so large and keen that I felt my skin crawl. I stood near you and looked at you carefully. You smiled at me and waited for 'something nice', and I thought about you instead. Who were you? Why were you here? I wished you had never left my room. I knew that I should have told you something nice, but what? I had no idea what to say.

You didn't wait long; you stood up and left my room slowly, without words, only closing the door softly. I didn't know what happened with me. I sat down on the chair, where you sat before. It felt damp from your wet dress, and it held your sweet smell.

Something made me stand up, and I run onto the balcony. It was raining, but I didn't notice the rain; I only looked for you immediately, you were so small. I was surprised by my voice when I shouted at you, "I loooove youuu!"

About one hour later I tried to call up my friend. I wanted to talk with him about you, but his broken-hearted voice surprised me. Instead of his usual greeting, he said, "My sister... had an accident... yesterday... and died..."
AIDS: Matter of Life and Death

by Cary McKeown

FYI: No, I do not have AIDS nor am I HIV positive. I wrote this article essentially as a public service because, being gay, I have become fairly well-informed about this topic. Everyone should, yet apparently few students take advantage of the AIDS awareness programs, developed by Tech’s AIDS Task Force. I hope this article will provide some motivation for more people to educate themselves and then use that education to protect themselves.

So, here’s why AIDS is important to you.

In 1989, approximately 2,000 babies were born infected with HIV in the U.S. When the Names Project Quilt started in October of 1988, it had 8,288 panels representing persons who died of AIDS; today there are over 13,500 panels in that quilt and it is still growing (Actually it is somewhat contrary to the Quilt’s purpose to say that, the Names project is to remind us that people, with names and lives of their own are dying, not numbers). The CDC estimates that each year as many as 40,000 adolescents and young adults (i.e. people the age of most Tech undergrads) become HIV infected in the U.S. To date nearly 100,000 Americans have died of AIDS*, many more than were killed in the entire Vietnam conflict. (*Mostly around their mid-thirties, i.e. most productive years for those of you who want to keep track of the economic cost.) The CDC estimates that around 165,000 Americans currently have AIDS (the final stages of the disease progression), and that a total of about 1 million Americans and 10 million people worldwide are infected with HIV. According to CDC estimates, as of winter quarter 1989 Tech probably had 35 to 42 employees and 65 to 72 students infected with HIV. These last numbers aren’t very large (now) unless of course you and/or someone you’ve been intimate with help make them up.

You can become infected by using a hypodermic needle after someone who is infected without sterilizing it first, by receiving contaminated blood or blood products (Screening and testing make this rare now and you CANNOT become infected by donating blood, those needles are sterile and used only once.), or by having unprotected sex (even just once) with someone who is infected. Heterosexuals are NOT immune or safe, in fact they currently have the highest rate of increase in infection with women being particularly at risk. The only other major risk is being born to an infected mother. You cannot be infected by swimming in a public pool, shaking someone’s hand, or other casual contact. If you like yourself become informed and learn how to be safe, ignorance is deadly.

Contact the Office of Human Relation, phone # 894-8337 for information.

Most statistics in this article are taken from “The Disease Detectives,” an article in the January 1991 issue of National Geographic, vol. 179 #1.
AN OPEN LETTER TO SIGMA ALPHA EPSILON FRATERNITY AND THE STUDENTS OF GEORGIA TECH

by Joshua D. Reiss

On the night of Saturday, January 12th, Georgia Tech student and SAE fraternity member Mike Adam drowned in a lake at Piedmont Park. This is known fact. What is not known, however, are the events surrounding his death. It appears that there may be students at Tech who have information pertaining to the case but have not yet revealed it. It also appears that there are forces at work actively suppressing attempts to investigate the circumstances of Michael Adam’s drowning.

Before Adam’s died he had been drinking at the SAE fraternity house, and had attended a concert with his fraternity brothers. They could possibly provide information related to the case, yet the fraternity wouldn’t grant a reporter’s request to talk with anyone who was with Adams that night. Police interviews with fraternity brothers were also inconclusive, as they turned up numerous conflicting stories.

Adam was last reported seen on 11th street in an argument with two Georgia Tech students. The information those students have may prove vital to understanding what happened that Saturday night, yet as of this writing they had not told their story to the police.

Many students believe that, as an initiation ritual, the SAEs throw their pledges in the lake at Piedmont Park, the same lake that Adams drowned in. The police believe this also, yet the SAEs deny it. Why the discrepancy? And peculiarly, reports that Adams was missing appeared well before (the next day) a college student’s absence in similar cases has been noted. By Sunday afternoon, there were already missing persons posters on campus. Many students at Tech may go missing for several days without a single raised eyebrow.

On Wednesday, February 20th, the Atlanta weekly newspaper, Creative Loafing, hit the stands with a cover story concerning Adam’s death. Hundreds of copies (a conservative estimate) of the newspaper were stolen off the shelves. On Thursday morning, several people were seen bringing a truckload full of Creative Loafings into the SAE fraternity house. Georgia Tech administrators have also confirmed this.

I do not have a personal vendetta against the SAEs, nor do I delight in frat-bashing. However, it seems that SAE brothers and perhaps other students may not have told the whole truth about what happened that night. Fraternities pride themselves on the bonds of friendship that are formed between their members. The SAEs have earned respect for their community service and campus leadership. They set high and admirable standards for their members to uphold and maintain. I speak to the brothers of Sigma Alpha Epsilon fraternity- you owe it to the memory of Michael Adams to disclose all information relating to his death. Do not desecrate that memory with conflicting stories, or through denials, or by suppressing information.

Anyone having information pertaining to Michael Adams’ drowning please call Detective R. Richardson of the Atlanta Police Department at (404) 658-6818.

(Information for this article is taken from Creative Loafing, the Atlanta P. D., personal accounts, and the Georgia Tech administration)
The electronic community in action:
a success story.

Relayed to you by David Burgess.
[My own comments are in brackets like these.]

GREAT! So not only do they have the
audacity to print an estimate of your income (which
could be quite damaging if they get it wrong, and is
an intrusion into your privacy if they get it right),
they also have space on the disk for arbitrary
comments about you — and they’ll be selling this
data in volume to mass marketing companies across
the country!

In interviews, Lotus has said that individuals
will NOT be able to correct their own entries, or even
see what they are. I didn’t try to confirm this in my
call to Lotus, but I did confirm that the person who
reported it — Rich Salz of BBN — has an excellent
reputation on the internet. Also, everything he said
that I checked with Lotus is absolutely accurate.
Further, the Wall Street Journal has reported on it —
saying that the database has ages, marital status,
and other such personal data as well.

So I believe it, and you should to, since it is going to
affect your life. Remember — a database of 120
million US residents comes to almost half the people
in the country. Considering that the database is
probably biased toward those with higher incomes,
the chances are *really good* that anyone able
electronically read this message is in the database.

What can you do about it? A couple of things. Lotus has said that they’ll omit from their
database anyone who asks. Therefore, start by
writing to the address below. Tell them that you
don’t want to be in the database, and tell them
exactly what you think of their database. I’ve
 appended a copy of my letter to Lotus for an example.

Second, pass this message along to anyone
whom you think might care. To me, this is not just
a matter of privacy. Lotus is going to sell information
behind our backs — we are not allowed to dispute
their data or even know what it is. Worse, Lotus is
continued on next page...
privacy because of its low cost, ease of use and lack of effective safeguards over who ultimately has access to it and why. They also say that the way it is designed allows users to ask a series of increasingly specific questions about small subgroups of people—identifying, for example, unmarried, wealthy women over 65 in a neighborhood. "They've crossed the line," says Marc Rotenberg, Washington director for the nonprofit Computer Professionals for Social Responsibility [a generally cool group]. "It simply shouldn't be allowed on the market." Lotus counters that the product, still under development, has been tailored to address privacy concerns. No phone numbers will be included, it won't be available in retail stores and it will be sold only to "legitimate businesses" [anyone with nice letterheads] at verified addresses checked against a "fraud file," [anyone they haven't heard of yet] Lotus says. A contract will specifically limit its use and provide penalties for abuses. Owners will be be allowed unlimited use of the names and addresses they buy, at a cost of $695 initially for the program plus 5,000 names and $400 for each additional 5,000 names [$9.6M for the set].

For what it's worth, here's the word from lotus....

Lotus - New program spurs fears privacy could be undermined

Privacy advocates are raising the alarm about a new Lotus product that lists names, addresses, shopping habits and likely income levels for some 80 million U.S. households. Due for release early next year, Lotus Marketplace packs the data on palm-sized compact disks aimed at small and mid-sized businesses that want to do inexpensive, targeted direct-mail marketing. But critics say the product is just too good. "It's going to change the whole ball game," says Mary Culnan, an associate professor at Georgetown University's School of Business Administration. "This is a big step toward people completely losing control of how, and by whom, personal information is used." Janlori Goldman, a staff attorney with the American Civil Liberties Union, adds that the product raises "serious legal and ethical questions." Lotus' critics concede that the product offers little more than is already available from established mailing-list brokers. But they say it is a greater potential threat to personal privacy because of its low cost, ease of use and lack of effective safeguards over who ultimately has access to it and why. They also say that the way it is designed allows users to ask a series of increasingly specific questions about small subgroups of people—identifying, for example, unmarried, wealthy women over 65 in a neighborhood. "They've crossed the line," says Marc Rotenberg, Washington director for the nonprofit Computer Professionals for Social Responsibility [a generally cool group]. "It simply shouldn't be allowed on the market." Lotus counters that the product, still under development, has been tailored to address privacy concerns. No phone numbers will be included, it won't be available in retail stores and it will be sold only to "legitimate businesses" [anyone with nice letterheads] at verified addresses checked against a "fraud file," [anyone they haven't heard of yet] Lotus says. A contract will specifically limit its use and provide penalties for abuses. Owners will be be allowed unlimited use of the names and addresses they buy, at a cost of $695 initially for the program plus 5,000 names and $400 for each additional 5,000 names [$9.6M for the set].

For what it's worth, here's the word from lotus....

Lotus - New program spurs fears privacy could be undermined

Privacy advocates are raising the alarm about a new Lotus product that lists names, addresses, shopping habits and likely income levels for some 80 million U.S. households. Due for release early next year, Lotus Marketplace packs the data on palm-sized compact disks aimed at small and mid-sized businesses that want to do inexpensive, targeted direct-mail marketing. But critics say the product is just too good. "It's going to change the whole ball game," says Mary Culnan, an associate professor at Georgetown University's School of Business Administration. "This is a big step toward people completely losing control of how, and by whom, personal information is used." Janlori Goldman, a staff attorney with the American Civil Liberties Union, adds that the product raises "serious legal and ethical questions." Lotus' critics concede that the product offers little more than is already available from established mailing-list brokers. But they say it is a greater potential threat to personal privacy because of its low cost, ease of use and lack of effective safeguards over who ultimately has access to it and why. They also say that the way it is designed allows users to ask a series of increasingly specific questions about small subgroups of people—identifying, for example, unmarried, wealthy women over 65 in a neighborhood. "They've crossed the line," says Marc Rotenberg, Washington director for the nonprofit Computer Professionals for Social Responsibility [a generally cool group]. "It simply shouldn't be allowed on the market." Lotus counters that the product, still under development, has been tailored to address privacy concerns. No phone numbers will be included, it won't be available in retail stores and it will be sold only to "legitimate businesses" [anyone with nice letterheads] at verified addresses checked against a "fraud file," [anyone they haven't heard of yet] Lotus says. A contract will specifically limit its use and provide penalties for abuses. Owners will be be allowed unlimited use of the names and addresses they buy, at a cost of $695 initially for the program plus 5,000 names and $400 for each additional 5,000 names [$9.6M for the set].
traditional industry practices for consumer privacy protection. Besides limiting the data to what is readily available as a matter of public record, Census data profiling, and similar sources most people can already access, we have taken three additional and important steps: 1) we are offering the product only to legitimate businesses [letterheads, remember?]; 2) we are providing consumers with an option to have their names removed from the database [if they ever find out about it]; and 3) we are educating and advising users of the proper legal and ethical responsibilities for list usage [big deal, Capt. Corporate Ethics].

What's in Lotus MarketPlace: Households, Name, Address, Age range, Gender, Marital status, Dwelling type, Estimated neighborhood income (based on neighborhood average at the 9-digit zip code level), Neighborhood lifestyle.

What's not in Lotus MarketPlace: Households, Telephone numbers, Individual credit data (number of credit cards, spending levels, balances, etc.), An individual's purchase history, An individual's actual income, An individual's actual age.

Lotus MarketPlace: Households does not include individual credit data and thus cannot be used to determine the credit worthiness of an individual.

Privacy Safeguards: Product Features: No telephone numbers, Inability to directly look up a single name, Ability to print/export names and addresses only (versus full records), Elderly people aggregated into a category "65 and older," Database includes decoy names that will receive sample mailings, Direct Marketing Association guidelines inserted into retail package.

Privacy Safeguards: Purchase Process: Only sample data included in retail package, Signed data order form completed by purchaser, Software license agreement outlines prohibited uses of the product, Product sold only to registered businesses, Approval and verification process of purchaser conducted prior to delivery of actual data discs.

Consumer Name Removal Options: Consumers can "opt out" of the Lotus MarketPlace: Households database by doing one of two things: Write the Direct Marketing Association's Mail Preference Service to remove their names from MarketPlace and from all other lists that participate in this nationwide service at:

Direct Marketing Association's Mail Preference Service P.O. Box 3861 / New York, NY 10163-3861.

Write Lotus with a request to remove their names from Lotus MarketPlace: Households at:

Lotus Development Corporation MarketPlace Name Removal Service 55 Cambridge Parkway Cambridge, MA 02142

To expedite accurate name removal from MarketPlace, individuals should include the following information in their correspondence: name, address, social security number, and signature.

Because MarketPlace is a subscription-based product that will be updated quarterly, the name-removal process will be ongoing and open to consumers at their discretion. Because of the normal turnover in the data, it is expected that a majority of MarketPlace users will elect the subscription option, thereby minimizing the amount of "old" MarketPlace information in use.

Chances are that if a consumer is included in the MarketPlace database, he/she is included in many other databases and lists. Consumers concerned with being on any lists should therefore direct their name removal requests to the DMA.

Direct Marketing Association's Ethical Guidelines: Lotus endorses and strongly encourages adherence by users to the DMA's guidelines for ethical direct marketing. These guidelines are included in the product's documentation.

While MarketPlace is perceived as breaking new ground in its use of CD-ROM and the personal computer to deliver mailing lists, all of the information in MarketPlace is already available through other published sources. Lotus believes that the product controls in place preserve consumer privacy while providing information and new technology essential to the growth of U.S. businesses.

We hope that this clarifies any questions or concerns.

End Lotus Statement

From: andre@ai.mit.edu (Andre' DeHon)

...sometimes, consumer complaints are
Lotus has cancelled its Marketplace produce, i.e. the CD-ROM database everyone’s been flaming about. Apparently, the complaining helped.

According to a second hand report on what was said on NPR this morning, the Residential one was canceled due to 30,000 complaints.

TO: All Lotus Employees
FROM: Jim Manzi
SUBJECT: Lotus MarketPlace Cancellation
DATE: 23 January 1991

Lotus announced today the cancellation of the Lotus MarketPlace: Households product that was scheduled to ship in March. As most of you know, the product has been the subject of controversy since its introduction last spring. Over the last couple of months, the volume of calls and letters to Lotus has been growing exponentially. At last count we had received more than 30,000 calls to our name removal service, including calls from customers, vendors and others in the industry.

Despite the data content and controls built into the product, public concern about the product has persisted. Looking ahead, estimated costs associated with maintaining the name removal service and educating consumers are significant. For these reasons, we have decided not to proceed with the Households product. In addition, we will discontinue Lotus MarketPlace: Business, since with the cancellation of the Households product the viability of the Business product is questionable. Current Business customers will be promptly notified and receive a full refund.

Unfortunately, we feel the majority of concern over the Households product has been generated by misinformation about the product’s content and a general lack of understanding about the direct marketing industry. From the very beginning, Lotus and its data partner, Equifax Marketing Decision Systems, implemented a number of privacy-related controls that exceeded traditional direct marketing industry practices. We felt confident that these procedures limited any potential abuse of the product. Consumers should demand that future products of this type be as scrupulous and responsible.

I would like to take this opportunity to recognize all members of the MarketPlace team for their dedication to an innovative product concept and for their willingness to take risks. Although the end result was not in the plan, we consider their creativity and entrepreneurial attitude to be valuable assets. Within Lotus, this group has a reputation for a "can do" attitude and a sense of team spirit that has prevailed even through the recent turmoil.

Human Resources will work with team members over the next couple of weeks to assist them in their transition to other projects. The following is the press release that was issued this morning.

CONTACT:
Pamela Cay
John Ford
Lotus Development Corporation
Equifax
(617) 693-1305
(404) 885-8309

Janice Brown
Janice Brown and Associates, Inc.
(617) 332-8066

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
Lotus, Equifax Cancel Shipment of Lotus MarketPlace: Households

Cite Consumer Privacy Concerns
CAMBRIDGE, Mass., Jan. 23, 1991 — Lotus Development Corporation and Equifax Inc. today announced the cancellation of Lotus MarketPlace: Households, a CD-ROM database product of names, addresses, and related marketing information on 120 million U.S. consumers originally scheduled for shipment in March. The companies said the decision to cancel the product came after an assessment of the public concerns and misunderstanding of the product, and the substantial, unexpected additional costs required to fully address consumer privacy issues.

Lotus also announced that it will discontinue shipment of Lotus MarketPlace: Business, a database of information on seven million U.S. businesses that began shipping in October 1990.

"Unfortunately, Lotus MarketPlace: Households is at the apex of an emotional firestorm of public concern about consumer privacy. While
we believe that the actual data content and controls built into the product preserved consumer privacy, we couldn’t ignore the high level of consumer concern,” said Jim Manzi, Lotus’ president and chief executive officer. “After examining all of the issues we have decided that the cost and complexity of educating consumers about the issue is beyond the scope of Lotus as a software provider."

"Technology is radically changing the way we work and, more importantly, how we use information,” said Manzi. “Balancing the advantages of easier access to information with the individual’s right to privacy is only the first of many new issues our industry will grapple with in the coming years.”

C.B. (Jack) Rogers, Jr., president and chief executive officer of Equifax, which provides the data in MarketPlace, said: “Equifax has made several key investments in consumer-oriented initiatives, including our sponsorship of a national survey of consumer attitudes on privacy. The major survey finding was that consumers are willing to make trade-offs for the use of their personal information when they clearly understand the benefits. Despite our significant consumer education efforts, consumer misperceptions about this new product offered through this distribution channel persist.”

In developing Lotus MarketPlace: Households, Lotus and Equifax implemented a number of privacy-related controls that exceeded traditional direct-marketing industry practices. These practices were the result of extensive research of the consumer privacy issue prior to product development, including testing the product concept with several consumer focus groups and counsel from a nationally recognized consumer-privacy expert. The practices included:

* Limiting the data. Specifically excluded from the product were telephone numbers and individual personal data such as actual income, credit data, and purchase history;
* Offering the data only to legitimate businesses, through a controlled purchase process;
* Educating and advising users about the proper legal and ethical responsibilities for list usage; and
* Providing several Lotus- and Equifax-funded options for consumers to have their names removed from the database.

"We developed MarketPlace in response to a perceived need and real market opportunity. MarketPlace is an innovative tool for small businesses, who are often shut out of sophisticated direct marketing because of its cost or complexity," said Manzi. “The market for tools like MarketPlace is a viable one. At the same time, the product is not part of our core business, and Lotus would be ill-served by a prolonged battle over consumer privacy.”

Mr. Rogers added: “Equifax is a technology leader and, equally important, a pioneer in the area of consumer privacy protection in the information industry. While we remain committed to using the most sophisticated technology available, we are equally committed to maintaining the delicate balance between legitimate information needs of business and consumers' privacy concerns.”

The Lotus MarketPlace product family was a suite of CD-ROM (compact-disc, read-only memory) database tools that used the Apple Macintosh personal computer to make it easy for businesses to find new customers.

Lotus Development Corporation (NASDAQ:LOTS), founded in 1982, develops, markets, and supports business software and CD-ROM databases that help users access, analyze, communicate, and share information. The company’s first product, Lotus 1-2-3, is the most popular computer software program in the world, with more than 14 million users. Lotus markets its broad range of products in more than 65 countries and offers users comprehensive support options, including 24-hour-a-day, seven-day-a-week support in the United States for PC users of its 1-2-3 spreadsheet.

Equifax, Inc., (NYSE:EFX) is the leading provider of information for consumer financial transactions. Established in 1899 in Atlanta, Equifax today has 15,000 employees in 1,100 locations in the United States, Canada, and Europe. Equifax provides information services and automated systems that help customers grant credit, insure lives and property, select new employees, market products, and complete other transactions that benefit the economy, business, and consumers. [Go read the Revelation of John and tell me if that doesn’t sound like The Beast to you.] Equifax’s revenues for the year ended December 31, 1990, were more than $1 billion.
SICK of ALTERNATIVE LIFESTYLE

Dear Editor,

Perhaps I'll be labelled as a reactionary for this but I wish to point out something that offends and outrages me.

Members of a certain fraction of the population, which is defined primarily by their sexual lifestyle, not only try constantly to 'recruit' others of all ages (Even children!) to it, but also frequently attempt to force it onto the willing as well and even demand and receive special treatment.

These heterosexuals are also responsible for spreading AIDS and other sexually transmitted diseases not to mention the fact that their animalistic failure to distinguish between the act of reproduction and the sharing of sexual affection coupled with lack of self-control and unwillingness to make responsible decisions about sex is a direct cause of global overpopulation and the staggering number of unwanted pregnancies which probably account for most abortions and produce who-knows-how-many thousands of unwanted children each year who are then abandoned or abused.

One might even note that statistically: 1) a large fraction of their "marriages" end in divorce, often in only a few years 2) 50% of heterosexual men are unfaithful to their partner and 3) 90% of child molesters are heterosexual males, while less than fifty percent of the general population is.

Now, I have many heterosexual friends who are good people and I don't mean to imply that homosexuals aren't fully entitled to exactly the same rights as everyone else, but they are not entitled to any special privileges and I wish they'd keep their sexual preference to themselves and stop trying to force it on everyone else.

Name submitted, but withheld by request

OPEN LETTER TO PAT CRECINE

Subject: Proposed Tech Cooperation with the Savannah River Nuclear Weapons Plant

Dear Dr. Crecine,

We are writing to you as concerned alumni and students, with regard to the above subject. It has come to our attention that Tech is in an association of Georgia universities (ERDA) which may sign, or perhaps already has signed, an agreement with the administrator of the Savannah River Nuclear Weapons Plant. According to a planned statement of purpose for ERDA, the association of universities would support the mission of the Savannah River "Site", and Tech's Nuclear Engineering Program (in the School of Mechanical Engineering) would make major contributions to this mission.

The mission of the Savannah River Plant is to produce material for nuclear weapons. We feel that a university should be life-affirming and support the development of the mind, not the production of nuclear weapons. Without a doubt, Tech's School of Chemical Engineering would come under great scrutiny if it were to actively support the mission of a poison gas factory. Nuclear weapons are potentially more threatening to the future of humanity than poison gas.

Furthermore, we are greatly troubled by a research are of interest to the association of universities, the "New Production Reactor". This reactor is the subject of a controversial proposal to spend billions of dollars of our nation's limited assets to produce more material for nuclear weapons.

We are all Tech alumni and/ or students (three of us are former or present students in the School of Mechanical Engineering), and from our perspective we find the proposed agreement with the Savannah River Plant to be highly objectionable.

According to the Whistle of 22 October 1990, you have stated that Tech's "...research is viewed as excessively dependent on military contracts..." In our opinion this is a matter of real concern, and the proposed agreement with the Savannah River "Site" would only strengthen this view. We urge you to consider further the damaging long-term repercussions to Tech of the proposed agreement.

Sincerely yours,

Carol F. Kallfelz
ME '92

Catherine E. Kallfelz
BSM '90

John M. Kallfelz
Graduate Student,
School of ME 1960

William M. Kallfelz
BS Physics '89
Graduate Student,
Atmospheric Sciences
Shortwave

by David Burgess

So, do you think that the media is controlled by government and big-business and hides facts from the American people? Or are you’re tired of the liberal press that never gives credit to conservative thinking and hides facts from the American people? The truth is that the things you see and hear are carefully calculated and shaped by a multitude of forces. This is unavoidable, but the problem is that a lot of these forces stand to gain or lose a good deal depending on what the American public think.

How can you get around these mind games? Well, you’re in luck: believe it or not, nine out of ten people on this rock are not members of the American public, and use news sources that are not calculated to shape American public opinion. Granted, there is still a lot of opinion-shaping going on, but the forces will be coming from very different directions, and most will be fairly obvious. Where can you get access to these alternative news sources? They are all around you at this moment; you need only listen to them.

How Do We Listen?

In the United States, Amplitude Modulated (AM) broadcasting is generally limited to the Medium Wave band, from 540kHz to 1600kHz. In the world outside of the United States, the Short Wave bands (from 5MHz to 30MHz) are commonly used for both commercial and public AM broadcasting as well as amateur communication. Specifically, international convention assigns the following frequency ranges, or bands, for broadcast radio:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>band</th>
<th>frequencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>120 meter</td>
<td>2300-2495 kHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 meter</td>
<td>3200-3400 kHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 meter</td>
<td>3900-4000 kHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 meter</td>
<td>4750-5060 kHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 meter</td>
<td>5950-6200 kHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 meter</td>
<td>7100-7300 kHz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31 meter  9500-9900 kHz
25 meter  11650-12050 kHz
22 meter  (newly opened)
21 meter  13600-13800 kHz
19 meter  15100-15900 kHz
16 meter  17550-17900 kHz
13 meter  21450-21850 kHz
11 meter  25670-26100 kHz

The shortwave frequencies are used because of their ability to reflect, or "skip," off layers of the upper atmosphere, allowing even a weak signal to be detectable over large portions of the globe. Receivers for AM shortwave listening vary widely in price and quality. In general, high-quality shortwave receivers cost about as much as cheap color TV’s, and aren’t nearly as dangerous. I bought my first one at a garage sale for $10. The set was pretty poor, but I could still hear programs from about a dozen different countries in Europe and the Americas.

As far as what kind of radio to get, it would be best for a serious buyer to refer to reviews in some type of shortwave listener’s guide (see next paragraph). For casual listening outrageous equipment and sophisticated antennas are not needed. My current rig is a Sony ICF-2010 with a modest (4 ft.) telescoping whip antenna. It can easily receive all the major world services and has more features than one really needs for casual listening. The Sony ICF series seems to be pretty popular, as well as Radio Shack’s DX products.

Much like non-commercial radio in the U.S., most shortwave stations operate on broadcast schedules. Not only do these schedules dictate the type of programming aired, they also determine the language spoken, the frequency used, and the part of the world to which a broadcast is directed, so knowing the schedules can be very important, unless you happen to speak three or four languages and can listen to seven channels at once. The best way to get these listings is through periodicals such as “WRTH” or “Passport to World Band Radio.” “Passport” is a better choice for most beginners, and is available at most large bookstores or radio shops. You should also keep a log of what you hear (frequency, time,
source, language) and eventually build up a listening schedule of your own. Shortwave services announce their schedules and mailing addresses at the start of each broadcast, and appreciate an occasional listener's report (called a QSL) or fan letter. For those of you with access to the internet newsgroups (all Ga. Tech. students), rec.radio.shortwave is an excellent source of the latest information on what's out there waiting to be heard and what kind of equipment to heard on.

Shortwave reception varies wildly with frequency, time of day, sunspot activity, and atmospheric conditions, but, for the most part, the best listening times for European English-speaking stations are in the evenings. During this time, the best reception will be for frequencies below 15MHz (41m, 31m, 25m bands), and this "maximum usable frequency" will tend to decrease over the course of the evening. The best daytime listening is generally on frequencies above 10MHz. The 13m and 11m bands are particularly good for morning reception.

What Will We Hear on Shortwave?

Shortwave programming formats are a lot like our own non-commercial radio. Typical broadcasts include news, music, interviews, mail-in programs, and information about current domestic issues in the country of origin. There are also radio evangelists and a few U.S. commercial stations with shortwave services. By far, however, most "world service" shortwave sources are operated by national and provincial governments. Personally, I keep these preprogrammed on my receiver (frequencies are in kHz):

[This is by no means a comprehensive list.]

WWV, Universal Coordinated Time
Colorado, Hawaii
2500, 5000, 10000, 15000, 20000
all the time

WWV broadcasts Universal Coordinated Time (UTC) from the National Bureau of Standards atomic clock. WWV also gives information on large storm systems, geomagnetic activity, sunspots, and satellite navigation systems. WWV is useful to people other than ocean-going captains because shortwave services operate on Universal Time (UTC, same as GMT or Zulu Time) and because its large number of frequencies can provide a quick reference of the usable shortwave bands and Maximum Usable Frequency (MUF) over North America.

Radio Beijing
China
11715
0300 UTC

These guys still lay down the communist rhetoric pretty thickly. Radio Beijing recently spoke of the anniversary of the "liberation" of Tibet. We all know what a brutal dictator that 14th Dali Lamma was.

Radio Netherlands
Holland
11720, 15560
0330 UTC
Often splatters over Radio Beijing.

Radio Moscow
U.S.S.R
7310, 9750, 12050, 17810
evenings
This is fascinating listening. In the last few years, Radio Moscow has dropped a lot of the propaganda and shifted to what they call an "ideologically neutral" format. Today, Radio Moscow features interviews (though they sometimes sound a bit contrived), American pop music, Russian classical music, news, cultural programming, and even advertisements. In fact, Radio Moscow may be the only government operated service in the world that advertises products on shortwave radio.

While there is still a whitewashing of Soviet domestic events, the commentators can be surprisingly frank. In December, one pop music D.J. said, "I'm hungry and freezing my butt off here in Moscow."
British Broadcasting Corporation
England
5975, 7150, 9640, 9915, 15260
all the time

This is the world's standard English-language radio service. Have you ever heard a session of the House of Commons? It sounds like they're running the government out of a tavern.

Radio Canada International
Ontario (?)
9535, 9755
mid evenings

"They look like us. They act like us."
They also have some very good interviews.

Christian Science Monitor Radio
Massachusetts
9850, and others
evenings
6185
late evenings

Good news programs, as well as one of the most popular mail-in programs in the world.

Deutsche Welle
Federal Republic of Germany
6049, 9670, 11810
late evenings

More news and other interesting stuff.
Spanish in mid-evening.

Voice of (North) America
District of Columbia
5995, 6035, 6680, 11580
evening
15410, 17800
day

This is a service of the United States Information Agency. It provides, to the rest of the world, the "official opinion of the United States government," as well as music, interviews, news, and special bulletins to U.S. citizens in foreign countries. It is fairly objective, and certainly worth listening to. It is your tax money at work.

Voice of Free China
Taiwan
5950
0300 UTC

News and information from Taiwan, as well as Chinese cultural programs. Language lessons start at 0350 UTC.

HCJB, Voice of the Andes
Ecuador
9745, 15155
evenings

HCJB carries mainly religious programming, but does offer Andean traditional music and local South American news.

Radio Sofia
Bulgaria
7115
early evenings

Music and informational programming.

WRNO, Rock of New Orleans
Louisiana
6185
late evenings

Classic and hard rock, news. Local events from our closest third-world neighbor.

Voice of Turkey
Turkey
9445, 17880
0400 UTC

Good music. Strange news. Informative
cultural programming.

Radio Vilnius
Lithuania
9750
early evenings

Back on the air after temporary occupation by Soviet troops.

Radio Atlantika
21460, 15540, 15210
1345 UTC

Occasional surrogate for Radio Vilnius in times of trouble.

Spanish Foreign Radio
Spain
11880
late evenings

Swiss Radio International
Switzerland
9885, 9850
mid-to-late evenings

Nice, objective news source.

Radio Bagdad
Iraq
11830, 11810, 13660
0230, 0430, 2100, 2300 UTC

Radio Bagdad goes up and down like a yo-yo. Arabic-language.

Voice of Peace
Iraq
11860
1000, 1200, 1600, 1800, 2101, 2200

“Bagdad Betty,” propaganda service to U.S. troops. There are some cultural problems to be overcome before the propaganda starts working. For example, they said that while U.S. troops where in the gulf, their wives would be sleeping with American movie stars like Bart Simpson. Nice try, Iraqi dudes.

Mother of Battles Radio
Kuwait
15505
various, changing

This is an Arabic-language propaganda service operated by Iraq in studios stolen from Radio Kuwait. Ya’ll come on out to the Jihad, ya’ hear!

Kol Israel
Israel
11605, 9435, 7465, 11585
0000, 0100, 0200, 0500

Get the REAL news from Tel Aviv, and a few occasional civil defense notices.

Radio Havana
Cuba (and proud of it)
11820
0000-0800 UTC

Industrial-strength propaganda. A flashback to the Good ‘Ol Days of Radio Moscow. They broadcast on many different frequencies all day long in several languages, including Esperanto. Have these people not heard, that communism is dead?

There is also a good deal of amateur traffic in the shortwave bands. In times of crisis (like now) in many countries (like most), amateur radio operators (hams) have provided a vital link to the outside world after local media have been seized by governments or disabled by natural/manmade disasters. For about two weeks last month, for example, a private operator in Vilnius provided the only reliable radio contact from Lithuania. Normally, however, the amateur bands are filled with middle-aged guys talking about radio equipment.

Most ham communication is in Carrier Wave (CW) Morse code, which will sound like alternating
bursts of silence and static on an AM receiver. The rest is Single Sideband (SSB) modulated voice, requiring a receiver with SSB capability. SSB comes in two flavors, Upper Sideband (USB) and Lower Sideband (LSB). SSB is used because it is 100%-500% more efficient than standard AM, and an SSB receiver will conveniently interpret CW Morse Code as a series of beeps.

International convention recognizes the following bands for use by amateur operators:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>band</th>
<th>frequencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>160 meter</td>
<td>1800-2000 kHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 meter</td>
<td>3500-4000 kHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 meter</td>
<td>7000-7300 kHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 meter</td>
<td>14000-14400 kHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 meter</td>
<td>21000-21450 kHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 meter</td>
<td>26960-27230 kHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 meter</td>
<td>28000-29700 kHz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Shortwave Noises

There are a lot of other noises on the shortwave bands from radio modems, navigation systems, slow-scan television, and other odd sources. Some of these strange noises are of particular interest. Until recently the first was the “Woodpecker,” a 10 Hz pulsed beacon that always operated at the MUF between Eastern Europe and North America. This signal was believed to originate from a set of Soviet-controlled transmitters in Czechoslovakia, though the Soviet government denied its existence.

The other is special type of transmission called a “numbers station.” These stations transmit spoken numbers in three to five digit groups, usually in Korean, Vietnamese, Spanish, Russian, or English using suppressed-carrier AM. No one in the world claims responsibility for any such transmissions, though they are believed to carry information to and from intelligence field operatives. In one such broadcast, originating in the District of Columbia, Radio Havana could clearly be heard in the background. Much of this is known to come from the CIA and U.S. military intelligence. There is a great deal of numbers traffic in and around the Mid East these days, likely from the Israeli MOSSAD service. 6840kHz is a popular numbers station, but there are many others. Although you can’t tell what information is being transmitted, when you hear the nightly patterns suddenly change, you know big things are about to happen in this world.

Most military forces still use the shortwave frequencies for local communication, but do so with enough power to be heard around the planet. Some long distance military communication systems also use these frequencies. Common bands for military traffic are 11050-11300kHz, 13200-13300kHz, and 6680-6900kHz, but there are others. Currently, a lot of the traffic in these bands comes from the Mid East. You can occasionally hear actual combat communications, and this should become more common once we engage our ground forces. Military SW radios use USB modulation almost exclusively, and much of a transmission may be encoded. Please, in the interest of national security and the safety of U.S. personnel, do not exchange the particular times, frequencies, or contents of these transmissions in any public-access medium. In some cases, such exchanges may actually be illegal.

What Will We Feel?

Shortwave listening doesn’t just give you a more objective view of the world; it makes distant events tangible. When I hear numbers station or a U.S. bomber calling for more fighter support, a chill goes up my spine. It’s the real thing, right in front of me, and passing right through me even as I think about it. I am a witness to the actual event. The overrun of Lithuania by the Soviets was similar. I listened to news reports about it all day, but the notable absence of Radio Vilnius spoke more about the situation than an afternoon’s worth of commentary. When I couldn’t hear their nightly broadcast, the Lithuanians’ situation suddenly became very real, and an event thousands of miles away had a direct effect on my activities.

To often, we forget that the far-fetched happenings on the news are real. Reality becomes like fiction, as journalist go out to cover a war like some kind of perverse sporting event. This is one of the great dangers of the mass-media. Shortwave wakes us up from this world of reenacted news events and game-show-style police documentaries by bringing a little piece of unadulterated reality into our homes.
What you don't know
By Carey McKeown

Some 'famous' or at least noteworthy gay or bisexual people: I put each into a category I felt they best fit. The only category that repeats persons named in the others is modern US military. Sources: Unnatural Quotations, Leigh Rutledge 1988; Gaze USA March 8, 1990 issue #5; Gay Community News Dec. 23, 1990 vol 18 #23; ETC magazine's Gay in the Military series; and Frontiers magazine.

Military figures historical
Alexander the Great, Julius Caesar, Richard the Lionhearted

US military in modern times
Rev. Troy Perry, Rock Hudson, Gore Vidal, Harvey Milk, Samuel Barber, Wm. S. Burroughs, Tom Waddell, John Cheever, Tyrone Power, John Rechy, Glenn Swann, Craig Claiborne, Dave Connors, Merle Miller, Richard Locke, Rick Donovan, Andrew Holleran, Frank O'Hara, Peter Orlovsky, Mary Ann Humphrey, Johnnie Phelps

Some people expelled from US military, reserves, or ROTC in past 15 years for being openly gay

Music
Leonard Bernstein, Aaron Copland, Dame Ethel Smith, Ned Rorem, Samuel Barber, Peter Ilyich Tchaikovsky, Benjamin Britten, Thomas Schippers, Elton John, Johnny Mathis, Bessie Smith, Cole Porter, Morrissey, Sylvester, Dave Diamond (of the group Berlin), Boy George, Brian Epstein (Beatle's manager), Andy Bell of Erasure, The Flirtations (five man, gay male a cappela group), Fred Small

Athletics
Martina Navratilova, Dave Kopay, Glenn Burke, Dr. Tom Waddell, Rod Jackson and Bob Paris, Dave Pallone

Film, stage, etc (actors, directors, critics, etc)

Visual arts
Leonardo da Vinci, Michaelangelo, Cecil Beaton, Herb Ritts, Andy Warhol, Keith Haring, Kristen Bjorn, Michael Leonard, Tom of Finland, Robert Mapplethorpe

Royalty not mentioned elsewhere
James VI & I, Edward II, William (as in and Mary), Emperor Ai-ti, sultan Selim I

Writers(including poets, playwrights, et al)
Holleran, Robert Patrick, David Lan, Martin Sherman, Anthony Sher, Nicholas Wright

US politics
Eleanor Roosevelt, William Rufus De Vane King and his lover James Buchanan who was later president, Robert Bauman, Roy Cohn, Gerry Studds, Barney Frank

Gay activists(a very incomplete list)
Dennis Altman, Arthur Bell, Harvey Milk, John Henry Mackay, Malcolm Boyd, Morris Kight, Jerry Silverman, Bruce Voeller, Rev. Troy Perry, Julie Dorf, 'Sister Dana Van Iquity' of the Sisters of Perpetual Indulgence aka Dennis McMillan, Tseko Simon Nkoli (RSA), Roman Kalinin (USSR), Olga Zhuk (USSR), Alexander Lukeshov (USSR, brutally murdered last year apparently by the KGB)

A few assorted supporters of gay rights(defined as the right to live your own life in peace)
Lucie Arnaz, Paul Newman, Dolly Parton, Humphrey Bogart, Patti La Belle, Blake Edwards, Correta Scott King, Kathleen Nolan, Bette Midler, Milton Berle

'We homosexuals [sic] would all love to think of ourselves [as human beings first], without giving a second thought to our sexual orientation. Social attitudes, however, expressed by laws and expressions like 'fag' [force us to think of ourselves as homosexuals first]. Until the time when these laws and attitudes change, [gay activist groups] will continue to fight uncompromisingly for a permanent end to homosexual oppression, a fight which necessarily focuses on each individual's sexual orientation.'(1)

In the charming season of the flower-time of youth, thou shalt love boys, yearning for their thighs and honeyed mouth.
—Athenian statesman and poet Solon.(2)

I hope to teach you something about how the images of gay people are presently obscured, distorted, and ignored in education and the media. It's been difficult deciding how to go about it and where to begin. Oh, I know what I want to tell you and have plenty of facts and figures to put into this article, in fact just what I know is too much to cover adequately especially since its such a complex, intertwined, and involved subject to try to explain to people who for the most part have never even considered, the possibility that there was anything more to lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals of both genders than the myths they accepted while growing up or that anyone they knew, had heard of, or studied in school could be gay.

Of course its really no wonder that most of you probably never gave this topic much thought, that's kind of the point of this article. Education and the media all tend to be whitewashed so that no one will get the impression that homosexuality and gay people are real and can be rationally discussed. The news media act as if there were nothing serious to discuss, popular entertainment generally only mirrors the images that straits already have of gays, so the public is shown only what it wants to see and it doesn't choose to see anything that doesn't conform to the lies it wants to continue believing-- i.e. the public believes in faeries—but not in gay engineers, in perverts but not gay love and permanent relationships, and in 'fruits' but not people. Maybe this example will help you see what I mean about entertainment; there are 7 'Cosby kids' right? Then there's about a fifty percent chance that at least one of them is gay(3). Do you think there's much chance we'll see Cliff and Claire or any other sitcom parents handling that in their uniquely mature and loving fashion soon?

I'm so tired of us not being allowed to touch each other,

kiss each other, as straight people are allowed to do, as black people are allowed to do, as anybody else is allowed to do on TV.

Every other minority has been exposed and dramatized to the hilt.

Why are we kept in such straitjackets?

—LARRY KRAMER, in a discussion of NBC's 1985 drama about AIDS, 'An Early Frost' [my emphasis, for those who wonder what I mean by the term, "strait". Cary](2)
On with the topic now.

Education: You may have seen one or two poems or speeches that were written in Ancient Greece or Rome in an English or Latin class sometime, but I doubt they used even one of the many, like the quote at the top of this article, expressing or praising homosexual love or desire. Psychology and sociology books and classes are just barely past the idea that homosexuality is a disease or problem, now they gloss over it with a bland paragraph or two. While they no longer actively promote most of the myths that used to be accepted as axioms in these fields, they don’t usually bother to point out and explain the flaws and fallacies of many commonly held beliefs about gay people or about homosexuality and its origins nor do they do much to inform people about the prevalence of homosexuality or the basic diversity of human sexual orientation. For example here at Tech, some class is using a book entitled ‘Doctor, Am I a Virgin Again’, about sex, sexuality, and responsible sexual decision making; when I noticed it in the bookstore I checked and at first thought it didn’t even mention homosexuality at all since none of the standard terms appeared in the index but on closer examination I did find, ‘gay or bisexual male’ on a list of risk factors for AIDS as well as ‘sex with a gay or bisexual male in the past X years’. Seemed a little redundant since sex with a non-monogamous partner in the past X years is the risk factor for sexual transmission of AIDS, and I don’t think it mentioned that lesbians have a very low frequency of infection and their primary risk-factor is having sex with a man in the past X years.

Did your literature books ever mention that Walt Whitman, Tennessee Williams, James Baldwin, Noel Coward, Gertrude Stein, Herman Melville, and Horatio Alger were gay? Well, what about: Marcel Proust, Gustave Flaubert, Renaud Camus, Joe Orton, E.M. Forster, etc? Do your history books mention which historical figures were gay? One of the speakers I listened to at the lesbian, gay, and bisexual studies conference at Harvard teaches history at a private high school. His talk was about the effects introducing some gay history into his curriculum had on his students attitudes (it sounded like a very progressive school). The assignment he gave them involved having the students read two conflicting evaluations of the berdache traditions in some American Indian tribes, discuss them, and form their own opinions about them. (Berdache were homosexual and/or transvestite tribe members with religious/ceremonial functions. They are known to have occurred in at least 145 AmerIndian tribes.) It was a very interesting talk with lots of positive implications, but what I wondered was why start with the berdache? It is valid history but it really only relates tangentially to contemporary gays and our society, since berdache aren’t the only gay people in history and Indians are largely ignored themselves, why make our (gay) history a special side-track into what will be seen as trivia, when so much of mainstream history concerns known gays but fails to point that out? For examples: Alexander the Great, Solon the lawgiver, Julius Caesar, Leonardo da Vinci, Michealangelo, King James VI & I (that’s the one with the bible named after him), James Buchanan, and the origin of the pink triangle as the symbol the Nazis used to label ‘homosexuals’ in the concentration camps. (If I’m not mistaken; conquest of the ‘known world’, the origins of Athenian law, the formation of the Roman empire, the European Renaissance, the consolidation of English nationalist power, the U.S. presidency, and World War II are considered important in western history.) For modern history we might include the Stonewall riots in 1969, the subsequent growth and change in the modern gay rights movement, Harvey Milk and the riots following his murder, the 500,000 people who marched on Washington for Gay and Lesbians Rights in October 1987. (The strait media largely ignored the March, just as they largely ignore local gay-pride marches, and when they do cover the pride marches the only pictures they usually show are of men in drag (!) or some other stereotype their readers or viewers will easily process as ‘gay’, never mind that virtually all of the people involved in the march dress the same way heteros going to the park that day would, the public expects drag queens and they mustn’t be disappointed or disillusioned. The press also seldom bothers to give any background information on what gay events they do cover to some degree, such as the fact that most gay pride events are scheduled on or around
June 26th, the anniversary of the Stonewall Riots in 1969, because it is considered the birth of the present stage in the gay rights movement.)

What you should know.

The first thing those of you who are heterosexual need to know about homosexual and bisexual people is that you don’t know anything about us. It is a common occurrence for elected officials, community leaders, and other individuals in general to express profoundly anti-gay attitudes and opinions while also declaring that they know no homosexual people personally, and nothing about us or this ‘lifestyle’ they claim we lead and often they declare that they are proud of this ignorance. If you will please stop to think about this for a second you should realize that you can’t claim validity for an opinion if you don’t know anything about the subject of your opinion. Most people, including gay people, grow up with negative feelings and opinions about homosexuality, this is because we’re almost all raised with those negative attitudes and incorporate them subconsciously. This is why most of you heterosexual types feel at least vaguely uneasy if you think about gay sex or affection (or what you think gay sex is). These feelings are thus understandable and not your fault for the most part, however you are not entitled to judge and treat people according to how you feel about them. Your feelings and unsupported opinions do not necessarily reflect objective reality, if we assumed they did we’d immediately run into contradictions because some people feel that homosexuality is evil while others feel that it is perfectly natural and right for them to love someone of their own sex. So is everyone entitled to treat you however they feel like treating you or will you admit that unsubstantiated feelings are not valid epistemological tools?

Second: Around ten percent or more of the general population in this country, and apparently in any country at almost any time, demonstrates its homosexual proclivities to the extent that most people would consider them gay and/or consider themselves gay. Since the Kinsey studies first revealed this in the 50’s or early 60’s subsequent studies have repeatedly confirmed this; when the L.A. Times conducted a national telephone poll in December of 1985, fully 10% of those who answered the question described themselves as gay, Georgia Tech’s human relations department conducted a survey that included a question about sexual orientation which found that 10% of the Tech population surveyed admitted being gay. Ten percent of the population equals 25 MILLION gay Americans. Roughly the same percentage of people are left-handed; there are almost as many gay people as blacks in America, the ratio of gays to Hispanics in this country is about 1.5, there are more than three times as many gays in this country as there are Jews. If you want to consider homosexuality some sort of pastime, it is more commonplace in this country than golfing (5%), bowling (6%), jogging (7%), or hunting (6%). Is this sinking in yet? (p.s. You probably do have gay friends whether you know who any of them are or not. If you don’t know who they are it might be because 1) it isn’t any of your business and they don’t owe you an explanation 2) even if they trust you there’s a risk of other people finding out from you and harasing them 3) why should they trust you? [i.e., you may be a wonderful person, hey maybe you’re even gay yourself, but have you ever made a homophobic remark or laughed at a joke that is derogatory to gays? Would you come out to someone who acts the way you do?] (6)

Third: Homosexuality involves sexual orientation, not gender role or gender identity (7 again) and it isn’t my fault heterosexuals usually fail to distinguish between those three and gender. I.e. they think that being a woman, acting ‘womanly,’ considering oneself a woman, and having sexual desire for a man are the same thing when in fact: gender is which sex you are physically(8); gender identity is which sex you consider yourself; sexual orientation (hetero, homo, bi, or none of the above) is whether you are sexually attracted to the opposite, same, both, or neither gender respectively; and gender role is just behaving in ways (‘masculine’ or ‘feminine’) that society considers characteristic of one gender or the other. Also, gay people are no more “confused” about their gender or sexuality than heterosexual people (Would anyone be offended if I just said, “grims,” instead?) and bisexuals are not confused, wishy-washy, or
undecided, we like both that's our 'sexual preference'. (and one does not have to alternate or always have at least one of each to be bisexual, also bisexual men and women's fidelity ranges over the same scale as hetero and homos', there's no law that bis must cheat on a spouse, if you're into monogamy and all it's no harder to forsake all others for one particular man or woman than it is for a monosexual to forsake the half that are a given gender for that one particular individual.

Notes.
(1) Paraphrased from either 'Out of the Closets' edited by Karla Jay and Allen Young or from 'Homosexual Oppression and Liberation' by Dennis Altman. Probably the later, but I can't find it at the moment.
(2) Phrase or quote taken from the book 'Unnatural Quotations', compiled by Leigh W. Rutledge
(3) Basic statistics: 0.9 chance for each one to be hetero, 0.9 to the seventh power=the probability that all seven happen to be hetero which is the probability that there are no gay Cosby kids equals 0.478, and 1-0.478= 0.52 or 52%, which is the probability that at least one kid in of a randomly selected group of seven is gay or will be when she or he grows up.
(4) i.e. that homosexuality is a disease and/or a choice, that it can and should be 'cured' by therapy, that gays are psychotic or neurotic due to their sexual orientation, that people 'become' gay due to recruiting by homosexuals or fear of the opposite sex, etc. These are all untrue but are still used as justifications for the hatred, harassment, and oppression of gay people and not just in 'somewhere else' but right here throughout this 'free' country. (I'm not being unpatriotic, despite the fact that in practice some other countries better respect the rights of gay people or other minorities it is still true that our government's constitutional framework theoretically protects the rights of all individuals better than any other ever written. I simply want the U.S. to live up to that promise more instead of just paying it lip service.
"Remember theoretically blacks, women, etc. have had equal rights under the constitution at least since they were admitted to be voting citizens, but in practice...
(5) They certainly weren't theories since there was never any evidence for them.
(6) Much of the information in the 'second' point, especially comparative statistics I got from the book 'After the Ball'.
(7) Most transvestites are heterosexual, and the vast majority of gay people are not transvestites. Drag is not the same as actual transvestism, but primarily a form of entertainment albeit one which attracts many transvestites and transsexuals (because they are uniquely qualified to do it and it

Protection, therefore, against the tyranny of the magistrate is not enough, there needs protection also against the tyranny of the prevailing opinion and feeling; against the tendency of society to impose, by other means than civil penalties, its own ideas and practices as rules of conduct on those who dissent from them; to fetter the development, and, if possible, prevent the formation, of any individuality not in harmony with its ways.

John Stuart Mill
offers a unique opportunity for them to practice some of the skills they need to pass. The functions and significance of drag in gay culture are many and complex; rebellion against heterosexist gender conformity and making fun of the straight world to name two and personally I think that in large part it serves to bring glamour into gay male situations, since the concept of male glamour doesn’t seem to exist in American culture. As I said however, it is a form of entertainment, a statement, or a lark not the way most gay men live.

(8) Even physical/biological gender isn’t nearly as cut and dried, either/or as most people think. We don’t have time to get into all that now, but aside from transsexual surgery some of the reasons for that are: hermaphroditism/psuedohermaphroditism, sex reversal mutations, ambiguous or intermediate gender, and so on. Feel free to look up the information.

Homosexuality is not rare or unusual, ever since the Kinsey studies in the 1950’s, survey after survey has shown that 10% or more of the American population is gay (specifically that many will admit to engaging in more than incidental amounts of homosexual sexual activity after adolescence), 10% equals 25 million Americans, which is roughly equal to the number of black Americans.

500,000 people marched on Washington for gay rights October 11, 1987 (Probably the largest civil rights demonstration in American history, but it was largely ignored by the mainstream press.)

438,000 = Atlanta’s current population according to the Mayor. (Considerably more than 10% of Atlanta’s population is gay, I believe ours is the third largest gay community in the country, San Francisco and New York are the only U.S. cities with larger numbers of gay people. Oh yeah, if you’re reading this on campus you are essentially in ‘the gay neighborhood’, i.e. Midtown, and I can think of at least six gay bars in reasonable walking distance.

415,000 = the number of U.S. troops in the Persian Gulf on January sixteenth, according to the A/J/C. (It’s also a little less than 1/60th of twenty-five million.)

41,000 to 42,000 = the number of gay U.S. troops in the Persian Gulf as of January sixteenth if around ten percent of them are gay–I believe this is a reasonable minimum estimate since I see no reason to believe that the military can screen out or discourage a significant percentage of gays from enlisting.

10,000 to 12,000 = approximate total population of Tech. 1,500 = total number of participants who attended that Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual Studies Conference at Harvard, for which the USC was so reluctant to give us $438.00 to help pay our travel and $20 per person registration fees for five people. 1,000 = approximately 10% of the Tech population. (10% of the Tech population is gay. This isn’t my assumption, there was a survey on campus a year or two ago that determined this.) 30 = a reasonable number of people for many classes at Tech. 3 = 10% of 30 or the average number of gay people in a class of 30 at Tech.

7% of Americans jog
6% of Americans bowl
5% of Americans golf
0.04 (aka 4%) = the probability that everyone in a randomly selected group of 30 Tech students (like a class) is heterosexual.

A transsexual is someone who wants to change their physiological gender to be the other sex, a transvestite wants to dress like their opposite gender, and neither is an aspect of homosexuality. Homosexuality is affectional and sexual attraction for a member of one’s same gender, just like the attraction heterosexuals feel for members of their opposite gender. Most transvestites are heterosexual, I don’t know how to categorize the sexuality of a transsexual, and the vast majority of gay people are NOT transvestites or transsexuals.

Most gay people are not child molesters and for that matter, 97% of child molesters are heterosexual men, while only 90% of the general population is predominantly heterosexual. (Before anyone panics, most heterosexuals are not child molesters either).
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