

# COLUMBIA SPECTATOR

ARCHIVE

Columbia Daily Spectator, Volume CXIV, Number 30, 15 October 1990 — Letters [ARTICLE]

## Letters

### Gulf policy defended

To the Editor:

I was going to write a long letter saying that what Mr. Kramer suggests (“Stop rationalizing our actions in the Gulf,” *Spectator*, Sept. 20) is no more than appeasement, and that there are some pretty solid reasons why we should be in the Gulf. Yet I feel that writing anything slightly endorsing the use of force will brand me as a warhawk. Sure, our lifestyle could use some changing, and we wouldn’t be in this mess if we weren’t so dependent on foreign oil. Yet the facts remain--Kuwait is an ally; the Saudis, and especially the Kuwaitis, welcome our presence; Hussein holds foreign nationals from many countries as hostages; and the stability of the world economy, wasteful or not, depends on the flow of oil from the Gulf.

Perhaps, Kramer, we should have you go to Iraq and ask that Hussein stop his aggression at the Kuwaiti border, promise to stop trying to build nuclear weapons, get rid of his huge arsenal of chemical weapons, and simply play nice. I might even grant that you might succeed, yet your victory might be short lived. At best, you might wind up immortalized like Chamberlain, who proclaimed “We have peace in our time.” At worst, you would become another hostage who will have to be rescued by the 82nd Airborne, or even worse, wait until the economic sanctions slowly strangle the Iraqi people into submission (surely not Hussein). The rest of the rational world opposes the invasion of Kuwait; why can’t you? Is it too politically incorrect?

What bothers me most about Kramer’s arguments are the ones that compare

arguments are the ones that compare Hussein's gassing of his own people to the internment of the Japanese during World War II and the Israeli occupation of the West Bank. His casual aside "what if Hussein does join the nuclear club and emerges a world power," is scary and downright stupid. Nuclear proliferation is no joke. Nor is quoting Depeche Mode "people are people so why should it be, you and I should get along so awfully," as a recipe for dealing with a man who goes on television with hostages and says they are quests. Please pick analogies that have some magnitude of relevance.

Yes, we shouldn't be in this mess, but we are. The United States is a world power, like it or not, and with the privilege of this status comes the responsibility of the position. Hopefully the world will solve this problem without bloodshed. Yet if it does come to war and the spilling of blood, we must pay that price.

**Andrew Anselmo**

## **Keep whimsy out of Gulf**

**To the Editor:**

What is a good example of Infantile Blat-hering? The answer is Jacob Kramer's recent article, "Stop Rationalizing Our Actions in the Gulf." (Spectator, Sept. 20) This article is not only foolish but ignorant and insensitive to the issues at hand.

Kramer suggests that we have no business defending Kuwait and Saudi Arabia. He enlightens us that "Fighting is bad, because when you fight, people die." Did it ever occur to Kramer that people have died because of passivity? Should we passively stand by when a leader like Hussein, armed with chemical warfare, with a history of betrayals, overtakes a nation while violating the unified voice of the United Nations? When he uses fellow Americans as potential human shields for his military installations? This is not merely about oil prices, but more about the violation of international trust. (Unfortunately, this was not reflected in Kramer's article nor in the

not reflected in Kramer's article and accompanying political cartoon.) Peace is not a consequence of passive international inactivity. Contrary to what Kramer believes, it has to be defended. The present crisis is being reckoned with in a peaceful fashion through sanctions. But if this doesn't work, withdrawal will not be the solution.

Our Middle East crisis is certainly not a cut and dry issue. Kramer would do justice to responsible journalism by representing the bigger issues at hand and keeping his whimsical remarks at bay.

M.E. Ugactz, GS

## Lannon misunderstood

### To the Editor:

Upon reading Benjamin Delfin's column ("Sexual Logic," Spectator, Sept. 24), which responded to Patrick Lannon's column on self-control two weeks earlier, I was left with many questions about Delfin's supposed "truths." He thinks he gets his point across by using trendy targets, such as Ronald Reagan, in writing about the acceptable losses theory in not using contraception enough. Isn't it also true, though, that there are "acceptable losses" in the widespread use of contraception, in that contraception does not always work, which in turn results in social ills like STD's and unplanned pregnancies?

Which leads to my next question--has "safe sex" solved any problems for society? Has the rate of the transmission of AIDS gone down since it's been highly promoted? Delfin states that "Obviously, if everyone used condoms, these problems (abortion, STDs) would be about as common as the bubonic plague." So what's the solution, Delfin? Do we not see enough safe sex reminders around this and other college campuses that people are "uninformed?" Are there not enough contraceptives given out freely that students cannot afford them or acquire them easily?

Also, Delfin, where do you come up with the idea that Lannon believes that "girls" who have had pre-marital sex are no longer "worthy" of respect, thus painting your own

worthily of respect, thus painting your own picture of him as disrespectful of women and anti-sex? He wrote nothing of the sort! Then you have the gall to accuse him of the "Big Lie?" This "oratorical technique" is used by you, Delfin, not the one you are accusing.

Unfortunately, people like Lannon, who truly have character to stand alone in speaking their minds, are shot down on this campus as "anti-sex" (a term used by the celebrity speaker at Columbia's last NARAL rally) and as "upper crust, white bred" (a term used to describe Lannon in a letter to the Federalist Paper last year.) This gross generalization, which most Columbia students like Delfin will proclaim they are against, is the obvious lie, one example being Professor Griff, who, in his visit to Columbia last year, spoke out against the proclamations that contraception is highly reliable.

Delfin, I recommend that you read Lannon's article again; if you can back up all your crude accusations again with a straight face, more

# Clarifying CORRE

## To the Editor:

In response to your article "CORRE speaker calls for new perspectives in college curricula," published in the Spectator on Sept. 26, I would like to clarify a few points. Though I serve on the curriculum committee of Barnard's Committee on Race, Religion, and Ethnicity (CORRE), and I coordinate work supported by a grant from the Ford Foundation to integrate "minority women's studies in the curriculum," my only official title is Director of the Barnard Center for Research on Women.

It was a great honor to be invited to deliver the first of CORRE's Open Communication Lectures. In response to questions about how professors at Barnard were responding to the opportunity to integrate material by and about women into their First Year Seminars, I said that I thought the Barnard faculty demonstrated knowledge, empathy, and enthusiasm for the material. The faculty of the First Year Seminar Program have attended workshops, consulted the bibliography on women of color we prepared for them, read reams of new material. Preliminary written assessments from students who have taken transformed First Year Seminars have shown that they generally approve of the seminars.

One student in the audience complained about her First Year Seminar teacher who no longer teaches at Barnard. I was reluctant to talk about a colleague and have no first hand knowledge about what goes on in anyone's classroom except my own. When pressed, I said that in meetings with other recipients of the Ford grant from other universities, I had heard that they suspected that some people entered transformation programs for the wrong reasons. I am certain that everyone at Barnard has only the best motives for participating in the program.

**Dr. Temma Kaplan**  
**Director, Barnard Center**  
**for Research on Women**