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World News in Brief

**Latin America**

Ecuador—This week, deposed former President Lucio Gutierrez fled to Brazil for asylum after weeks of protests had mitigated his increasingly draconian hold on power. The revolt against Gutierrez was a response to his dismissal of the country’s supreme court in an attempt to forcefully implement economic policies recommended by the International Monetary Fund. People in Ecuador’s capital Quito had perceived his packing of the Supreme Court a flagrant abuse of power and responded with demonstrations numbering in the hundreds of thousands. After Gutierrez’s authorization for the use of force by police teams resulted in the death of a protester, the country’s Congress dismissed him from power. Former President Gutierrez has been the third Ecuadorian president since 1997 to be driven from office by political protests for attempting to impose free market reforms.

Mexico—Andres Manuel Lopez Obrador, the current mayor of Mexico City and heavy favorite for the presidential election next year, will seemingly face prosecution over a land dispute after being stripped of his immunity by the country’s two largest political parties. He is accused of allowing construction of an access road to a public hospital on expropriated land. If convicted, he claims he will run his candidacy for presidency from jail. Obrador, a populist and member of the small left-wing Party of the Democratic Revolution, has gained praise from the lower and lower-middle class during his mayoral tenure because of his increased spending on welfare and his restructuring of notoriously corrupt police forces. Several hundred thousand protestors gathered over the weekend to voice their support of Obrador and dissatisfaction in current President Vincente Fox, whose inaction over the issue threatens Mexico’s fledgling democratic freedoms.

Philippines—The Philippine government and breakaway rebel group Moro Islamic Liberation Front (MLF) have reportedly achieved a breakthrough during negotiations in Malaysia last week. Although the specific details of the agreement have not been disclosed, officials for both sides have apparently come to an accord over control of large swaths of land in the southern Philippines (including Mindanao, the Sulu Archipelago, and Palawan) claimed as the ancestral homeland by the MLF. The control of these areas, which compromise over thirty percent of the total land mass in the country and are claimed by the Moro Islamic Liberation Front as “ancestral homelands,” has been the main stumbling-block for peace in previous conferences. This agreement is expected to precede formal peace negotiations in June to resolve the thirty-year war that has claimed over 120,000 lives.

Nepal—A meeting this week between King Gyanendra of Nepal and Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh has resulted in the lifting of an Indian arms embargo on the war-torn Himalayan country. The ban on weapon sales was imposed in February following Gyanendra’s dismissal of parliament and suppression of human rights with the intent to pacify the ongoing Maoist insurgency in the country. The sale of weapons to the King and the Royal Nepali Army will fuel continued aggression against the Maoist rebels present throughout the countryside. In recent weeks, fighting between the Maoists and the Royal government in Nepal has claimed over two hundred lives.

Australia—Officials in Australia have concluded that a massive cull of camels in the outback is the only way to limit their expanding population. The camels, originally brought into the area for transportation, have experienced a population explosion to over 700,000 over the last several years due to lack of natural predators and abundant resources. Local farmers claim the camels place a strain on water reserves. No set population reduction has been announced.

**Africa**

Tanzania—Tensions have increased on the Tanzanian island of Zanzibar after a bomb blast killed four people in the political offices of the ruling CCM party. It is widely suspected that the opposition CUF party, which favors independence from the mainland, is behind the attacks. The two islands which compromise Zanzibar have been officially unified with mainland Tanzania since 1964 yet have maintained significant autonomy with a distinct president. Violence between the pro-union CCM and pro-independence CUF parties has occurred in Zanzibar after the last two elections and is expected to increase ahead of the elections in October.

Philippines—The Marburg virus, a highly contagious hemorrhagic fever similar to Ebola, has reached a critical juncture and is nearly contained. Workers for the World Health Organization and Doctors without Borders report instances of new infection have decreased over the last several weeks. The Marburg virus, fatal to a fourth of those infected, has claimed two hundred and forty four people in the Uigue area over the last month. Doctors claim the reduction in reported cases can be attributed to increased awareness of methods of disease transmission among the local populace and the minimization of traditional funeral ceremonies which involve close contact with the deceased. However, news sources report local “healers” have increased the rate of transmission through injections with used needles.

Angola—Health workers in the northern Angolan town of Uige claim the Marburg virus, a highly contagious hemorrhagic fever similar to Ebola, has reached a critical juncture and is nearly contained. Workers for the World Health Organization and Doctors without Borders report instances of new infection have decreased over the last several weeks. The Marburg virus, fatal to a fourth of those infected, has claimed two hundred and forty four people in the Uigue area over the last month. Doctors claim the reduction in reported cases can be attributed to increased awareness of methods of disease transmission among the local populace and the minimization of traditional funeral ceremonies which involve close contact with the deceased. However, news sources report local “healers” have increased the rate of transmission through injections with used needles.
T
he subtitle to the paper you are presently reading is 'the journal of progressive thought.' It's a bold claim. One might ask 'what is progressive thought?' The normal response will be to point out certain writers or commentators involved with anything from the New York Times to tiny socialist papers. The answer seems intuitively correct, since these are, to varying degrees, progressive publications. I'd like to make a very simple claim: many people writing in such publications, including Diskord, don't do much progressive thinking. I include my piece here in that condemnation. The lack of progressive thought is an issue like any other. I can only hope to provide some sort of catalyst.

People in the Anglophone world seem increasingly eager to avoid thinking by consuming news or commentary on the issues. In England there's a new, half-mocking ideology, 'Guardianism,' which takes its name from the country's most respectable daily newspaper. What Guardianism amounts to, however, is not a thought. It is a stance on issues, which calls for tolerance without change. It is the political equivalent of the Church of England, known more for baking cakes than theological niceties. Here, the equivalent is the New York Times. Of course, these are newspapers and I'm perhaps wrong to expect any thought to emerge from them. But the Guardianist trend towards commentary rather than thought can be discovered in far more diverse publications: The Nation, any given Party paper, or anarchist zines. That includes Diskord.

So far I haven't really said much, of course. 'Why, one is entitled to ask, is commentary of specific issues to be cast aside?' The easiest way to explain is by investigating one set of issues, a particularly pertinent one for a journal which emerges from a University: the case of Ward Churchill and David Horowitz. As a brief recap of the momentous events involved, it is enough to note that Churchill, a professor, said unpleasant things about the United States, a particularly impressive example being that he labeled those killed in the World Trade Center 'little Eichmanns.' Horowitz, a conservative activist, has proposed an 'academic bill of rights,' which would call for equality in hiring practices between Democrat professors and Republican professors. Thus has erupted howls of indignation and praise from both 'sides' of the political divide.

Let's investigate the attacks and parries. Churchill, it seems, is being denied his right to free speech. Or perhaps his students are being denied their right to ideologically 'neutral' education. Horowitz wishes to deny the right to academic freedom. Or perhaps he wants to defend Republican professors' right to equal hiring practices. Boiled down to the essence, the whole rumpus involves nothing more than the inherent inconsistency of the doctrine of rights, embraced by the left and the right alike. These rights have nothing to do with what Churchill or Horowitz have to say. Their respective claims have been diminished to the status of a signifier, another issue-picket in the political fence. The question 'which side do you fall on?' isn't out of place here. Nobody puts effort into falling.

Perhaps I'm looking in the wrong place for thought though; the letters pages of any publication are invaluable. What about the academics involved? Churchill has never elucidated what his claims are in public; Lifton-Zolne quoted a suitable paragraph last week and pointed out that Churchill 'may be a knee-jerk reactionary liberal.' There is no maybe. Churchill's academic work proceeds by targeting an enemy and then reacting to said enemy's movements with suitable rhetorical verve. His bite-size declamations make him the perfect image of thought. Churchill is a blank mirror; the left looks and sees the right making dead babies; the right looks and sees the left teaching 'innocent' students. With nobody looking, Churchill expresses nothing. This is not progressive thought.

Is there thought to be found in Horowitz? He, at least, must be expected to react rather than act. But he too focuses on issues, reacting to the dominant state of affairs: dominant in the sense of prevalent, and dominant in the sense of news-worthy, that is, worthy of commentary. Conservative students have long been pointing from the Guardianist trend towards commentary rather than thought through from the work of the structuralists and post-structuralists, or from the first generation Frankfurt scholars. Philosophy, the vaunted realm of pure thought, is nothing more than a commentary on society, or consumption of the news it itself produces in Mind.

Today, as the war on terror redraws the geopolitical map, the actual divide left and right- revolutionaries from reactionaries-is being taken down picket by picket; the left fundamentally agrees with the right, for example, on privatization and the primacy of human rights. The left's impotence at this point has been plentlyfully noted. It has been correctly attributed to a loss (death?) of ideological clarity; this loss is present also on the right, but less noticeably. The response from both 'sides' has been to replace the one fence with two imaginary fences, the moral and the microeconomic. This is hardly a way to clarity: the 'right' favors freedom economically, but regulation morally. The left favors freedom morally, but security economically. There are two rights, and two lefts.

In a curious reversal of the psychological, these divides deceive us, and conceal the plentitude and homogeneity of the political. The imaginary divides use issues as their tools: Horowitz, Churchill, Schiavo, Social Security. Actual progressive political thought- what I will now refer to as 'politics' - is not concerned with imaginary events or imaginary divides. Politics sees behind the Churchillian mirror and Schiavo's feeding tube. It is this politics which can enable a resistance (not reaction) to the issues of the day, through the application of thought to problems. In large part, the outcome of this application will be to simply point out the vacuity of what is at issue, the impotence of the commentary. Occasionally, politics shows us that there is a non-imaginary divide, a divide which it is necessary to stake out and describe; the political state of Latin America, for instance (Venezuela was referred to today in the New York Times as Castro's Cuba with oil!)

But it is for this very reason that progressive thought must be separated from the issues and commentary of the day. Progressive thought is always really indistinct from those issues, because it is what is applied to them; but numerically it must remain distinct. Progressive thought has no time for the image of itself. It has no time for the rhetoric of democracy; no time for the doctrine of rights. There is no left/right divide for progressive thought; there is no issue-picket to take sides on. It remains a fact that most thought comes from people who, if they are forced to fall, fall on the left, but never comfortably. It would be a terrible shame if the inspiration provided by this history (from Rousseau through Deleuze) was to be lost. Diskord is in a prime place to provide a forum for progressive thought: it is a progressive journal running in a university full of brilliant people. I hope those more able than I continue to fill its pages.

Progressive thought must be separated from the issues and commentary of the day.

Letter to the Editor

by Justin Evans

Post-structuralist
More Money, More Problems?
Woodlawn’s Affordable Housing and the New Communities Project

By Emily Alpert

South of the Midway, residents fear the wolf may be guarding the henhouse. The New Communities Project (NCP) has entrusted three entities, the Woodlawn Organization (TWO), WPIC (the Woodlawn Preservation and Investment Corporation) and the University of Chicago with a coveted pool of funds to “rejuvenate” Woodlawn, Hyde Park’s neighbor to the south. Care of the MacArthur Foundation, the initiative claims to improve Woodlawn through greenspace, retail and revitalized schools “while also creating affordable housing for low-income residents.” Yet one of NCP’s partners, TWO, is currently attempting to evict low-income residents from subsidized housing, in violation of the Federally Subsidized Housing Preservation Act, allegedly for the purpose of building new condos. As they do so, neither WPIC nor the University are raising much of a fuss.

First, some background on the University’s historic relationship to the issue of affordable neighborhood housing. For those who remember the years of urban renewal, the current plan’s rhetoric – and its power players’ perceived duplicity – is eerily reminiscent of one which ejected thousands of low-income families from Hyde Park in the 1950s and 60s. For those that don’t, it’s time for a history lesson. Professor Arnold Hirsch, author of Making the Second Ghetto: Race and Housing in Chicago, 1940-1960, devotes two chapters of his book to the subject, chronicling the urban renewal program in Hyde Park and its devastating effects on affordable housing and community amenities in the area. The following account is derived largely from his research.

It’s widely accepted that the University of Chicago and its surrounding communities have had a rocky history. In the 1950s and 1960s, Hyde Park, like hundreds of neighborhoods nationwide, underwent a program of urban renewal, purportedly to the ends of “slum prevention.” The Urban Communities Conservation Act of 1953 expanded the government’s power of eminent domain to include properties deemed “blighted” or, curiously, “headed for blight.” In effect, this meant the government could forcibly buy up homes considered “blighted” – even by so little as a broken porch board – in the name of slum prevention.

A second law, the Neighborhood Redevelopment Act of 1941, turned over that power to any three residents who organized a private corporation. These corporations could carry out a redevelopment plan under the supervision of a mayoral commission. The South East Chicago Commission was one such corporation, created by the University, which pushed for the demolition and redevelopment of area properties.

The overall effect of these laws was that University officials received government support to force homeowners and landlords to sell their property. In the process, the majority of Hyde Park’s affordable housing was eliminated, slating over 4,000 families for relocation. The efforts diluted both class and racial diversity in Hyde Park: while roughly 48% of white individuals and families displaced by the project found homes again in Hyde Park and Kenwood, only about 15% of displaced blacks found housing in the area. It also eliminated the area’s nightlife: before renewal, there were more than twenty bars located on 55th Street, east of Woodlawn Avenue, as well as a number of movie theatres and artists’ studios throughout Hyde Park. Today, 55th Street is largely vacant, save for Jimmy’s, which, according to U of C grad and Hyde Park scholar Max Grinnell, was likely saved by student protest.

It’s with this history in mind that we should approach the New Communities Project and its attendant redevelopment efforts in Woodlawn. The tainted history of the University and area organizations in manipulating development to the detriment of low-income people does not automatically indict them in this instance. However, it does serve as a cautionary tale of what can happen when low-income community members are divorced from decision-making on the fates of their respective communities.

In light of this history, the recent actions of TWO, an area nonprofit and one of the three partners in NCP, are cause for concern. TWO manages a five-building complex of publicly subsidized housing named Woodlawn Redevelopment #2, located around 62nd Street and Kimbark Avenue. In December 2004, roughly 200 residents were told they must leave by May 2005, to make way for the buildings’ conversion into condos – a timetable in violation of state law (which mandates that management give tenants at least one year’s notice). TWO has been less than communicative with its tenants as May draws near: after an informational meeting was finally scheduled in March, TWO cancelled it, leaving residents in the dark. A number of tenants, including seniors and disabled residents, have already moved out of the buildings, fearing a forced eviction come May. Though all building residents are living on fixed or low incomes, TWO has offered no compensation for moving costs – and the housing market for low-income people in Chicago ain’t pretty.

Affordable housing is in peril in the Windy City, with over 16,000 subsidized units expected to be demolished or converted before 2010. Waiting lists...
W
omen and Youth Supporting Each Other (WYSE), an RSO that mentors middle school aged girls in Little Village, constantly confronts tensions between censorship and appropriate information. During one memorable session, after showing and explaining to the girls the various types of birth control, mentors asked the girls if they had learned anything about condoms in school. One girl immediately spoke: “Yeah, we’ve just had a week-long session on not having sex until marriage and how condoms do not work. They say they have holes in them.” Even though this young girl seemed to understand the fallacy in such information, how many others believed such lessons because they were not at this session? Furthermore, how many more girls will be convinced, as such instruction is repeated over the years included in the federal government’s policy on sex education?

The first line of Section V in Senate Bill 457 reads: “The General Assembly finds and declares that Illinois’ teen birth rate, numbering over 18,000 per year, ranks among the highest in the nation.” Senate Bill 457 concerns sex education, and Section V is a proposed amendment (currently under consideration) to expand the AOUM sex education curriculum in Illinois public schools. This bill could change the lives of 18,000 Illinois teenage girls, who are currently at outstanding risk for teen pregnancy; outstanding even for the US, which has the highest teen pregnancy rate of any countries.

Illinois’ current AOUM curriculum teaches abstinence as the only standard for sexual activity before marriage. Other prevention methods are not required to be taught and, worse yet, alternative education is not funded. There is no evidence to support the efficacy of AOUM programs. On the contrary, several studies show how potentially harmful these programs are, when presented as the only form of sex education. The National Campaign to Prevent Teen Pregnancy has found a link between AOUM and a decreased use of condoms. It should be noted that STIs (sexually transmitted infections) are increasingly a problem. Chlamydia cases in Illinois increased 10% between 2001 and 2002; more disturbing is that 15-24 year olds accounted for 71% of that increase. In 2002, the same cohort represented 60% of gonorrhea cases. The fact of the matter is that the great majority of adolescents are engaging in various types of sexual intimacy, and obviously a great number are not being safe or clean about it. Is this merely carelessness, or might access to better information change these statistics? Unfortunately, we cannot know this, because there are no attempts made to impart this education in the first place.

Despite such disturbing realities, sex education in Illinois is often inconsistent or censored by the government, the Board of Education, or the teachers themselves. While 90% of sex education teachers include some component of sex education, 66% of them often omit major elements of responsible and comprehensive sex education. Just over half (52.7%) of teachers do not teach about where to get birth control and related health services, with a third of them reporting that they do so because it is not in the curriculum. A quarter of the teachers do not include information about youth rights with regard to rape and sexual assault, half saying because it is not in the curriculum. Just under two-thirds of teachers do not teach about condom use, a quarter saying because it is not in the curriculum. Lastly, 63% of teachers do not teach about other forms of birth control besides abstinence, 30% of them saying because it is not part of the curriculum.

 Obviously, there is something wrong with the curriculum. It is leaving teenage girls vulnerable and alone in the face of unwanted pregnancy, assault and rape. These subjects that are supposedly “not part of the curriculum” are an unfortunate but very real part of sexual activity. Comprehensive sex education teaches abstinence as the sure way to prevent pregnancy and STIs. It empowers youth with the information to make good choices should they decide to become sexually active. Furthermore, comprehensive sex education addresses sexual abuse/harassment, healthy life skills (e.g., goal setting, promoting healthy relationships, self-esteem), the effects of alcohol and drugs on decisionmaking, GLBTQ inclusion, and emphasizes the responsibility of both partners. These are useful skills inside and outside of the bedroom, and they will protect our peers. Keeping this information from adolescents and young adults is irresponsible and immoral. This program addresses issues that concern not only vulnerable females, but also issues of male sexuality, the teen/young adult LGBTQ community, and adolescents in general.

Another disparity is the lack of time spent on female sexuality. Many girls grow up believing that their interest in, or enjoyment from sex is somehow dirty or deviantGirls should not only be allowed to enjoy sex as much as boys, they should be expected to. They should be encouraged to question themselves, wholly understand what they are ready for, and be empowered to decide when they are ready. They deserve to be equipped with the proper emotional and intellectual tools to grow into strong women. When we do not educate our female youth, we leave them prone not only to the heartache that opponents of comprehensive sex education warn will come of anything other than abstinence, but much worse.

Comprehensive sex education encompasses all facets of sexual relationships and has the support of Illinois residents. A February 2005 statewide survey found that 83% of Illinois residents think youth deserve information about how to protect themselves against pregnancy and STIs. There is a sense that youth should be equipped with appropriate knowledge regarding sex.

The current state of sex education in Illinois is at a turning point. Currently the state senate is voting on SB 457, which provides more local control and diverse sex ed options. It also requires that information be age-appropriate and medically accurate. The University of Chicago has been involved in working to pass SB 457. Sex Education Activists went to Springfield, Illinois on April 6th to lobby for the bill. We brought over 30 high school students and 20 University students to the capitol building; and talked with senators and lobbyists to learn about the process of passing a bill. Willinois youth deserve to know how to protect themselves. Any other program is negligent and morally wrong. Please do your part to make a difference: E-mail your senators and sign the state-wide e-petition (http://www.responsiblesexed.org/campaign/sb457_petition). In the event that the bill is tabled, we must stay vigilant about e-mailing and petitioning. This is an issue that affects us all, even if indirectly, and is a matter of youth’s rights.

An overwhelming majority of sex educators (93%) believe that youth should get appropriate information about sex, even if they choose not to be sexually active. Notably, 82.5% of sex educators do not believe that teaching youth about sex encourages them to have sex. The current state of sex education is dangerous, impractical, and counterintuitive. This discrepancy is due in part to the curriculum, but our teachers are not held accountable for what they teach. Teenage girls, however, must deal with the reality and the accountability of becoming pregnant. They deserve better decision-making tools.
What the Hell is Happening in Hyde Park?

Local Feature
by Nick Juravich

On Tuesday, April 12, 2005, students received an email from Hank Webber, the University's Vice President for Community and Government affairs. While most blanket emails from administrators warrant immediate deletion, this one was read widely. The facts, as reported in Webber's email and corroborated by the Chicago Tribune and the Chicago affiliates of ABC, NBC, and CBS, are disturbing. Since January 31, crime and violence in Hyde Park have spiraled dramatically. Webber’s email reports that “there have been more than three dozen incidents throughout Hyde Park, at various times of the day and night, in which lone males have been attacked and beaten by groups of young men.” The most widely reported of these attacks was the killing of a man in front of the CVS at Kimbark and 53rd in March. However, students have increasingly been the targets of muggings and violence, and campus is buzzing with stories of friends and classmates held at gunpoint or assaulted.

Over thirty arrests have been made in connection with these incidents. Reports have designated ninety percent of perpetrators as African-American males ages fourteen through eighteen, twenty percent of whom have been Kenwood High School students. The University and city have promised to beef up UCPD and CPD patrols in the area “until the events end,” says Webber, but in the meantime, students are asking themselves why this is in Hyde Park in the first place.

The CPD and UCPD have issued no official explanation for the rash of attacks, further confusing the community and increasing speculation over the causes. Some students have contended that the attacks are racially motivated, while others have blamed the conspicuous rise in students carrying valuable portable electronic devices, such as ipods and cell phones. However, such explanations presume students to be the specific target of the rise in crime in Hyde Park, which discounts other motivations.

The rise in crime and group violence in Hyde Park can be attributed to broader patterns in city public housing and gang activity. The Chicago Housing Authority is in the midst of a federally funded, multi-billion dollar “Plan for Transformation” that is rapidly transforming the South Side. The overarching mission of the CHA’s plan, as stated by its CEO Terry Peterson, is “ending the isolation of public housing residents by creating new mixed-income communities, where people of all economic backgrounds will live as neighbors.” To this end, the gargantuan Robert Taylor Homes and Stateway Gardens housing projects that collectively housed tens of thousands in Chicago from their completion in 1961 until the beginning of their decommisioning in the fall of 1998, are almost completely gone. The Ida B. Wells Homes, the oldest public housing project in the nation and only two miles north of campus, are in the process of being decommisioned and new Section 8 (mixed-income) housing is going up across Cottage Grove Avenue between 37th and 39th streets. These plans include aggressive incentives for private investors as well as for the CHA’s own action. Throughout the city, residential buildings are being purchased and renovated at cut-rates by private developers with public money, in exchange for the creation of Section 8 units. The building that pioneered this system is Hyde Park’s own Regents Park, home to everyone from students to community members in public housing to Carol Mosley Braun.

Regents has been renovated and operating as a mixed-income environment with great success since the 1980s, but the CHA’s adoption of the Regents model on a massive scale is beginning to cause problems, of which Hyde Park’s crime spike is symptomatic. It is all well and good to tear down the monstrous jail-like concrete towers that a previous CHA chief said “bred crime”, and which by their end became the most famous example of the failure of 1960s urban redevelopment. However, the CHA has been forced to make accommodations around the city for those displaced in the process. The Regents Park experiment succeeded in part because the building’s owners only opened their public-housing units to people without criminal records or CHA misconduct records. Regents Park was not a CHA guarantee, but rather a high-end site for public houses from which they could be evicted if they broke any rules. Now, however, with all city public housing following this model, the strict requirements for residence that Regents kept can no longer be applied.

While the majority of the beneficiaries of public housing have welcomed these changes, the gangs that ran the projects have found their members scattered and the borders of their turf rendered meaningless. On the South Side and in Hyde Park, the city’s two largest African-American gangs have come into conflict. The Gangster Disciples operated in the Stateway Gardens from 39th to 47th Street on State St., but the relocation of their members to mixed-income housing in Kenwood, Hyde Park, and Woodlawn has brought them into close contact with the Black P Stone Nation, which has traditionally controlled the areas east of Cottage Grove Avenue, particularly in Woodlawn, south of campus. Communities that were once home to only one “set” have had their public spaces, including schools such as Kenwood Academy, infested with new gang members. The results of these clashes have been fatal for some and have left the South Side police (CPD and UCPD alike) with more crime and violence than they can handle.

Students and community often consider Hyde Park impervious to the crime patterns of the rest of Chicago. However, a closer look at Hyde Park’s place in the changing geographical and social organization of the South Side suggests that in this new context, Hyde Park has seen a rise in crime because it is a border zone and a commercial center that attracts large numbers of surrounding community members. Hyde Park community members are right to consider their neighborhood very different from the rest of the South Side. The unusually diverse and wealthy population of Hyde Park, coupled with the presence of the University and its police, make it an unlikely area for a gang or even two gangs to dominate. However, this does not deter gang activity in Hyde Park. Rather, the neighborhood has become an increasingly important and dominant center of commerce for the South Side’s African-American population, including members of the displaced Gangster Disciples and Woodlawn’s Black P Stone Nation. The inevitable result is gang violence over turf that was previously dominated by one gang.

The results of this situation for Hyde Park have been attacks on community members (predominantly on African-American males walking alone, not on students) designed for intimidation. These attacks have spilled over into violence against students, as well as muggings, and petty crime activities that serve as initiation (“blooding in”) rites). These crimes and assaults also serve to designate turf for specific gangs through their psychological effects on the community. The presence of the “Green Lizard” graffiti appearing in and around Hyde Park is another part of this, tags left by Black P Stone Nation members (whose color is traditionally green, as the gang tends to be heavily Islamic) to mark new territory.

The good news is that Hyde Park and its residents are not being specifically targeted for crime. The reality is that Hyde Park is a neighborhood in Chicago’s South Side, not an isolated academic oasis in the midst of the city. The University and the community must accept our place in the city and work for positive changes on the whole South Side to prevent gang warfare and group violence. The Chicago Housing Authority has outlined an aggressive new set of policies designed to eliminate the process of ghettoization and gentrification that has divided neighborhoods in the city and foster a series of mixed-income neighborhoods with public housing alongside private development from the South Loop to Calumet. For this goal to become a reality, the city will not only have to pay more attention to mixed income housing, but will have to increase education funding, community services, and police presence on the South Side. This will ease tensions between new neighbors and make sure the gangs that ruled the projects never gain a foothold in the new Section 8 units the CHA has pinned its future on. The University of Chicago already aids the city in these endeavors (the UCPD and the Neighborhood Schools Program are two examples) but the community still considers Hyde Park separate from the South Side. The best way to eliminate crime and group violence in Hyde Park is for Hyde Parkers to take a more proactive role in the processes that shape the City of Chicago and the South Side in particular.
From U.S. Funded Death Squads to L.A-Bred Maras
The Rise of Transnational Salvadoran Youth Gangs

International Feature
by Kelly Richter

On March 15, 2005, U.S. Immigrations and Customs Enforcement (ICE) announced the arrest of 103 key members of the Mara Salvatrucha gang, otherwise known as MS-13. Premised on criminal and immigration charges, the crackdown targeted the top MS-13 networks nationwide – Los Angeles, the Washington D.C. area, New York City, Long Island, Newark, Baltimore and Miami. Part of the ICE’s targeted multi-agency “Operation Community Shield” launched this January to combat the growth of MS-13 in the United States, these arrests indicate a future of ensuing mass deportations of MS-13 members from the country.

Salvadoran gangs, of which the notorious MS-13 is the largest, have established a significant presence in the U.S. over the past two decades. The gangs originated in Los Angeles during the early 1980s amongst Salvadoran youth fleeing civil war. They have since developed a pan-Latino membership and expanded into East Coast cities and American suburbia over the past decade. They have acquired a national membership into the many tens of thousands in over 30 states.

El Salvador has yet to rid itself of political and military impunity. The wartime culture of violence has not fully subsided.

The phenomenon has taken on transnational dimensions as deported/exported Salvadoran American gang affiliates have arrived on the war-torn streets of urban El Salvador, Honduras and Guatemala over the past decade and most recently, begun operating in rural Central America, the Mexican borderlands, Canada and other Latin American countries. Gang membership in Central America has grown rapidly – current estimates suggest up to 30,000 members in El Salvador and up to 50,000 in El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala combined. While the problem of Salvadoran youth gangs has been long-standing, their rapid proliferation and the extreme U.S. federal response to the phenomenon this year are without precedence.

Early this year, the FBI listed dismantling MS-13 as a top priority of its organized crime unit and established a Washington D.C.-based taskforce for coordinating “Operation Community Shield” efforts between over five federal agencies and their local law enforcement counterparts. The Pentagon’s South Command has declared transnational gangs like MS-13 a top threat to Central American stability. This past March, the Homeland Security Department began coordinating intelligence and training with Central American law enforcement to directly combat the gangs, and made plans to exchange federal agents across borders following the precedent of several local U.S. law enforcement agencies including the LAPD and NYPD.

Prior to recent federal interest in the operations of transnational gangs within Central America, U.S. anti-gang efforts in the region were largely contained to funding local police departments. In 2003, Central American officials began to tackle the problem with draconian anti-gang laws and even enlisted military support for some operations. This fostered a surge in prison populations and a questionable human rights situation. With the current U.S. stopgap deportation law enforcement approach, the transnational gang situation will likely worsen.

**Context: US Intervention in El Salvador**
The current Salvadoran-American gang phenomenon is a product of a long and tainted history of U.S. intervention in Central America. During the Cold War, Central America served as a nexus for the projection of American fears over the rise of the “Left,” especially after the Sandinistas rose to power in Nicaragua in 1979 and zealous anti-communist Reagan came into office in 1981. During and prior to the 1980’s, the United States openly and covertly funded the Salvadoran military and paramilitary “death squad” operations claimed some 30,000 victims of leftist groups and the military mobilization of the Marxist Farabundo Marti Liberation Front (FMLN) guerilla insurgency, which led the country into a full-scale civil war.

During the official war, which lasted twelve years and claimed an estimated 100,000 lives, military human rights abuses and impunity were rife under U.S. watch and support – including widespread torture, forced disappearance, and child soldiering amongst other acts. The FMLN also engaged in abuses to a significantly lesser degree. In light of the violations (including murders of U.S. citizens), the Carter administration wavered on aid to the junta but ultimately restored funding under anti-communist pressure. When Reagan came to power, funding of the Salvadoran military dramatically increased (often under executive order to congressional opposition) and the U.S. continued to extensively fund the Salvadoran military until the 1992 ceasefire.

The early 1980’s saw a massive influx of Salvadoran refugees and illegal immigrants into the U.S. fleeing death squads, the military, the FMLN, economic desolation, and other trappings of guerilla war. However, the United States refused to acknowledge the extent or existence of a humanitarian crisis. Salvadorans were categorically denied amnesty in favor of refugees from communist countries. While biased policies were successfully challenged in the early 1990’s, the status of Salvadorans in the U.S. has remained precarious. Beginning in the early 1990’s, various legal concessions have prolonged temporary residency status and have given many permanent residences; however, most who have applied for amnesty have been denied.

New waves of illegal immigration from El Salvador have occurred in lieu of a persistent dearth of local opportunities in a national economy increasingly dependent on remittances. El Salvador has yet to rid itself of political and military impunity. The wartime culture of violence has not fully subsided. Since the end of the war, the country has had one of the highest murder rates in the world, a problem only compounded by a recent surge in American-style gang activity. Of the roughly two million Salvadorans in the U.S. today (nearly 20% of the total global Salvadoran population), many remain undocumented. The threat of deportation has bred a perceived inability to contact law enforcement authorities in U.S. immigrant communities, an optimal atmosphere for criminal gang culture to proliferate.

**Rise of the Domestic Salvadoran Maras**
Youth gangs have grown remarkably in prominence, organization and geographic scope amongst all ethnic demographics in the United States over the past two decades, garnering immense media focus and stimulating popular moral panic about the future of American youth. The federally funded National Youth Gang Center reported 772,500 youth in 24,500 gangs in 2000 – a near eight-fold increase from twenty years prior when there were some 100,000 youth in 3,000 gangs nationwide. Salvadoran gangs have gained notoriety for their immigrant composition and violence.

The socio-historical experience of Salvadorans demonstrates that the recent spread of gang culture amongst Salvadoran-American immigrant youth cannot be characterized merely as one element of the broader spread of gang
culture. The Salvadoran war fostered incredible stress for youth, many of whom witnessed the torture and murder of their families, or who were recruited by the army as child soldiers. In the name of protection, many parents sent their children alone or with distant relatives to the U.S., and many youths escaped with fractured families or came to this country entirely alone. Some academics and psychologists have suggested that the civil war and immigration trauma hardened some youth, fostering violent instincts replicated on American streets. On the whole, the phenomenon has defied traditional American scholarly explanations of youth social organization and criminal deviance (The author has explored various existing explanatory approaches in separate research project on this topic). Sociology aside, the historical trends of the proliferation of Salvadoran youth gang culture in the U.S. are clear and troubling.

The earliest and most extensive case of Salvadoran youth gang culture in the U.S. took shape in East Los Angeles, the largest Salvadoran immigrant settlement center in the country (by virtue of kinship networking and the city’s geographic proximity to the border). In 1993, the year after the civil war ended, there were some 500,000 Salvadoran immigrants living in L.A. compared to barely several thousand a decade prior. Today, L.A. has the second largest urban Salvadoran population in the world, outnumbered only by San Salvador. Salvadorans settled primarily near run-down Pico Union, isolated from mainstream opportunities. Marginalization has been compounded by a lack of documentation and subsequent harassment; in 1989 the L.A. Salvadoran population was 60% illegal. With a constant influx of new immigrants, illegality remains a major issue.

Many of the Salvadoran immigrant youths arriving on the harsh L.A. streets in the early 1980’s lacked substantial family networks and access to mainstream opportunities and so were drawn into the South Central’s pervasive gang culture. Many joined established Mexican American gangs but experienced discrimination because of their recent immigration and Salvadoran heritage. Some opted to form their own gangs, often to rival pre-existing ones.

Mara Salvatrucha was the one of the first major gangs to emerge, roughly in 1984. MS-13 soon grew to the largest and most notorious Salvadoran gang in the city; as early as 1990 it had 500 members. Alongside MS-13 came a proliferation of smaller Salvadoran crews: some groups organized around socializing and graffiti tagging; others around violent contestation for control of local turf or localized trade in drugs, arms, and other illicit goods. As Salvadorans became more established in the city, many youth began to associate more closely with other Latinos. In turn, many Salvadorans began to join the Mexican American Calle 18 gang, which became the avowed foe of MS-13. This rivalry provoked a surge in violent gang conflict.

Over the course of the late 1980’s and 1990’s, L.A.’s Salvadoran gangs evinced a strong police reaction, resulting in LAPD Rampart anti-gang civil rights abuses, cover-ups, and public scandals. As police harassment of Salvadoran youths in L.A. intensified over the 1990’s and the city unsuccessfully attempted to use injunctions to stop youth from gathering on the streets, the gangs grew increasingly popular and more sophisticated. MS-13 began trafficking Central American arms and drugs into the U.S. and stolen American cars to Central America. Arrests and imprisonment of gang members, rather than deterring gang activity, produced an increasingly hardline loyalty of youth to the gangs. Today, Calle 18 is estimated to have up to 10,000 Salvadoran members in L.A. County out of its total 20,000; MS-13 membership is likely much higher.

Salvadoran Gangs in U.S. Suburbia

About ten years ago, INS and police targeting of L.A.’s Salvadorean gangs stimulated the migration of members to the East Coast. According to law enforcement authorities, many of the gang members who migrated sought to establish drug rings in untapped U.S. markets, suggesting an organizational approach to the relocation. Numerous gang members affiliated with L.A.’s MS-13 and Calle 18 began to arrive in the Washington, D.C. area during the mid-1990’s. Salvadoran immigrants had established themselves in the D.C. area in the early 1980’s upon the basis of kinship networks, forming the second largest Salvadoran population center in the U.S. While some settled in low-income downtown areas, many clustered in suburban neighborhoods and apartment complexes in Northern Virginia and Maryland. Although there have been more employment prospects in D.C. than in L.A., Salvadoran employment in the area has largely remained contained to marginal household and consumer service sectors.

Local Salvadoran youth gangs began to appear in the D.C. area during the mid-1980’s. While gangs such as La Mara de Washington responded to threats of local African American gangs, a few suburban crews formed as social groups but morphed into full-fledged gangs rivaling and fighting one another, even dabbling in the drug trade. While D.C.’s first gangs were very small, the local phenomenon exploded with the arrival of L.A. affiliated crews. Members of MS-13 and Calle 18 began heavy organized recruitment efforts of local youth in suburban areas, and began targeting public middle schools for new members, particularly newly arrived immigrant youth. Recruitment turned D.C.’s Salvadoran gangs into a largely suburban phenomenon. By 2003, MS-13 had an estimated membership of 3,000 in Northern Virginia alone.

Sensational accounts of Salvadoran gang activity have pervaded local media, with particular emphasis on violence over the past several years. MS-13 has been involved in 11 murders in the area over the past two years, as well as machete attacks and gang rape. In 2001, a fourteen year old MS-13 member who stabbed a man to death at a Virginia strip mall became the youngest person charged as an adult for murder in Fairfax County.

Salvadoran gang culture has been a pioneering force for a broader Latino gang phenomenon sweeping the D.C. region; many local Latino youth, lacking gangs of their own, have been joining the four major Salvadoran gangs. Over the past decade, D.C. area police have adopted harsh anti-gang tactics, collaborating with the FBI and the INS to deport local illegal immigrant criminals. Such efforts have been criticized as discriminatory and invasive and have not damaged the popularity or spread of Salvadoran gang culture amongst local youth.

Beyond D.C., Long Island, New York also witnessed a remarkable proliferation of Salvadoran youth gangs during the mid-1990’s. MS-13 membership began in Long Island suburbia a year or two after it first emerged in D.C., roughly in 1996 or 1997. Today, MS-13 is Long Island’s largest gang, with 3,000 members. Many members engage in conflict with African American gangs, and sell crack cocaine and stolen goods.

Most recently, over the past several years, there has been a dramatic spread of Salvadoran gangs into over 30 states across the country, according to U.S. authorities. In North Carolina, there have been 18 MS-13 linked killings over the past two years. Miami has become home to hundreds of MS-13 members and Salvadoran gangs have established themselves in cities as diverse as Boston and Omaha. With the widespread use of internet technology in gang affairs, many of the new sprouting chapters of MS-13 and Calle 18 are merely copycat affiliates not integrated into higher levels of transnational leadership.

Exporting American Problems

In 1996, when federal law enhanced provisions for the deportation of undocumented criminals, major deportations of Salvadoran criminals had been taking place for four years. By 1994, deported gang members had already established a significant presence in San Salvador, enhancing the transnational criminal links of L.A. gangs and laying the ground for the replication of American style gangs. Deportees began to recruit local youth into fledgling crews of MS-13 and Calle 18, and some Salvadoran youth began to form indigenous crews in reaction to the Americanized gangs. There are some now 30,000 gang members in El Salvador.

Maras continued on page 11
Snakeheads, Triads, and Tenements
New York City’s Fuk Ching and Human Smuggling

International Feature
by Ali Winston

Manhattan’s Chinatown, squeezed in between the office towers of the Financial District and Soho’s astronomically priced lofts, has undergone a profound change. The ubiquitous restaurants and dumpling shops, souvenir shops, and illegal sweatshops are all still there but the neighborhood has undergone a profound demographic shift. An influx of immigrants from China’s Fukien province has shifted the balance away from the established Chinese immigrant populations from Hong Kong and neighboring Guangdong. This trend applies to the whole United States: since the 1980s, Fukienese communities have sprung up in Cleveland, Chicago, Boston, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and Seattle.

Fukienese businesses and organizations (particularly the Fukien American Association) are experiencing sustained growth and profitability. East Broadway, the main thoroughfare of Chinatown’s Fukienese area, is bustling with people and energy and now goes by the nickname ‘Fuzhou street’, after the main city of Fukian province. On Mondays, the street is packed with Fukienese from other cities, who come to New York for marriages, bill payments, visits to the doctor, and to assuage homesickness. In the midst of the expansion there has been a negative development – the rise of the Fuk Ching, who have violently forced their way into New York City’s criminal subculture and fostered connections with transnational crime syndicates through human smuggling.

Chinese youths as a reaction to aggression by whites, blacks, and Hispanics. A plethora of successor gangs have come and gone over the years: only two, the Ghost Shadows (1966) and the Flying Dragons (1967) have survived the years. These two gangs have benefited greatly from close ties and informal control of tong, associations typically formed around ethnic identities to provide services to recent immigrants and act as power brokers in intra-community conflicts and affairs. Ethnicity is not a unifying factor in determining tong membership; the Hip Sing and On Leong tongs, both Cantonese, rival for power and influence through support for the Flying Dragons and Ghost Shadows, respectively.

Bitter enemies for decades, much of the violence that pervaded Chinatown in the late 1970’s and early 1980’s can be attributed to an ongoing turf war between these two gangs over territory between Grand and Pell streets. Amidst the turmoil, the growth of the Fukienese population and the rise of a new segment of disgruntled youth led to the formation of the Fuk Ching in 1983. After initially setting up shop on East Broadway and Pike street under the shadow of the Manhattan Bridge, their quick growth and vicious brutality expanded their territory Northwest, effectively controlling all of East Chinatown.

When the Fuk Ching first arrived on the scene, Fukienese establishments were minor on East Broadway, and in Chinatown in general. Now, under the supervision and protection of the local tong, the Fukien American Association, Fukienese restaurants, corner stores, discount bus lines, and gambling parlors all profit off of the immigration boom. The price of dealing with a tong is coping with the racketeers and extortion common for Chinatown business owners, a standard tactic of Manhattan’s Chinese gangs. Fuk Ching shakedown typically take place along East Broadway, Chrystie Street, and Henry Street. Racketeering and competition among small Chinese businesses has become increasingly violent over the past two years. In May and October of 2003 a bus driver and a would-be extortionist became casualties of such a turf war; a headless corpse linked to the war was also found. Arson and destruction of discount bus offices and vehicles is commonplace. Most of these companies, such as Dragon Coach USA and the New Century bus line, are run by and for Fukienese migrants. The brutal, gangland style murders of bus company employees and the particular Fukienese identity of these businesses indicates the involvement of Fukienese criminal elements. The Fuk Ching has also turned towards the lucrative practice of smuggling Fukienese into the United States. Mention involvement with tong business crime.

Since the first Chinese came to the United States to work on the transcontinental railroads in the 1860’s, illegal immigration has been an undeniable aspect of Sino-American relations. The influx of illegal Chinese migrants remained steady from the passage of the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 up until the re-establishment of diplomatic ties between the US and China in 1978. The New York metropolitan area is well-acquainted with this uncomfortable reality, and for generations illegal Chinese migrants have successfully concealed their presence amidst Gotham’s routine chaos.

In one of the most acrimonious cases of human trafficking in the United States, a ship named the Golden Venture was stranded off Long Island in June 1993: 280 Chinese citizens desperately leapt overboard and swam for the dim lights on the shore. For 10 of the illegal passengers who had endured the hardships of the month-long sea voyage, the 40-minute swim proved to be too much. Following the Golden Venture tragedy, the Fukienese American Association’s Chinatown headquarters was raided by the NYPD and Fuk Ching leader Kuo Liang Kay was arrested in Hong Kong in connection and sentenced in 1998 to 20 years for organizing a criminal conspiracy.

The Golden Venture was only one of the most publicized of a rash of maritime seizures, dating back to the August 1991 seizure of the I-Mao and its 131 illegal passengers.

Over recent years, the techniques of Chinese smugglers, otherwise known as “snakeheads,” has become increasingly sophisticated. Chinese migrants now enter the United States by land, air, or sea. Some arrive in Canada or Mexico and then traverse the border illegally – purportedly, several thousand Chinese are in smuggling way stations across Central America at any given time. Other layover points are Russia, Cuba, Jamaica, the Dominican Republic, Bolivia, Venezuela, Belize, and Guam.

Even with post September 11 scrutiny of air traffic and international passengers, snakeheads have succeeded in skirtsing American security by securing legitimate visas and passports from corrupt Chinese officials by including migrants in official business delegations. In April 2000, Interpol arrested Cheng Chui Ping, a Fukienese snakehead based on East Broadway. Her operation, which changed migrants anywhere from $25,000-$30,000 (current rates are anywhere between $50,000-$70,000) for transportation into the United States, involved corrupt officials in China and Central America and travel agencies on the take. In collaboration with the Manhattan branch of the Bank of China, Ping channeled $40 million back to China. The Fuk Ching acted as her enforcers, threatening, kidnapping, torturing and sometimes murdering migrants who could not pay their fee.

The Fuk Ching play a key role in Chinese human trafficking. The gang provides an essential link for overseas smuggling partners by providing access to the finances and connections of Manhattan’s Chinatown. Thanks to the backing of the Fukien American Association, which loosely supervises the activity of Fuk Ching members, the gang is able to operate with
impunity within their neighborhood. Following the 1997 British handover of Hong Kong to China, local Triads (vast criminal organizations based in Hong Kong, with extensive ties in Asia, Europe, and the United States) have woven themselves into the fabric of government. The Chinese Minister of Public Security openly admitted to police collusion with Triad elements. Hong Kong Triads have successfully meshed with legitimate business enterprises and government infrastructure to the point where delineating between the legal and illegal activities of a Triad is almost impossible. Even though Hong Kong Triads such as the 14K and Wo Hop To Triads have been accused of collaborating with government officials to place illegal migrants amongst official “business delegations” bound for the U.S., no formal indictments have been issued. Considering snakeheads’ dependency on corrupt government officials (both Chinese and foreign) and forged documentation, it can be inferred that at least indirect links exist between China-based triads and the Fuk Ching.

Better wages are the dominant reason for Fukienese migration and this lucrative transnational economy has been well exploited. Not only are illegal immigrants in New York employed at the most minimal level of the service industry and housed in overcrowded, decrepit tenements, but their bosses and landlords are also subject to Fuk Ching extortion. This creates a vicious cycle of exploitation that begins with the snakehead and propagates socio-economic difficulties. Over one-third of Chinatown’s families live below the poverty line, and only recently has the neighborhood seen an upturn. Despite intense suffering and exploitation, there are no indications that the influx of Fukienese to the United States, and New York in particular, will lessen. Unlike other illegal immigrants and asylum seekers, the Fukienese do not intend to permanently settle. They work exhausting 6-day work weeks in order to first pay off their debt to the snakeheads, and second, to send money back to Fukian to support their family and children. Families and marriages are put under immense strain with the year-long absence of a breadwinning father. Affairs among neighbors and friends in Fukian have become increasingly commonplace, and test the strength of a community’s social fabric. The prospect of earning $1,500 per month in New York versus $50 per month in China outweighs the hardships of leaving a family and illegal migration, however. After roughly two decades, this migratory pattern has become an integral part of Fukian province’s culture and economy, a trend reinforced by the pressures exerted on small farmers by large-scale industrial and commercial endeavors. It is extremely difficult to pin down connections between the various overseas partners, and Fuk Ching’s on-the-ground operations in New York in the human smuggling rings. Thanks to Triad organizations and corrupt governments, the sines of human trafficking are now intertwined with transnational economic and political relationships: passport officials and border patrol officers have been indicted for aiding and abetting smugglers. Even if one snakehead or an organization that engages in the trade is caught or broken up, the flexible nature of associations in human smuggling allow traffickers to quickly shift their connections and frustrate law enforcement. The ease of concealing large flows of money in the midst of China’s massive economic boom complicate efforts to trace transactions involved with human trafficking, and to demarcate legitimate enterprises from this shadow economy. All too often, the two are tightly intertwined.

Encouraging long-term, sustainable development and employment in Fukian itself, greater cooperation between Chinese, Central American, and U.S. law enforcement agencies, as well as with increased government scrutiny of international business relations can potentially exert more efficient and conclusive pressure on human smuggling operations. In order to confront an issue that reaches from southwest China to the heart of Manhattan, the U.S. should further re-examine its central role in this globalized economy.

Maras continued from page 9

In order to find a genuine solution to the Salvadoran gang problem, U.S. law enforcement must reconsider its policies of gang dumping. The Central American countries lack the infrastructure to cope with the recent spread of violent American-style gang activity. Current hard-handed approaches in these nations fail to address local realities, namely cultures of impunity and unemployment. The conservative shift in these countries over the gang issue is alarming in light of legacies of human rights abuse and impunity. A re-evaluation of U.S. support for such policies in the wake of law enforcement integration is of utmost urgency, lest Cold War failures in the region be repeated.

It is undeniable that many Salvadoran gangs are criminal and must be confronted, but it also necessary to acknowledge that the majority of Salvadoran youth in the U.S. are not malcontent, violent gang members and should not be subject to blanket profiling and harassment by law enforcement authorities. So long as so many Salvadoran immigrant communities remain on the fringe of U.S. society by a failure of justice, unrealistic immigration policies, a lack of engagement with mainstream America by virtue of citizenship status, and stereotypical depictions of Salvadorean as criminals, gangs will remain an increasingly attractive option. It is time for more constructive and proactive government approaches to the transnational gang problem. The role of current as well as prior foreign and immigration policies in fostering and exacerbating the problem must be addressed, within marginalized and targeted immigrant communities in U.S., and within Central America itself. Deportation won’t just make a long history of U.S. failures disappear.
Gimme the Loot
A New Age of Piracy on the High Seas

Fangcheng Anchorage
South China Sea
LAT: 21 45 N
LON: 108 21 E

The lights of the docks were veiled in halos from the light drizzle. From the harbor lane they ran together in a mass of incandescence. The crew of the Kanpur steamed into Fangcheng just after dark, in hopes that there would be less of a wait for the bunkers.

Fangcheng was one of the few South China Sea ports that made bunkers and fresh water available at anchorage and berth. The harbor pilot had been eager to finish guiding in the ship and seemed to be in a hurry to get off shift, almost nervous because of the dark. In a couple of hours the ship would berth at dock number 4. The Kanpur, a bulk carrier, would then unload some cargo. In the meantime, the ship anchored parallel to the docks and the crew had a clear view of the port from the starboard side of their quarters.

Around 7:30, as the watchman strolled around the bow of the ship into the forepeak lockers, he was almost knocked overboard by a swinging locker door. As the door receded from him, it revealed a picture that made the man’s stomach drop. Seven men with what appeared to be machetes and crowbars were gutting the lockers and piling up the loot along the port side railing. The watchman kept silent and watched the men unnoticed.

The man in front of him was about the same height and looked Chinese. He was wearing a faded red bandana, heavily soiled navy shorts barely covering his wiry thin legs, and worn rubber slippers with thongs about to fall off. His machete was fastened around his hand he gripped his crowbar and as the watchman looked at him, he turned to the railing where his grapnel hook was attached to a rail and tied to a fibrous rope. The man threw over several large cubes of cargo and climbed over to the other side preparing to descend. The watchman, snapping out of his ill-timed stupor, called out the alarm in Tamil. The man in the bandana, alarmed by the shouts, looked up to see the watchman and flashed a toothless smile of victory as he descended with the others.

Piracy on the Rise

The above incident was reported on October 9, 2004 to the Fangcheng Port Authority and Harbor Police and filed in the International Maritime Organization’s Reports on Acts of Piracy and Armed Robbery. The incident is but the face of piracy in the twenty-first century.

Most people are surprised to hear that there are still pirates. Perceived as relics of the past, pirates are relatively unheard of by the public. In spite of their lack of notoriety, pirates have increasingly been making their presence felt. The shipping industry worldwide incurs estimated losses in the neighborhood of $14 billion a year due to piracy and armed robbery. In 2004, the number of acts of piracy reported to the International Maritime Bureau was 325, down from a record 445 in 2003. Despite the 2004 dip, recent years have witnessed an increasing number of ships dealing with pirates, brigands, and various bandits on the high seas.

The IMB Piracy Reporting Center was established in 1995 to monitor piracy and armed robbery on the high seas. Based in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, the Center has recorded 3,653 acts through October of last year. The agency is a part of the International Chamber of Commerce and the International Maritime Organization. These institutions were intended to promote trade, primarily by stopping malpractice and fraud. However, during the early 1990’s many shippers and insurers, as well as government agencies, became alarmed at the growing number of pirate attacks. The IMB has since acted as a coordinator between various parties affected by piracy in an attempt to curb it.

The strong presence of piracy and pirates in the global shipping industry should come as no shock in an age of globalization. With 90% of the world’s cargo being carried via ship, pirates have plenty of ripe targets. Booming growth in Asia has steadily increased that continent’s role in international trade, driven by growth in countries like China and India. It comes as no surprise that shipping capacity and liberalization are of crucial importance to international trade talks, even meriting their own negotiations at the WTO Negotiating Group on Maritime Transport Services (NGMTS). The private sector has an additional interest in preventing pirate attacks. Shipping companies must deal with the added expenses of increased insurance costs for vessels, as well as delays and potential investigations.

Piracy: Theory and Practice

According to the IMO:

“Piracy consists of any of the following acts:
1. any illegal acts of violence or detention, or any act of depredation, committed for private ends by the crew or the passengers of a private ship or a private aircraft, and directed:
   i. on the high seas, against another ship or aircraft, or against persons or property on board such ship or aircraft
   ii. again a ship, aircraft, persons or property in a place outside the jurisdiction of any State;
2. any act of voluntary participation in the operation of a ship or an aircraft with knowledge of facts making it a pirate ship or aircraft.”

In actuality, piracy usually follows one of two basic methods. The first is an assault type attack. Pirates board a ship, rob its members of money/cargo and retreat off the ship – a hit-and-run. In the second form, pirates steal the entire ship, crew and all – a hijacking.

One of the alarming facts in the resurgence of piracy is the increase in hijacking-style attacks. These tend to be more brutal, with crews sometimes murdered outright upon the pirates’ boarding of the vessel. While the modus operandi seems to have changed little over time, pirates have taken full advantage of technological advances. Modern day pirate ships range from ultra-fast cigarette boats to...
have since coordinated their efforts to reduce pirate attacks, an attempt that brought the number of attacks down to 6 in 1998. However, a resurgence of pirate attacks in the straits coincided with the recovery of Asian countries from the Asian financial crisis in 1998. Stories like that of the Tenyu, a Panama registered ship taking aluminum ingots from Indonesia to South Korea only to disappear in the straits and reappear with a new crew and flag in southern China are by no means isolated in the Malacca straits.

Just to the north, the South China Seas have proved a trouble spot for ships as well. Since the sea is so vast (200 miles across), patrolling it is rather difficult. Pirates have been known to dress up as Chinese officials or pretend to be fishing vessels. Witnesses have implicated the People’s Liberation Army’s Navy in some attacks, pointing to corruption. India and Bangladesh also face growing problems, with many ships being attacked while anchored in Calcutta or Chittagong.

Piracy in South America and the West Indies has also risen, as New World pirates have taken more to attacking ships at port, technically classifying the attacks as armed robberies. The Venezuelan/Colombian coast is a high-risk area for yachts sailing the Caribbean and many attacks there are thought to be drug-related. Kingston, Jamaica has seen dozens of incidences of organized men dressed in black with automatic rifles robbing ships and retreating back into the city. Brazil is considered to be a major hotspot worldwide, with high rates of violence per incident.

In Africa too, pirates have made a comeback. The waters off the coast of Nigeria were once considered the most dangerous in the world, with pirates taking advantage of heavy oil tanker traffic. Nigeria still sees attacks, but not as frequently in recent years. Sea captains are advised to plot courses at least 50 miles off the Somalian coast to avoid piratical attacks by militiamen from that country. Somali pirates are reputed to employ mortars and shoulder-fired rockets in pursuit of vessels. The highly unstable civil situation in Sierra Leone has also contributed to increased attacks on ships at port there. The number of attacks even spurred a protest by local fishermen.

Securing the Sea

The international response to the recent rise in piracy is best described as frustrated. This is due, in no small measure, to issues of national sovereignty and international cooperation. Since many attacks occur while ships are at port, countries are not free to pursue pirates. Jurisdiction is often claimed by the countries in whose territorial waters the attacks occur, placing restrictions on how incidents can be handled.

There is a greater need for cooperation among regional countries to secure against attacks. The IMO has included this recommendation in most every report issued, revealing how integral cooperation will be to successful counter-measures. The communal efforts of the coastal countries on the Malacca Straits has proven that effective international collaboration yields results. This cooperation is expedient in other parts of Asia which have witnessed decreases in the number of naval and security vessels at sea and with them, the ability to police pirate activity. Japan and India have led Asian efforts in the piracy area with a joint Coast Guard training. In cases where the Japanese navy has made a presence in pirate infested waters, attacks have almost always gone down.

Ship owners and the shipping industry have made efforts to reduce the threat from pirates. Shipping companies have begun to provide training and safety plans for crews traveling through dangerous waters. On board security systems such as electrified fences and alarms are becoming more common. The IMO has also issued circulars to ship owners providing recommendations such as reducing the amount of cash in the master’s safe and discrete radio communication about valuable cargo or cash. Prolonged investigations often discourage reporting by ships to local authorities. Bureaucracy and corruption appear to be the primary causes.

One major problem fighting piracy is the alleged complicity of some governments and local officials in such attacks. This problem is closely linked with the connection of piracy to international crime syndicates. Many attacks, particularly in the South China Sea, are carried out with pirates disguised as officials. The high degree of planning and coordination of some attacks suggests the involvement of crime syndicates based out of China that have spread to other countries in Southeast Asia. In South America, competing drug-dealers loot ships smuggling drugs. The requisite level of law enforcement in these countries is not sufficient to combat the highly organized criminal elements behind these acts.

Wind in the Sails

It appears pirates today are enjoying a second wind at sea. Economic growth and trade in the developing world will no doubt continue to rise for the foreseeable future. In turn, this means that the seas are only going to get more and more crowded with cargo, welcome news for pirates the world over who are eager to take their share of the loot. Until countries begin to seriously consider and implement cooperative security measures, pirates will be able to operate relatively unhindered. While international institutions like the IMB, IMO, and UN are beginning to take necessary measures to combat piracy, the high seas are likely to remain dangerous in many places.
A Liberal Nixon is Arisen
Joan Hoff’s Nixon Reconsidered in Context

The Burial
On April 27, 1994, Richard Nixon’s body was laid to rest in Yorba Linda, California. Reviews were mixed. While Bob Dole sobbed that Nixon was an American hero who worshiped God and saluted the flag, the immortal Hunter S. Thompson called Nixon “a swine of a man and a jabbering dupe of a President” who possessed an “ugly, Nazi spirit” and whose body “should have been burned in a trash bin.” Such were the highly subjective and emotional reactions that President Nixon’s personality yielded from both sides of the political spectrum. As a two-dimensional character, Nixon appears to be the ultimate right wing brow-beater, a man who hated East Coast elitism, hated the arts, hated sixties counterculture, and hated everyone under the age of thirty. But as a policy-maker, Nixon has enjoyed a radical revision of late.

The Revisionists
Since the mid-1980s, Nixon has ironically been resurrected by a group of historians as the last great liberal president on domestic policy. The first article to make a primary case for Nixon’s liberalism appeared in the February 24, 1983 issue of The Washington Post. Written by former Nixon aide Jodie Allen, the article was entitled “Last of the Big Spenders,” and deployed a mythical, big government Nixon to lament the age of Reagan. But it was not until four years after Allen’s article surfaced that the theory began to attract a significant following. At a 1987 conference at Long Island’s Hofstra University, two historians presented papers which openly, and for the first time, deeply argued the case for Nixon’s liberalism. Their names were Barry Riccio and Joan Hoff. Also present in Long Island, and listening carefully, were Herbert Farmet, Tom Wicker, and the erstwhile military historian Steven Ambrose. All five were to write analyses of Nixon that, if not completely reassessed his personality, yielded from both sides of the political spectrum. As a two-dimensional character, Nixon appears to be the ultimate right wing brow-beater, a man who hated East Coast elitism, hated the arts, hated sixties counterculture, and hated everyone under the age of thirty. But as a policy-maker, Nixon has enjoyed a radical revision of late.

The Policies
To restate their argument, the most basic indicator of Nixon’s liberalism was his continuation, and indeed expansion, of Lyndon Johnson’s Great Society programs. The Family Assistance Plan (FAP), which proposed to deliver cash payments to every poor family in America, was typical of Nixon’s social welfare policies. He originated proposed FAP to steal the Democrats’ thunder, but the plan so angered conservatives like William F. Buckley and Milton Friedman (whose “negative income tax” theory the plan was loosely based on), that Nixon was eventually forced to abandon it and FAP greatly expanded government spending. Perhaps most indicative of the spending explosion is the fact that, under Nixon, funding for the arts, most of which was pocketed by the hated East Coast cultural elites, quadrupled. It is interesting to note that National Public Radio was established under Nixon’s watch and that he supported the National Endowment for the Humanities. As Herbert Stein, a member of Nixon’s Council of Economic Advisors, put it, “the administration that was against expanding the budget expanded it greatly; the administration that was determined to fight inflation ended by having a large amount of it.” Nixon’s huge increase in federal spending was paralleled by an equally large expansion in federal regulation. Nixon’s government founded the Occupational Safety and Health Administrations, the National Transportation Safety Board and the Environmental Protection Agency. The number of pages in the Federal Register, which contains all the federal rules and regulations, grew only 19 percent under Johnson. It grew 121 percent under Nixon. Indeed, the actual number of federal regulations tripled during Nixon’s term in office. As Stein wrote, “probably more new regulation was imposed on the economy during the Nixon administration than in any other presidency since the New Deal.” The revisionist historians offer a surprising reassessment on the issue of race. While they certainly acknowledge his anti-busing rhetoric, quota bashing, and nomination of latter-day Dixiecrats for the Supreme Court, their key analysis falls on his administration’s more substantive progress. Indeed, the historians note that Nixon’s administration oversaw the desegregation of African-American schools. Between 1968 and 1972, the percentage of Southern African-Americans attending all-black schools fell from 68 percent to 8 percent. The historians also look past Nixon’s rhetorical hatred of quotas to his revival of Johnson’s “Philadelphia Plan,” which mandated that federal contractors act affirmatively in hiring minorities. They also highlight his Native American policies. During his Presidency, Nixon expanded the Bureau of Indian Affairs, endorsed the Native American policy of self-determination, and settled several land disputes in the favor of the tribes. No one would argue that Nixon was an earth-shattering revolutionary when it came to racial policy. The historians are never passed the Congress. Supplemental Security Income, however, did pass through Congress in the wake of FAP, and stipulated massive amounts of aid to the elderly and to the disabled. Indeed, Social Security benefits rose under Nixon, the Food Stamps program was expanded, funding for the Model Cities program increased, and universal health insurance was proposed. In terms of social welfare, Nixon’s administration outperformed Johnson’s.

Furthermore, Nixon’s administration dramatically outspent Johnson’s, in part to pay for the social programs. It is almost shocking to learn that under Nixon, and at the near height of the Cold War, social spending exceeded defense spending for the first time in American history. While Nixon’s first budget in 1970 had allotted $55 billion to social spending, by 1975 that figure had increased to $132 billion. Social spending took up 28 percent of the federal budget when LBJ left office. It took up 40 percent by the time Nixon left. As shown below, Nixon also greatly expanded regulation, which, in turn,
only attempting to draw a distinction, here more than almost anywhere else, between Nixon’s often politically motivated rhetoric and his action.

Finally, on environmental policies, Nixon was the first, and maybe last, truly green president. Not only did he found the Environmental Protection Agency, but he also helped to pass the Clean Air Act and the Clean Water Act, which were radical at the time and which laid the groundwork for all domestic environmental policy that followed. While some of his environmentalism may have sprung from the energy crisis following the Yom Kippur War of 1973, OPEC couldn’t have influenced legislation passed three years before its inception. Nixon was the first president to seriously tackle environmental problems, and the revisionist historians rightly give him credit.

**The Explanations**

In an October 2004 edition of *Rolling Stone*, noted Nixon basher Hunter S. Thompson wrote “Richard Nixon looks like a flaming liberal today, compared to a golem like George Bush.” Thompson’s wonderfully overstated analysis, that Nixon only looks like a liberal when held up to the regressive light of presidents like Ronald Reagan and George W. Bush, is one of many explanations for Nixon’s recent makeover. These explanations include: that Nixon’s domestic staff was made up entirely of progressive best-and-brighest holdovers from the Kennedy and Johnson eras, that Nixon didn’t really care about domestic policy and so all of his decisions were entirely motivated by politics, that Nixon’s détente foreign policy vaguely bled into his progressive domestic policy, that America as a whole has grown more conservative over the past 35 years, that Bill Clinton destroyed what it means to be a liberal, and that Daniel Patrick Moynihan was the real power behind the throne. Indeed, the juiciest explanation is that Moynihan turned Nixon on to the 19th Century British Prime Minister Benjamin Disraeli, who often talked right and walked left. After reading Disraeli’s biography, which Moynihan had given to him, Nixon allegedly told his trusted Democratic advisor, “you know very well that it is the Tory men with liberal policies who have enlarged democracy.”

**The Liberal**

Whatever the reasons guiding Nixon’s liberalism and the perception of it, the end result is that on paper, and given the evidence presented by historians like Joan Hoff, Richard Nixon was the last great progressive president on domestic policy. No matter how awful his rhetoric and his image may have been, Nixon instituted more social programs than his welfare-loving predecessor, spent more money on the Great Society than on the Cold War, imposed unheard-of levels of federal regulation, heavily funded his avowed cultural nemeses in the arts, was racially sensitive (to a degree), and was the first president to fight for a greener America. If that’s not a liberal, then what is?

As Hunter S. Thompson once wrote, “Richard Nixon... was a crook and a creep and a gin-sot, but on some nights, when he would get hammered and wander around in the streets, he was fun to hang out with. He would wear a silk sweat suit and pull a stocking down over his face so nobody could recognize him. Then he would get in a cab and cruise down to the Watergate Hotel, just for laughs.”

---

**Students for Human Rights**

*New U of C RSO fights police brutality*

On February 14th, 1982, decorated police commander Jon Burge declared, “It’s fun time,” as he proceeded to brutally torture Andrew Wilson, who was accused of killing two policemen five days before. Wilson was subjected to radiator burns on his chest, beatings, and electric shocks to his genitals, ears, fingers, and nose. Using this type of coercion, Burge and his men convinced Wilson to sign a confession that ultimately led to his conviction and a sentence on death row. A civil suit was brought against the City of Chicago by Andrew Wilson and his lawyers, protesting the treatment of Wilson at the hands of Burge and his men. The suit ended in July of 1996, after two trials under Judge Brian Barnett Duff – each clearing Burge and his accomplices of any wrongdoing.

As members of the new RSO, Students for Human Rights, we will be working to hold John Burge and other violators of human rights in the CPD accountable. Through connections with the law School and organizations throughout the city we plan to work effectively and creatively to educate the University of Chicago community and the city at-large about this important issue.

Students for Human Rights will also be working on a health and labor rights campaign with the Service Employees International Union (SEIU) against Advocate Hospitals’ discriminatory funding of hospitals in minority communities in Chicago, which has tremendous consequences for the quality of care received by those who live in these neighborhoods. Look for more information about that issue in the next issue of Diskord.

If you want to work effectively and strategically for change, or need more information please contact Lauren Willy (lwilly@uchicago.edu), Rebecca Brocker (rbrocker@uchicago.edu), Emily Brice (eebrice@uchicago.edu), or Maureen Tracey-Mooney (motm@uchicago.edu).
Consensus Across the Lines
Decriminalize Marijuana

Libertarian Commentary by Richard Page

Our anti-marijuana laws are in serious need of revaluation. We must ask ourselves, “Do the costs of the anti-marijuana laws exceed the benefits derived from them?” If so, the laws should be repealed.

The costs of prohibiting marijuana are extraordinary and take on a variety of forms. The National Organization for the Reform of Marijuana Laws (NORML) estimates that taxpayers annually spend more than $7 billion arresting and prosecuting individuals for marijuana violations. Currently, 60,000 individuals are behind bars for marijuana offenses at a cost to taxpayers of $1.2 billion per year.

Aside from the explicit financial costs, there are many “hidden costs” involved with our anti-marijuana laws. Law enforcement efforts directed towards marijuana represent a diversion of resources away from the prevention of more serious crimes. Interestingly, U.S. police arrest more citizens per year on marijuana charges than the total number of arrestees for all violent crimes combined, including murder, rape, robbery, and aggravated assault. New Mexico’s 2001 state-commissioned Drug Policy Advisory Group determined that marijuana decriminalization will result in greater availability of resources to respond to more serious crimes without any increased risks to public safety.

Another drawback to prohibition is the creation of a “forbidden fruit effect.” Under this effect, citizens find themselves more inclined to smoke marijuana simply because it is forbidden. Additionally, there is the problem of increased disrespect for the law. The American Bar Association (ABA) supports “discouraging the use of marijuana through education,” recognizing that “when the law defines as criminal an activity in which one-fifth of the adult population has engaged, society’s respect for law may be significantly undermined.”

Perhaps the most pernicious cost of marijuana prohibition is the underground economy it engenders. Prohibition funnels a massive amount of money into illegal enterprises. The large profits that are created inevitably find their way into the hands of petty inner-city drug dealers, who lack other opportunities for employment in their blighted neighborhoods. Criminal subcultures are formed through the emulation of these lawbreakers. Ultimately, dealers are likely to end up dead or in jail. “It’s almost legal genocide,” claims A.J. Kramer, chief of the federal public defender’s office in Washington, D.C. “We’re locking up an entire generation of young black Americans.” Currently there are more young black males in jail than in college, and drug-related violence is now the main cause of death among young black males. There is no disputing that the direct and indirect costs of anti-marijuana laws are high. Nonetheless, we still need to evaluate the possible benefits of prohibition.

Assuming that marijuana smoking does present a serious threat to society, the benefits of criminalizing this drug should logically include (1) a decrease in usage due to lack of availability, (2) a decrease in usage due to its illegality, and (3) a decrease in usage due to an increase in the price of marijuana where it is available. It does not appear that the first two of these goals are being realized. The third goal may be having some impact, but could easily be replaced with a tax (as proposed by University of Chicago Nobel laureate Gary Becker). Thus, the benefits of marijuana criminalization appear to be negligible.

Studies repeatedly show that marijuana remains widely available. The percentage of high school seniors reporting that marijuana was readily available has remained above 82 percent since 1975. The billions of dollars poured into the war on drugs have simply failed to make marijuana inaccessible. The legality of marijuana does not appear to be of importance. States such as Oregon and California have liberalized their marijuana laws without witnessing any apparent increase in usage. In Australia, there has been no variation in marijuana usage rates between states that have legalized it and states that have not. Studies demonstrate that marijuana offenders continue to use it after their conviction, at rates equal to those prior to their arrest. Most shockingly, some offenders continue to use marijuana while in prison. Unfortunately, it is difficult to find any substantial benefits from prohibiting marijuana.

A new policy of marijuana decriminalization is in order. Contrary to gut instincts, this would not set off a wave of increased usage. People would not smoke more marijuana under decriminalization for the same reasons that they choose not to smoke more now. According to the National Academy of Sciences, “most individuals cite health concerns and family responsibilities rather than legal concerns as their primary reasons for ceasing (or never initiating) marijuana use.” If most citizens do not enjoy smoking massive quantities of marijuana now, there is no reason to believe that their attitudes would change under decriminalization.

Of course, regulation of marijuana would come with decriminalization. Age restrictions would be implemented, DWI laws would still be enforced, and mass marketing of marijuana would be banned. Marijuana could be treated like hard liquor, or even like a prescription drug. Sales taxes and licenses could generate more than $18 billion in revenue for federal and state governments. These funds could be used for anti-marijuana education programs and rehabilitation services.

If the case for decriminalization is so simple, then what is the holdup? Public opinion is overwhelmingly in favor of keeping marijuana illegal. In 1969, when President Nixon began promoting a war on drugs, only 12 percent of U.S. citizens were in favor of decriminalizing marijuana. Despite over 30 years of failure, this prohibitionist attitude is still held by the majority of the electorate. In the 2002-midterm elections,
If public opinion over this issue were to shift, so decriminalization is not yet politically feasible. Rather, their hands are not obtuse to the point of actually believing in the current strategy. Rather, their hands are not obtuse to the point of actually believing in the current strategy. Rather, their hands are not obtuse to the point of actually believing in the current strategy. Rather, their hands are not obtuse to the point of actually believing in the current strategy. Rather, their hands are not obtuse to the point of actually believing in the current strategy.

In September of 2004, Sgt. Tom Donegan of the Chicago Police Department disclosed some surprising and disturbing statistics about Chicago’s current marijuana policy. Using statistics from the Cook County Clerk’s Office, Donegan announced that the majority of Chicago’s small marijuana violations were thrown out of court. The numbers are baffling. In 2003, 94% of the 6,894 cases involving 2.5 grams of marijuana or less were dismissed by judges or dropped by prosecutors. Furthermore, in 2003, 81% of the 6,945 cases between 2.5 and 10 grams were dropped or dismissed. 52% of the 1,261 cases between 10 and 30 grams were thrown out for the same reasons. The total number of dropped or dismissed cases, involving 30 grams of marijuana or less, was in 2003 was 12,817. Unfortunately, the implications of that number are even more shocking that its size

This statistic has far-reaching implications. First, consider what this statistic means for Chicago’s legal institutions. Thanks to petty marijuana offenses, our legal system was clogged 12,817 times in 2003. Imagine how many hours the police and courts lost working on cases simply thrown out, and what they could have accomplished instead of pursing fruitless cases. Instead of focusing of pointless arrests in small marijuana violations police/prosecutors/defendants/judges could be solving and prosecuting murders, sexual assaults and other dangerous crimes. Even if only one police officer/prosecutor/defense attorney/judge spend a single hour on each thrown out case we would gain $1,268 work hours. That’s the equivalent of 2,136 days, or almost 6 years! We would gain $1,268 work hours. That’s the equivalent of 2,136 days, or almost 6 years!

The current marijuana laws have cost the citizens and city of Chicago $3,257,992! Keep in mind $333,242 is only the amount spent if every case only takes four hours of work in the pre, post and trial periods and using only the bare minimum wage for Illinois $6.50 per hour. Trials seldom last for only four hours. $333,242 would only represent the money lost to the current drug policy in 2003.

If the possible money earned is added to the potential savings we get a possible net gain of $3,807,992 for our city.

The ticketing idea is based off of a similar plan in the town of Darien, Illinois. There, police have the ability to give marijuana violators a citation instead of arresting them. This plan has existed in Darien since the late 1970s.

What makes this particular initiative important is the public support of Chicago mayor Richard Daley. Mayor Daley agrees with Donegan that arresting and trying citizens, only to clog our judicial system and waste police hours and taxpayer money, makes little sense. When asked if Chicago was going to decriminalize marijuana Mayor Daley responded that, “It’s [marijuana] decriminalized now...they [judges] throw all the cases out. It doesn’t mean anything. You just show up to court. Another case goes out. It’s decriminalized now... [judges] throw all the cases out. It doesn’t mean anything.

"It's decriminalized now... [judges] throw all the cases out. It doesn't mean anything."

—Major Richard M. Daley

Given the state of marijuana laws in Chicago and their effects on Chicago’s social fabric, Donegan’s plan is appealing. A citation program has immense potential to succeed because of the amount of time and money it will save. We have a chance to make Chicago a better city and show the rest of the country that decriminalizing marijuana is an effective policy. If you are in support of a ticketing plan for small marijuana violations, please write your member of the Chicago City Council. The particular wards in Hyde Park are 4, 5, and 20. All the details about your specific ward specifically who and where to send your letters can be found online at: cityofchicago.org/CityCouncil/. Show Hyde Park’s representatives that we know our current laws do not make sense and are causing more harm than good. Show them that we want a change. Support drug ticketing in Chicago and our mayor’s bold stance.
Feminism and Hip-Hop

It’s 2:30 AM as I flip to Black Entertainment Television, better known as BET. Suddenly, I am bombarded with images of half-naked women on motorcycles, stripper poles or beaches. At this time of night, BET’s UNCut showcases the more adulterated, raunchy videos that are too “mature” to see the light of day. On any given night, you may see artists such as Nelly, Lil John or lesser known rappers all partaking in the objectification of women. If you want to look at these videos, I must warn you before hand- you will see a lot of naked women. You might see some nice cars or some flashy jewelry. What you probably will not see is some sort of storyline or plot, and if you were hoping for some kind of political message, you have come to the wrong place.

Earlier this month, the Center for the Study of Race, Politics, and Culture at the University of Chicago held a conference entitled “Feminism and Hip Hop.” This conference hoped to explore the role of sex, gender, and race in hip hop culture. One of the focuses of the conference was the portrayal of women in music videos and lyrics.

Can I fight these negative images while allowing myself to fall victim to the entrancing melody of “Get Low”?

And the images of women in most of the mainstream music videos are negative, to say the least.

I wish to emphasize that my point is not to degrade rap music as an art form. On the contrary, I am a big fan of hip hop. The music I usually listen to, however, is the name-calling. Obviously, someone that wishes to be called socially aware cannot compromise? Can I fight these negative images while allowing myself to fall victim to the entrancing melody of “Get Low”?

First off, while I think a lot of this music is extremely demeaning towards women, I don’t think it should be censored. It’s true that plenty of songs that make me physically nauseous when I hear them. But that does not mean that I should prevent all listeners from “enjoying” the noise. I always assume that maybe my ears are just more sensitive than theirs are. With the variety of radio stations, music television stations, and downloadable music options, I have many avenues for finding music that I consider more positive. If a certain song or artist offends me, I feel that I have an obligation to stop listening to that music, and help others understand why they should stop listening to it, too.

Secondly, I do not wholeheartedly believe that the music and the videos are solely to blame. Women have been exploited long before music videos were invented. Producers and directors saw an opportunity for a sure way to sell a record and took it. I know that I am not the first person to admit that sex sells, and if we are intent in living in a capitalist country, the buying and selling of such a “commodity” will continue. If it is not done through music videos they will find some other outlet and the fight will continue on some other battlegrounds. Does this mean that the women are doomed? I certainly don’t think so.

It has taken a long time and a lot of hard work, but we have come a long way. Just the idea that a conference called “Feminism and Hip Hop” could be held at one of the most white-male oriented institutions in the country gives me hope for a better tomorrow. What our fight requires is a focus on the females who participate in this objectifying culture. We need to understand why women who play these degrading roles in music videos decide to become a part of the problem. Their decision to participate in exploitive industries is not that surprising, given the lack of options for minority women in this country. The money and the fame of being in a music video may sound appealing when there are few positive female role models in pop culture. We need to learn what these women want and need, and spread our message of respect.

Many people condemn these women for participating in the industry, but we should instead embrace these women and reveal the effect their participation in exploitive music videos has on the rest of womankind.

When women are not willing to accept these roles, then hopefully these artists will have to resort to more creative and positive approaches to showcase their music.

So I ask myself again: can I in good conscience continue to dance to these songs at parties, knowing the ramifications of my actions? The answer is a resounding NO. Many intellectuals feel that they can get away with hypocritical actions if they are aware of the problems surrounding them. However, I believe that when you know that something is exploitative, there is stronger reason to boycott it. There is a certain amount of innocence in ignorance, but knowledge creates responsibility. Now that I think about it, the parties were never that great anyway.
suppose I look a bit threatening to the conservative eye, which more often than not considers the un-American and the uncommon as threats to its social order. In my oversize football jerseys, eight-year-old cargo pants, and tie-dyed hijaab, I look pretty original – like a misplaced Pakistani girl whose ordinarily white shawl got lost somewhere in the sixties, whose body got stuck in the wardrobe of an impressionable white suburban teen, and whose identity is neither Pakistani nor American, but maybe like her skin – a mix of black, white, and brown. I am just some yet-unidentified type of Muslim. But a Muslim, and a rather obvious one, nonetheless.

My parents immigrated to America in 1983, the year of my birth. Although I wasn’t born here, this is the only country I’ve called my home. That is not to say that I’ve always felt at home here, though, because I haven’t. I don’t feel at home when I’m told to be more Pakistani, and I certainly don’t feel at home when I’m told to be more American. I remember the kids who decided to call my house the day after 9/11 to cuss out my mother and tell us to go back “home.” I suppose they were implying that we’re not American enough for their nation. Perhaps they thought, as many do, that there is an inherent conflict in being both Muslim and American. I haven’t yet found one. I don’t really know how to prove “Americanness.” But I think a lot of Muslims tried to prove just that during the post-9/11 “backlash” by plastering American flags all over their property. My dad made sure to stick a flag in our yard, one on each door, and two on the car. Just in case.

In my opinion, trying to prove a cultural identity is near impossible, especially to people who already think that they know what a Muslim is supposed to look like, or dress like, or talk like. I have never tried to prove that I am American. I just assume that my social surroundings have been responsible for forming some part of me, the parts that are seen as foreign or “Amirikan” to fellow immigrants. Such as my taste for hip hop and jerseys. That’s not very Pakistani, and to some, it’s not very Muslim either. But as I see it, anyone who believes as such fails to realize that it is impossible to be raised as an un-American, or non-American, in America.

Folks who delight in telling me that as a Muslim I’m either too American or not American enough have the same problem: they integrate their conceptions of what a Muslim ought to be, or what...
Women's Center. Women’s and Queers Center. Women’s and LGBTQ Center. These suggested names have sparked recent discussions surrounding the movement to create a safe space for women on campus. Many of the discussions centered on the purpose and community of such a center. These points of contention are inextricably linked because one determines the other. Participating populations will define the purposes of a center. However, the discourse surrounding the center has centered on the character of this proposed center. The center’s proposed titles emphasize the most important aspect of a center: the people themselves. Determining who would have access to such a center is linked to the effectiveness and viability of such a center. Such an institution will wilt if it the question of for whom the center is intended is not clarified. This poses problems that go beyond the issue of whether or not to include women and all LGBTQ people in a center.

The original intent of this article was to respond in a very direct and decisive manner to the question of “for whom” posed in the various titles discussed above. However, it became quite clear that the discussion so far has neglected some very serious issues within this discourse and have remained entirely within hetero-normative bounds. Therefore, my revised intention is to elucidate some perspectives that have been marginalized in the discussions to date surrounding the question of “for whom”.

The last women’s center affiliated with the University of Chicago and Hyde Park vanished in the 1970s. Last quarter, a group of students initiated an effort to bring back a women’s center to create a safe place for women from the University of Chicago and Hyde Park. The intent was to offer a harassment-free environment for women to create a coalition unrestricted by any difference, i.e. class, race, religion, sex, sexual orientation, or gender (meaning that anyone identified as or wishing to be recognized as a woman). Some of the services that the women’s center would provide included women-specific programming around women’s health issues – emotional, physical, intellectual – as well as domestic violence, sexual assault, violence, discrimination, issues in the workplace, issues within academia, persistent gendered inequalities, and anything else that may surface. A trained staff would be able to refer women to services and organizations women might need or like to get involved with. In this way, women can come together to support one another and work together to accomplish mutual goals and create a sense of stability and belonging.

But what populations should a center as described above serve? Women and queers has already been suggested. However, it is problematic to delineate ‘women’ and ‘queer’ as separate entities. While individuals who identify as one or the other may have no problem with this delineation, such a distinction sends a troublesome message to people who identify as both women and queers. First, it seems to imply that a person cannot be both a woman and queer, that one must be one or the other. Secondly, it implies that to be ‘woman’ is to be understood as straight and to be queer is to be not ‘womanly’. This is closely tied to the first point, but there is a subtle distinction in that this second point is aggressively more hetero-normative. To make such a vague distinction between two identity markers excludes members of all groups. On the other hand, the point of including LGBTQ people in a women’s center is to keep the center open to LGBTQ people who self-identify as ‘woman’ in any fashion. While this is admirable and politically correct, it backfires because there are people who identify as both and the redundancy in the name forces people to choose a monolithic identity.

While there are definite differences between the various issues and problems facing women and LGBTQ people, there are intersections, notably in terms of some discrimination and social bias. While these intersections exist requires collaboration of the groups involved.

However, the question addressed at the beginning of this article, “for whom”, embodies the intent of inclusion. While it is important to be inclusive, particularly on overlapping issues, whom to include becomes a difficult task. Stating that all women have access to the center is not a viable solution. ‘Woman’ as an identity is generally associated with the female body. This association and description with terms – ‘woman’ and ‘female’ – make up half the language of discourse that sets up the heterosexist binary system within which society operates. People are ascribed to either the category of ‘man’ and ‘male’ or ‘woman’ and ‘female’, and are expected to fit into either category. This is the norm.

Yet, many people defy these static categories by existing outside these boundaries. The problem lies not in the fact that all people cannot be squeezed into one of two categories, but in the fact that people who don’t fit the norm determine which category serves as a best fit. When the question of “for whom” is posed, it’s a difficult matter because an individual may ascribe to a certain identity and therefore feel to belong in a center for only women. Other individuals may not identify that person in the same fashion and exclude that person. This problem of “for whom” highlights persistent issues of sexism and heterosexism present in society, and further complicates the situation because sexism and heterosexism affect people of all gender ascription.

The exclusive nature of a center for women only poses an uncomfortable position for people who may house their identity within a body marked as ‘female’ but may not ascribe to the socially expected identity as ‘woman’. Although the explicit inclusion of all LGBTQ people solves the problem of including various people of various gender expression and identity, it is exclusive to a specific group of people – straight men. This is an uncomfortable situation because of the explicit and deliberate exclusion. The struggle of inclusion versus exclusion is worked through the “for whom” question and offers no clear solution. This is indicative of a larger problem that involves the language used in the dominant discourse of gender. On the other hand, people do identify with the binary system for multiple reasons and from such adherence stems the push to create a safe place for women. It has been acknowledged on some level that a safe space is needed for at least this particular group, but the discussions have pointed to the fact that a safe space is needed for people that do not necessarily fit into this group but nonetheless are intricably related to it. Again, if worked out correctly, such a space could be very beneficial and productive.

Perhaps what should be considered in light of these positions is the creation of some kind of community space and host nights of programming or certain time blocks where certain groups can get together. These issues raised are very important and should not be ignored. Perhaps what is needed is more than just a women’s center, but a community center that can be a venue to organize and host different programs and events for the community at large. This sort of conceptual space definitely allows for coalition when desired but is also respectful of difference.

In order to be successful, members of the women’s center campaign must actively question the role that gender and sexuality will play in such a space.
U of C AIDS Group Protests in D.C.

Campus Activist Feature
by Grant Gordon and Margot Yopes

On February 26th, 2005, more than 3,000 high school and college students gathered in front of the White House to march down Pennsylvania Avenue to the Capitol in protest of George Bush's HIV/AIDS policies. We, as representatives of the national Student Global AIDS Campaign's University of Chicago chapter, joined the protestors.

In response to the growing HIV/AIDS pandemic and the United States government response, we had five major demands in Washington. The demands we made, while they did not fully reflect the full social and medical political complexity of the HIV/AIDS issue, were those we found the most substantive and pressing. First, that 100% of developing country debt to the United States and international finance organizations be dropped. Second, that the US contribute an additional $1.5 billion to the Global Fund to fight the disease. Third, that government supported HIV/AIDS prevention programs be based upon science and not politics. Fourth, that the Ryan White CARE Act be reactivated and fully funded. And fifth, lastly, that all affected by the HIV/AIDS be guaranteed access to effective and affordable treatment.

At the end of 2004, an estimated 39.4 million people were living with HIV worldwide. Infection rates are currently exponentially multiplying. Unfortunately, most new infections take place in developing nations with limited resources, countries which owe huge sums to the IMF and the World Bank. Canceling such debts, the international financial community could arguably, without harming its own realistic interests, return capital to nations for use in healthcare, education, and the distribution of condoms and medication.

More substantial US government support for the Global Fund furthermore would help combat HIV/AIDS. The Global Fund, an international non-governmental organization that provides generic drugs and healthcare infrastructure throughout the world, is a strong apolitical means for the US government to funnel resources into countries that need them most. The US government however, currently refuses to give as much as is possible to the Fund and instead, uses much of its funds to fight the spread of HIV/AIDS on abstinence-only sex education programs. This is unfortunate. Comprehensive sex education is a critical way of preventing the spread of HIV/AIDS.

On the domestic front, an important measure to combat HIV/AIDS would be the reactivation and full funding of The Ryan White CARE Act. The Act, which prohibits discrimination in the on the basis of HIV status and strives for better HIV/AIDS medical care in the US, was named after Ryan White, a HIV-positive teenager who wasn't allowed to attend a US public school. Unfortunately, the government, under the lobby pressures of big pharmaceutical companies, currently prohibits the distribution of cheap life-saving generic drugs, making treatment a near impossibility for many living with this disease. Ideally, effective and affordable treatment would be guaranteed to anyone living with HIV/AIDS, even those around the globe.

In the days leading up to our arrival in Washington DC to protest on behalf of these causes, our spirits and hopes were high. It seemed clear – we would go, we would march, and then things would change.

The march itself was thrilling. Roped off on a predetermined pathway, students played bongos, flashed puppets of Bush with gouged out eyes, and yelled chants reminiscent of the 1960's. In an attempt to empower ourselves and change international policy, students from all over the world and nation made signs and screamed in cathartic moments of protest, symbolically signifying mass mobilization for the HIV/AIDS cause. Spending the day with so many other motivated, concerned protesters from all over the world and nation made signs and screamed in cathartic moments of protest, symbolically signifying mass mobilization for the HIV/AIDS cause. Spending the day with so many other motivated, concerned protesters from all over the world and nation made signs and screamed in cathartic moments of protest, symbolically signifying mass mobilization for the HIV/AIDS cause.

While we went to Washington with a pointed agenda for change, we shortly discovered the realities of protest and policy. In an arena of suspended disbelief, we collectively participated in what we anticipated would change HIV policy. But something seemed off. When our organizers screamed, “yell so loud that you get Bush out of bed,” we knew that Bush, in Germany rectifying European political relationships, was not in bed at all. A similar constructed façade applied to our act of protesting.

We waved our signs at the Capitol, knowing no one was listening except, perhaps, the other protestors. Nothing actually changed through our actions. Policy wasn’t affected. American leaders didn’t reform their politics. Generic drug companies weren’t empowered. We, as activists, had no accomplishment.

We left the march and DC feeling lost – what difference had we made and where would we go from here? The classic Aristotelian structure that imbued our group reached its climax that afternoon in DC. With all the fundraising, planning and sign making of our group, the protest march had become our goal. We were at a loss as to what we should do after we had returned to Chicago.

Reflecting more critically on our experience now, we realize that change happens slowly, and only with huge amounts of effort. Protests and large activist gatherings are important for the attention they provoke, but are only part of a greater fight for change. Often political energy is lost when people are disenfranchised by forces over which they have no control. But then again, that is exactly why we must continue to protest - not necessarily to change things directly with our actions, but to keep people motivated. The collective energy we felt in D.C. is an energy that needs to be constantly renewed in the fight against HIV/AIDS. While it might be a very difficult task in the long run to affect real political change on these issues, acknowledging the collective nature of our battle keeps us going. Though we didn’t see it then, that’s why we and so many others went to Washington, D.C.

For more information, check out http://www.fightglobalaids.com or http://www.unaids.org. Or come to a SGAC meeting Wednesdays, 9:30 in the South Lounge of Reynolds Club.
It Was the Spring of Hope?

Geoffrey Chaucer begins his “Canterbury Tales” with the lines, “When in April the sweet showers fall/That pierce March’s drought to the root and all/And bathed every vein in liquor that has power/To generate therein and sire the flower.” Here on campus, the weather has been quite gorgeous. Spring is here in its entirely expected guise. With the recent absence of winter quarter, students now look out of their windows in sheer disbelief at a world devoid of snow and a sky so blue and tranquil that it’s almost eerie. However, what Chaucer’s assessment fails to address is the World Health Organization’s statement that suicide rates also escalate doing the spring.

Stretched out on the Quad, doubtless only a few of those former fanatics of the Reg would find fault with Chaucer’s estimation. However, invariably some still disagree. And sitting on the uniform shelves of the Regenstein library a stone’s throw away from Chaucer sits Thomas Stearns Eliot, his literary adversary on the subject of spring’s benevolence, who states that “April is the cruelest month, breeding/Lilacs out of the dead land, mixing/Memory and desire, stirring/Dull roots with spring rain.”

According to Dr. Lucy Davidson, a Clinical Associate Professor of Psychiatry at the Emory School of Medicine as well as an expert consultant to the Surgeon General in the National Strategy for Suicide Prevention, “the seasonal pattern for suicide is highly significant with the rate of suicides being above average all spring and below average all winter. In the United States, April is usually the peak month and December is usually the trough.” Furthermore, the medical community now recognizes the seasonality of suicides. Davidson rationalizes that “the increasing number of hours of daylight in spring affect suicide by lowering secretion of the hormone melatonin...completed suicides represent the interaction of many biologic, situational, psychodynamic, and interpersonal factors. Seasonal fluctuations in many risk factors for suicide may account for aggregate seasonal variations in suicide rates.”

From a literary as well as a real world scope, spring is clearly an ambivalent period, evocative of both creation and destruction. In Christian conception, this is the setting for Easter, the celebration of Christ’s resurrection and triumph over death. However, as Amanda Machin, a Catholic, and a poet, reminds us, “they are both true. In some ways [spring] feels more like winter...it’s not sorrowful, it’s more just depression, [but] it’s not complete because there is the hope that spring brings.” For Machin, the month of April is “the month of rebirth and the death that precedes it. I think that spring forces us to look at our lives in a way that often makes us upset.”

Revelation

They say the End will come with trumpets
(birds will scream, nuns will cry and
men will be sorted like greenmarket melons.
The squishy ones will go to Hell,
the rest of us jumping through orange-cream clouds
to the fires of gospel and trumpets); not so.

Here is what will happen.

Your sheets are black, as always.
Your hair a mess, as always.
We lie there, as always,
and as I run my fingers through the ridges of your neck,
I do not hear the door click (never to open again);
I’ll never see the endless hall of guys like you and guys like me,
locked in our bedrooms forever,
hearing strange, sad trombones echo through the night
and mistaking the trickle of blood in the streets
for just another south side reckoning.

—Zachary Herz

Poetry, prose, and visual art are graciously accepted for this section. Contact Charles Umeano at mercurya@uchicago.edu.

APRIL is the cruelest month, breeding
Lilacs out of the dead land, mixing
Memory and desire, stirring
Dull roots with spring rain.

—T.S. Eliot
Il Papa

Minutes fall from the sky like hailstones clattering on the sidewalk—
I gather them with cold, chapped hands.
My scars are suburban
(a burn from the top of the stove,
a scratch from the edge of a bookcase
crowded with alternative lives,
a fingernail bitten by trivial worries,
a bruise blooming on my knee
from long Sunday Mass)
but they are deep,
somehow.

Mourners (black pants, black dresses,
black shoes, black text of Psalm 23 in hand)
congregate around these abandoned moments,
these loud gifts from a storm cloud.
We lament the descent, the finality,
with fifty-three "Hail Mary"s
which are climbing the long ladder of air
to the unknown kingdom where all prayers gather to wait in line—
Now my hands smell like rosary beads,
the semi-sweet, deep-wood scent
of hope fading into acceptance, peace,
"Glory" clinging to my fingers
as a child with a nightmare clings to its mother,
then eases gently
back into a sweet sleep.

We, the left-behind, seek such slumber,
grasping for tranquility with words
that tumble into the darkness
and tap-dance across
the parking lots of churches
where we assemble
to weep and sigh.

—Charles Umeano

What's a flower?

Beneath snow and soil, something grows.
Alien to ourselves, we walk, as if
Entranced, towards delicate folds
That herald spring's disastrous arrival.

In the morning light,
The odor of decay pierces the air.
All that was white now
Seems soiled somehow.

And thrusts to a heaven
That no longer exists for us.
The mind and the world, for once, are one;
They are now worn shadows.

But who will mourn winter?
Stalks green, thirsty,
And petals, brilliant white and bruised purple,
Which confirm April's cruel irony?

Strange how it should be
Our sole witness.
Do you remember walking
Through last February?

And I told you,
And you said,
"What's a crocus?"
The pungency of realization
Enveloped us,
And our eyes moistened.

It was entrancing; faultlessly seeing
Nature mirror our
Soft tears that silenced the ground,
Became droplets, and were absorbed.

Such a spectacle! You composed
Yourself, and finally asked me,
"What's a flower?"
And that was what I said.

—Charles Umeano

What's a flower?

Minutes fall from the sky like hailstones clattering on the sidewalk—
I gather them with cold, chapped hands.
My scars are suburban
(a burn from the top of the stove,
a scratch from the edge of a bookcase
crowded with alternative lives,
a fingernail bitten by trivial worries,
a bruise blooming on my knee
from long Sunday Mass)
but they are deep,
somehow.

Mourners (black pants, black dresses,
black shoes, black text of Psalm 23 in hand)
congregate around these abandoned moments,
these loud gifts from a storm cloud.
We lament the descent, the finality,
with fifty-three "Hail Mary"s
which are climbing the long ladder of air
to the unknown kingdom where all prayers gather to wait in line—
Now my hands smell like rosary beads,
the semi-sweet, deep-wood scent
of hope fading into acceptance, peace,
"Glory" clinging to my fingers
as a child with a nightmare clings to its mother,
then eases gently
back into a sweet sleep.

We, the left-behind, seek such slumber,
grasping for tranquility with words
that tumble into the darkness
and tap-dance across
the parking lots of churches
where we assemble
to weep and sigh.

—Amanda Machin

What's a flower?

Beneath snow and soil, something grows.
Alien to ourselves, we walk, as if
Entranced, towards delicate folds
That herald spring's disastrous arrival.

In the morning light,
The odor of decay pierces the air.
All that was white now
Seems soiled somehow.

And thrusts to a heaven
That no longer exists for us.
The mind and the world, for once, are one;
They are now worn shadows.

But who will mourn winter?
Stalks green, thirsty,
And petals, brilliant white and bruised purple,
Which confirm April's cruel irony?

Strange how it should be
Our sole witness.
Do you remember walking
Through last February?

And I told you,
And you said,
"What's a crocus?"
The pungency of realization
Enveloped us,
And our eyes moistened.

It was entrancing; faultlessly seeing
Nature mirror our
Soft tears that silenced the ground,
Became droplets, and were absorbed.

Such a spectacle! You composed
Yourself, and finally asked me,
"What's a flower?"
And that was what I said.

—Charles Umeano
Stuff to do

Friday, April 29th:
“Featured Address by Dr. Bernard Kouchner—Founder of Doctors without Borders”
Nobel Peace Prize laureate Dr. Bernard Kouchner will give an address on the global effects of the HIV/AIDS pandemic and highlight the importance of cooperation and coordination between national governments and non-governmental organizations. Dr. Kouchner is the co-founder and former president of Medecins sans Frontieres, a Paris-based non-profit humanitarian organization. He organized humanitarian operations and has led field operations throughout Latin America and Asia. Northwestern University; Fisk Hall, Room 217; 8:00 PM

“The Psychology of Rape”
Chris Kilmartin, a psychologist, comedian, and activist will discuss the psychological underpinnings of perpetrators who are involved in acts of rape. Presented by the Gender studies department as part of their Brown Bag lunch talks series, and sponsored with resources for sexual violence prevention as part of Sexual Violence Awareness Month. 5733 S. University Ave., First Floor; 12:15 PM

“Wallace Stevens Appeal to Philosophy”
Stanley Cavell, the 2006 Critical Inquiry Visiting Professor, and a Professor Emeritus of Philosophy at Harvard University will deliver a lecture relating Steven’s poetical musings on the nature of reality and consciousness to a lecture relating Stevens’ s poetical musings on the nature of philosophy. Kent Hall, Room 120; 4:00 PM

“Animal Collective”
The progressive and psychedelic music group Animal Collective will perform their innovative fusion of campfire melodies and Brian Wilson inspired pop, featuring songs from their critically acclaimed release “Sung Tongs” in the Cloister Club in Ida Noyes. Local impresarios Health and Beauty will also grace your aural palate in this event presented by The Hive. Ida Noyes, The Cloister Club; 9:00 PM

Sun, May 1st:
“Robbing the Cradle of Civilization: The Looting of Iraq’s Ancient Treasures”
Professor McGuire Gibson will show the documentary film “Robbing the Cradle of Civilization” which visits the seven days of pillaging that occurred at the Iraqi National Museum in Baghdad after the American Invasion. The film is part detective story, part historical thriller, and part archaeological tragedy. A discussion with Professor Gibson will follow the screening. Oriental Institute, 1155 East 58th Street; 2:00 PM

Disord is neither sponsored by nor affiliated with any of the events listed here.

Wednesday, May 4th:
Performance: “for colored girls who have considered suicide/when the rainbow is enuf”
Written in the midst of the 1970s feminist movement, Ntozake Shange’s play explores what it means to be of color and female in the 20th century. Through their own voices, dance, and the silty sounds of the decade, seven women will finally get the chance to tell their stories. Join Ladies in Red, Blue, Yellow, Green, Purple, Orange and Brown on their journey to self-discovery, and the realization that “truth” comes in all colors of the rainbow. Performances on Wednesday and Friday at 8:00PM, and Saturday at 7:00PM. Reynolds Club Francis X. Kinaan Third Floor Theater; 8:00 PM

Thursday, May 5th:
“Envisioning Kosovo: Prospects for an Uncertain Future”
Janusz Bugajski, Director of the Eastern Europe Project at the Center for Strategic and International Studies in Washington, DC, and Professor John Mearsheimer from the University of Chicago will each present their own visions for the future status of Kosovo, which will be under debate later this year. The professors will also discuss the ramification of Kosovo’s final status on Southeastern Europe and the rest of the world. Stuart Hall, Room 101; 6:00 PM

Friday, May 6th:
“Fundraiser for Ox Plow Seed Project and the International Social Welfare Club”
A fundraiser will occur for the Ox Plow Seed Project and the International Social Welfare Club, groups interested in promoting the discussion of international social justice issues and social work’s response to these issues. Prizes will be distributed and tickets are seven dollars in advance or ten dollars at the door. Please contact laforey@uchicago.edu for further information. Social Service Administration Building, Lobby; 8:00 PM

Saturday May 7th:
“The Books”
The Books, “the most brilliant and innovative music makers since Gandhi” will bestow their aural brilliance on your unworthy tympanic membrane tonight in Ida Noyes. The show will be free of cost, and presented by The Hive and WHPK. Social Service Administration Building, Lobby; 8:00 PM

Tuesday, May 17th:
“The Incorporated Citizen: Liberated, Authentic, Imperial”
Jennifer Sprull from the Department of Anthropology will discuss the nature of “sexual citizenship” which is currently present in post-apartheid South Africa in a workshop presented by the Department of Gender and Sexuality Studies. 5733 S. University Ave., First Floor; 8:00 PM

Passings

Andrea Dworkin, one of the most vocal and controversial figures of the feminist movement, died earlier this month at the age of 58. Dworkin, fueled by experiences of molestation, abuse, and prostitution, crafted scathing critiques upon the subjugation of women in society, specifically through marriage and prostitution. Her views of pornography as a means for rape resulted in a national campaign to ban pornography during the eighties, yet the ordinances imposed were deemed unconstitutional later that decade. Her books, most notably Intercourse, Women Hating, and Pornography and Our Blood, connected sexual issues to the larger societal framework, arguing coercive sexual behavior serves as the root cause of gender inequality in the greater society.

Maurice Hilleman, a distinguished microbiologist who formulated eight of the fourteen most commonly used vaccines (including measles, mumps, hepatitis A and B, meningitis, pneumonia) and assisted in the discovery of adenovirus, which underlies the common cold, died last week at the age of 85. Hilleman began his studies in vaccinology at the University of Chicago and received a doctoral degree in microbiology. His first accomplishment was formulating a vaccination for a strain of flu which was speculated to surpass the 1918 flu pandemic in scope (over 50 million dead). His subsequent vaccination have saved millions, and protected millions more. It has been estimated that Hilleman’s work has saved more individual lives than any other scientist in history.