

PERSPECTIVES

March in Washington Brings Mix of Anti-War Protests

Lara Ramsey
Features Editor

"Draft beer, not people," read one of the zillions of anti-war posters, bobbing up and down in the midst of 300,000 marchers. With the wide range of opinions represented at the march, I found few containing such humor. "The cost of war for one day could pay 91,000 teachers' salaries for a year," another one said. "Oil Schmoil" read yet another, created and carried by Guilford students.

I was impressed by the different interpretations of 'anti-war' which the chants and posters presented. However, on the same side of the issue as myself, I found I disagreed with some of the responses. "Send in Bush, send in Quayle, send in Neil when he gets out of jail," for example, did not strike me as a non-violent solution.

Neither did the comparative caricatures between Bush and Hitler strike me as substantial, in light of the larger picture. Bush took his share of personal slams, "Mr. President, please stop thinking with your missile," one sign offered. And the flag burnings, of course... I've never understood why someone would do that. Sure it should be constitutional, but where is the intelligence, the information, the convincing quality to such a 'protest'? It has the shock effect of slapping someone in the face, and a severely similar lack of education and respect to back it.

These protests were not the majority that I observed. Most people held flags, held heads, held hands... "Peace is Patriotic" claimed several signs. "Support our country and bring them home," pleaded others. Although the radical statements stand out

in my mind, the atmosphere altogether preserved a feeling of protest out of caring, not despairing. Some people sang "Give Peace a Chance" incessantly, refusing to be disturbed or distracted by the rallying cries from either within or outside the parade.

At times, the magnificent puppets and marching bands and Greenpeace's helium balloons really did add an element of festivity. Korean dancers demonstrated on the grass in Lafayette Park, where all the people funneled in from the streets, and where speakers such as Jesse Jackson and

(who knows why?) Susan Sarandon charged the crowd with anti-war perspectives. From the bank in front of the Washington monument, the crowd looked colorful, like a million mixed-up crayons, and energized, as people awake to imminent issues often do.

Why is the U.S. in the Gulf?

Badi Ali
Guest Writer

The governments in Kuwait, Iraq and Saudi Arabia were not established on the basis of Islamic rules, nor do they implement the rules of Islam in their systems. In particular, the economic and political systems in these countries are derivations of western capitalistic and democratic ideologies. It is true that most of the criminal laws are based on the Islamic Code, but Islam does not consider a state to be Islamic unless all laws from the Islamic Code are followed. Therefore, Kuwait, Iraq and Saudi Arabia are not Islamic states, whereas Iran, based on the Shiite Muslim Code, is an Islamic government.

Removing the border between Iraq and Kuwait complicates and is consistent with Islamic law. After the collapse of the Ottoman Empire (which was an Islamic state), Britain and France took control of the Middle East. In 1916, they divided the Muslim world into 50 countries and the Arab Nation into 22 countries. Before division of the area by the British and French, Kuwait did not exist. This area of land was a part of Al-Bassra, a city in southern Iraq.

The West divided the Muslim world in a way that distributed the wealth into the hands of a small population and left the masses in poverty. The division of land into many small countries created a lot of border disputes between the Muslim countries; actually, there is a border dispute between all countries in the Middle East... Kuwait and Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and Iraq, Iraq and Turkey, Turkey and Iran, Iran and Iraq, Turkey and Syria, Syria and Jordan, Syria and Lebanon, Egypt and Sudan, Egypt and Libya, etc. The borders were designed by British to keep Arab and Muslim countries fighting each other. Therefore, the act of removing borders between Kuwait and Iraq is seen as unifying the area and returning it to its original boundaries. Unifying the area is consistent with Islamic ruling.

The Kuwaiti government is not democratic. The ruling family in Kuwait was chosen by the British because they were the only family willing to cooperate with the foreign force at the time. The leaders of the other small countries were also chosen because of their sympathy for the western governments that had created them. President Sadat wondered during an address why all the small countries were formed and how they continued to exist. A Japanese scholar, Toyomo Kto, believes that the world will need another century to correct the damage done by British actions and American intervention in the Middle

East.

Ironically, the governments of Kuwait and the other small countries in the Gulf wrote in their constitutions that they would consult with the British government before making any decisions concerning the oil in their countries. I feel strongly that we, as Americans, are in a terrible situation now in the Middle East because of the British. We are fighting to uphold British policy in the Middle East; we are sending our young men to fight for British Petroleum.

This war is not our problem. Since Americans invaded the Gulf, the problem became an American vs. Arab problem; it was actually an Arab vs. Arab problem, Kuwait vs. Iraq. Now it is only an American vs. Arab problem—where is the British army?

I feel the U.S. has made a terrible mistake by starting this war. Due to pro-Israeli and pro-British positions by the government and media, Americans do not understand the Muslim positions and politics.

The American military involvement will cost us many innocent lives, will damage trust between the west and the Muslim world and will damage future work toward peace in the Middle East.

...

The writer works for the Islamic Committee For Palestine/N.C.

THE GUILFORDIAN

Editor-in-ChiefJacob Stohler
Managing EditorPeter Smith
News EditorCourtney Roberts
Assistant News EditorJustin Cohen
Features EditorLara Ramsey
Editorials EditorLisa Pope
Sports EditorButch Maier
Layout EditorBruce James
Assistant Layout EditorJennifer Watts
Photo EditorGeorge Brand
Copy EditorSuzanne Moore
Business ManagerLesley Funk
Advertising ManagerDavid Putzel
Faculty AdvisorJeff Jeske

The Guilfordian is the student newspaper of Guilford College, Greensboro, N.C. Submitted articles are welcome. Opinions expressed in editorials and letters to the editor do not necessarily reflect the views of the staff and editorial board. The editors reserve the editorial licence to The Guilfordian staff. Please address all mail to: The Guilfordian, Box 17717, Greensboro, NC 27410.

CO Support Group

Brian Yacono
Staff Writer

Do you believe that all wars are wrong? If you answered yes you might be a conscientious objector (CO). According to cur-

rent laws someone who is opposed to the participation in an form of organized, large-scale killing is not required to serve in the military, "if they hold deep-rooted moral, religious, and ethical views that would prevent them from doing so," said Max Carter.

Carter suggests that anyone who believes that they may be a CO should begin to build a case that will support these views in front of a draft board. One can do this by collecting letters from people who know of your convictions and by gathering witnesses of instances where you displayed your beliefs. But most importantly Carter said, "Even though there isn't a draft, COs

see SUPPORT on page 4

Correction

In last week's issue, we accidentally said that Hank Ketchum, the creator of "Dennis the Menace," had been appointed the new head coach of Guilford football. Of course, Mike Ketchum is that team's new coach.