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4 Timeline of a National and International Movement to Protect Children Under Law From the invention of juvenile courts to the ratification of international treaties, the movement to protect children under law has a history.

6 The Dilemma of Child Soldiers David M. Rosen discusses the stories of child soldiers around the globe. He explores the recruitment of child soldiers by governments and terrorist groups, and he addresses the moral and legal ambiguities surrounding child soldiers who are victims of war and sometimes also perpetrators of war crimes.

10 A Refugee’s Journey Machien Luoi shares his story as a Lost Boy of Sudan, while Joan Hecht explains how one American nonprofit organization is reaching out to help refugees like him.

14 Broken Promises: Child Labor and Industrial Violence James D. Schmidt outlines the growth of child labor laws in the United States and internationally. He uses examples from industrial accidents and injuries to young workers to illustrate the complex relationships between youths and the world of work.

18 Perspectives: Should the U.S. Legal Drinking Age Be Lowered? John McCardell and Maria Carmona debate the pros and cons of lowering the current 21-year-old minimum age required to purchase alcohol throughout the fifty states, by examining the drinking patterns of youth, highway accidents and fatalities, and the experiences of other countries.

22 Students in Action: Junior State of America Engaging Young People Colleen Danz interviews students from the Junior State of America about how they are acting on international issues that affect youth around the world.

24 Learning Gateways In this lesson, students consider arguments surrounding the U.S. debate over ratification of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, through the lens of child labor.

26 Law Review David L. Hudson Jr. reports on two current U.S. Supreme Court cases challenging the constitutionality of imposing sentences of life imprisonment without the possibility of parole on juvenile offenders.
Director’s Note

September 2010 will mark the 20th anniversary since the international community signed a comprehensive human rights treaty for the promotion and protection of children’s rights, the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child. The preamble to the Convention states “the child, by reason of his physical and mental immaturity, needs special safeguards and care, including appropriate legal protection…” Despite this extraordinary commitment, millions of children throughout the world face remarkable challenges to their survival, including the lack of essential sustenance and shelter necessary to ensure healthy development, and inadequate safeguards from abuse, exploitation, and poverty. This issue of Insights highlights some of these challenges, examining legal, political, and social conditions that create them.

Our issue opens with a timeline of U.S. and international events that chronicles the legal status and protections extended to children since the nineteenth century. Legal anthropologist David Rosen leads us on an exploration of the child soldier and suggests that the treatment of these children has both moral and legal dimensions. He notes that there are 250,000 child soldiers in the world today. Author Machien Luoi takes readers into the world of the displaced child as he recalls his life journey as one of the Sudanese “Lost Boys.” Historian James Schmidt recounts the continuing efforts to curtail the use of child labor as a history of broken promises to children that is linked to economic pressures on families and industrialization. Learning Gateways rounds out this discussion with a lesson plan focused on the scope of child labor and the challenges of regulation. Our Perspectives columns focus on the question: Should the U.S. legal drinking age be lowered? And in Law Review, author David Hudson examines two pending U.S. Supreme Court cases that question whether juveniles should be sentenced to life in prison without parole. Add to this rich roundup of topics Insights on-line, www.insightsmagazine.org which offers teachers additional instructional resources and supports, including photos, PowerPoint® presentations, interactive games, and primary source materials.

Since this issue will reach you as you complete the school term, we hope you will have time to peruse it carefully. Let us hear from you. We would like to have your feedback on the issue and how you might incorporate it into your classes next term. And let us know if there are topics that you would like to see us tackle in these pages. In any case, enjoy the issue and your summer.

Mabel McKinney-Browning
Director, ABA Division for Public Education
mckinnem@staff.abanet.org

Become a fan of the ABA Division for Public Education on Facebook, and follow us on Twitter! Just click on the Facebook and Twitter icons at: www.insightsmagazine.org
Invention of Juvenile Courts
One of the first major child protection reforms in the world was the establishment of juvenile court systems. Rather than exposing children to adult criminals in the court system to possibly breed more crime, juvenile courts were designed to rehabilitate delinquent children so they could later return as law-abiding members of society. An American prison reformer at the time, Frederick Wines, explained: "We make criminals out of children who are not criminals by treating them as if they were criminals. That ought to be stopped. What we should have, in our system of criminal jurisprudence, is an entirely separate system of courts for children, ... who commit offences which would be criminal in adults. We ought to have a "children's court" ... we ought to have a "children's Judge," who should attend to no other business. We want some place of detention for those children other than a prison."

U.S. Children's Bureau
The U.S. Children's Bureau was established in 1912 with this charge: "The ... bureau shall investigate and report ... upon all matters pertaining to the welfare of children and child life among all classes of our people, and shall especially investigate the questions of infant mortality, the birth rate, orphanage, juvenile courts, desertion, dangerous occupations, accidents and diseases of children, employment, [and] legislation affecting children in the several States and Territories."

Declination of the Rights of the Child
The 1959 Declaration of the Rights of the Child maintained many of the welfare priorities of previous documents, but most significantly, raised awareness of the need for a separate international code of child rights. The next decades saw a growing international movement for child rights, culminating in the United Nations' declaration of 1979 as the International Year of the Child. That same year, the Government of Poland submitted a draft for what would become the Convention on the Rights of the Child a decade later.

Child's Right to Due Process
In response to the lack of procedural protections for 15-year-old Gerald Gault in his adjudication, and subsequent imprisonment, for making obscene phone calls, the U.S. Supreme Court, with its 1967 decision in In re Gault, extended most of the constitutional rights afforded adult criminal defendants to juveniles. These included the right to timely notice, to counsel, and to confront and cross-examine witnesses, as well as the protection against self-incrimination.

1832
In the United States, the New England Association of Farmers, Mechanics, and Other Working-men condemn child labor.

1869
In one of the first such court rulings in the United States, the parents of Samuel Fletcher are fined $300 for child abuse.

1873
First national convention of the American Federation of Labor passes a resolution calling on U.S. states to ban child labor under age 14 from employment.

1899
Illinois Juvenile Court Act establishes the first juvenile court system in the world, in Chicago.

1903

1904
National Child Labor Committee forms to abolish all child labor in the United States. Lewis Hine produces photographs of children at work for the organization.

1909
U.S. president Theodore Roosevelt convenes the White House Conference on Children to "consider the care of children."

1912
U.S. Children's Bureau is established as the first federal agency in the world to educate people about general child care and development.

1931
Theodore Roosevelt, with the support of distinguished educators and reformers, establishes the United States Children's Bureau.

1934
Minimum Age Convention attempts to establish the international minimum age for employment with the goal of abolishing child labor.

1936
Theodore Roosevelt advises the American people: "... we ought to have a "children's Judge," a moral, social, and legal judge who would...".

1949
The United Nations General Assembly declares the right of the child to participate in cultural and scientific life. A traveling dispensary from the U.S. Children's Bureau delivers medicine and supplies to parents. Photo courtesy of the Library of Congress.

1959
Declaration of the Rights of the Child is unanimously endorsed by the UN General Assembly. The document builds upon provisions already outlined in the 1924 declaration.

1962
The first child abuse reporting statutes for the United States are discussed by the U.S. Departments of Health, and Education, and the U.S. Children's Bureau.

1966
UN General Assembly adopts International Covenants on Civil and Political Rights, and Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

1967
U.S. Supreme Court rules in Tinker v. Des Moines that children have First Amendment rights to freedom of speech and expression at school.

1969
U.S. Supreme Court rules in In re Gault, extending most of the constitutional rights afforded adult criminal defendants to juveniles.

1974
Minimum Age Convention attempts to establish the international minimum age for employment with the goal of abolishing child labor.

1977
Relief to Rights

Eglantyne Jebb was a pioneer in child rights law. She established the Save the Children Fund in England in 1919 and the Save the Children International Union in Switzerland in 1920 to aid children suffering from consequences of World War I.

Following the war in 1923, Jebb explained her shift from providing relief to fighting for rights:

If we wish nevertheless to go on working for the children … the only way to do it seems to be to evoke a cooperative effort of the nations to safeguard their own children and labour for their universal recognition.

With that in mind, the Save the Children International Union drafted a declaration of child rights and lobbied the League of Nations to adopt it as the Geneva Declaration of the Rights of the Child in 1924.

UNICEF

UNICEF was established in 1946 as the United Nations International Children’s Emergency Fund to provide postwar humanitarian aid to children affected by World War II. In 1950, UNICEF’s mandate was broadened to address the long-term needs to children around the world, and in 1953 became a permanent part of the UN with a shortened name: the United Nations Children’s Fund. Today UNICEF works for the safety, health, and equality of women and children in developing countries.

World War II refugees included many children. Photo courtesy of the National Archives.

1916

First U.S. child labor law prohibits interstate movement of goods made by children. The law was declared unconstitutional two years later by the U.S. Supreme Court (Hammer v. Dagenhart).

1918

Laws in every state in the United States require children to attend elementary school.

1919

Newly formed League of Nations establishes the Committee for the Protection of Children.

1924

Declaration of the Rights of the Child (part of the Geneva Convention) is adopted by the League of Nations and establishes first international children’s rights.

1938


1944

U.S. Supreme Court holds in Prince v. Massachusetts that the government has authority to regulate the actions and treatment of children.

1946

UNICEF is created by the United Nations as the International Children’s Emergency Fund.

1948

UN General Assembly passes the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which refers in Article 25 to children as “entitled to special care and assistance.”

1989

UN Convention on the Rights of the Child becomes the most comprehensive legal document protecting the rights of children.

1990

World leaders sign the World Declaration on the Survival, Protection, and Development of Children, a plan to improve child survival, health, nutrition, and education.

1995

Madeleine Albright, acting as the U.S. Delegate to the United Nations, signs the Convention on the Rights of the Child following Congressional ratification discussions.

1999

International Labor Organization adopts Convention No. 182 concerning the prohibition of the worst forms of child labor.

2000


2002

United States ratifies both of the United Nations optional protocols.

2005

U.S. Supreme Court declares in Roper v. Simmons that it is unconstitutional to impose the death penalty for crimes committed before age 18.

2010

Somalia and the United States remain the only countries eligible to ratify the Convention on the Rights of the Child that have not yet done so.

Convention on the Rights of the Child

Since its ratification by the United Nations General Assembly in 1989, and entry into force in 1990, the Convention has become the most-ratified human rights treaty in history, with 193 signatories. Although there are provisions protecting child rights in other international laws, and in many individual countries, the Convention was the first to articulate terms of childhood and rights relevant to children—physical, economic, social, cultural, civil, and political. It represents a global commitment to protecting children, and stresses accountability with governments that are entrusted with making and enforcing policies that ensure child rights are realized.

For more information on, or resources for teaching about, children’s rights under U.S. and international law, please visit Insights online at www.insightsmagazine.org.
Two boys, both soldiers, born more than 200 years apart and both only thirteen years old when they went to war, illustrate the extraordinary complexity of understanding the “problem” of children who fight in armed conflicts. One was born in 1767 and the other in 1980; their stories provide historical bookends to the transformation of our cultural attitudes and understandings of both childhood and war. Both boys fought in conflicts that pitted neighbor against neighbor, where soldiers and civilians were massacred, murdered, and mutilated. Both survived and continued their studies after the war—one studied law and was admitted to the bar in North Carolina, the other finished a degree in politics at Oberlin College in Ohio. Both were the subjects of national bestseller books. But the earlier one became a great American hero, while the latter achieved international fame as a victim of war.

Two hundred and thirteen years separate the birth of Andrew Jackson—child soldier, patriot of the American Revolution, and seventh president of the United States; and Ishmael Beah; child soldier, victim of the civil war in Sierra Leone, and spokesperson for the plight of child soldiers everywhere. Throughout the nineteenth century, Jackson was known as the “Brave Boy of the Waxhaws” for the incident in which he, in 1781, as a prisoner during the Revolutionary War, was attacked with a sword by a British officer whose boots he refused to clean. This event was given a prime place in John Eaton’s 1824 book, The Life of Andrew Jackson, which caught the attention of the nation as the first presidential campaign biography. Ishmael Beah’s autobiography, A Long Way Gone: Memoirs of a Child Soldier, was a bestseller in the United States in 2007, although parts of Beah’s narrative have recently been challenged for accuracy, its central story of the child soldier as a victim of war captured the attention of the world. Why has Andrew Jackson’s experience as a child soldier been deemed heroic, while Ishmael Beah has been designated a victim of adult abuse? What processes turned the heroes of yesteryear into the victims of today?

There are no simple answers to this question, but one factor is the changing concepts of childhood in Western countries, which have also taken the lead in shaping the ideas about childhood in international law. The UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) has created a universal definition of childhood. It sets age 18 as the end of childhood, codifies a universal bright-line distinction between...
childhood and adulthood, refusing to accept the idea that childhood may be understood and experienced in different societies in divergent ways.

A second factor is that war itself has been radically deromanticized since the nineteenth century. Most societies no longer celebrate the glories of war, but instead, memorialize the suffering of civilians and the plight of soldiers. Today, war is considered at best a necessary evil; sometimes, it is regarded as a criminal activity. In this light, childhood and military service are rarely seen as compatible.

**The Recruitment of Child Soldiers**

Experts estimate that there are about 250,000 child soldiers under the age of 18 in the world today. The number fluctuates depending upon the levels of conflict in the world. Modern concerns about child soldiers involve two issues—the criminal liability of those who recruit child soldiers and the culpability of child soldiers for war crimes they may have committed as soldiers. In light of the CRC, humanitarian and human rights groups have sought to ban the recruitment of any person under age 18. Currently, however, only the recruitment of child soldiers under age 15 is considered a war crime. This criminal prohibition was first made law by the UN resolution that created the Special Court for Sierra Leone. The first persons ever formally convicted of this crime were the heads of the warring factions of the Sierra Leone Civil War (1991–2001), including Ishmael Beah’s captors, who were tried and convicted in this court. Charles Taylor, the former president of Liberia, is currently on trial before this court on these charges.

Despite these international laws, it has proven to be difficult to suppress the recruitment of children into armed groups. Until the middle of the twentieth century, many national armies recruited children into their ranks. That practice has all but disappeared. The only remaining significant national recruiter is Myanmar (Burma), which makes extensive use of child soldiers to meet recruitment goals and where, according to a 2007 Human Rights Watch report, boys are bought and sold by military recruiters. Instead, the primary crux of the child soldier problem has shifted to the recruitment of children by nongovernmental armed groups, such as insurgents; rebels; revolutionary movements; guerrilla fighters; global terrorist networks; regional tribal, ethnic, and religious militants; and local defense organizations. These groups support no single cause and have no single ideological commitment. But they do share a kind of “outsider” status in the world community, in that governments and the international community usually reject them as legitimate political actors.

Until recently, virtually all rebel groups stood completely outside the framework of international humanitarian law. Many of the armed groups fighting today do not participate in international lawmaking because this is still the exclusive domain of sovereign states. From the perspective of sovereign states, these rebel groups are illegitimate actors. Indeed, nation states will not ordinarily grant recognition to rebel groups, even though there is considerable evidence that, when they do, both sides to a conflict are more likely to observe the laws of war. Thus, although the laws of war may require that rebel groups forego the use of child soldiers, even if these groups were to strictly adhere to the laws of war, their efforts likely would yield no tangible rewards. They would still be considered criminals under domestic law and would receive no international recognition of the legitimacy of their causes. Thus, it is difficult to persuade them to comply with international standards. For example, UN representatives who have made attempts to negotiate with...
rebel groups and other nonstate actors on the issue of child soldiers have found it very difficult to achieve progress. The failure of these efforts has caused some to call for “sharper teeth” in the enforcement of criminal and political sanctions against recruiters of child soldiers.

There are several reasons that nonstate actors reject international standards. Sometimes they do not share, or flatly reject, the cultural views about children or childhood held by the international community. They often do so because they believe that the applicable standards have largely been forged in the West and imposed upon the rest of the world. In other instances, child recruiters are terrorist organizations such as the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC), Hamas and Islamic Jihad in the Palestinian Territories, or insurgent movements such as the Naxalite-Maoist rebellion in India, all of whom practice what is known as hybrid or unrestricted warfare and have publicly demonstrated little or no interest in observing the laws of war. Whatever the reasons, however, laws banning recruitment have had little or no influence on the behavior of nonstate actors.

The Criminal Culpability of Children
The second big issue concerning child soldiers relates to their culpability for war crimes. The record shows that it is difficult to prosecute children, even those who may have committed war crimes, because children, even child soldiers, are generally regarded as victims of war rather than perpetrators. Indeed, no child soldier has ever been put on trial before an international tribunal. For example, the civil war in Sierra Leone provided a highly visible instance of wartime atrocities committed by children. The UN resolution establishing the Special Court for Sierra Leone considered this issue and tried to find a balance between the concern for children and the need for justice. Accordingly, it provided that no child under age 15 would be prosecuted. Children between ages 15 and 18, however, could be put on trial for war crimes, but they would not be imprisoned even if they were convicted. Nevertheless, a broad array of child protection and human rights groups, including Human Rights Watch (HRW), UNICEF, Save the Children, Cause Canada, and the Coalition to Stop the Use of Child Soldiers, lobbied to prevent the Special Court from trying any person under age 18, regardless of the severity and scope of war crimes that they committed. Many Sierra Leoneans disagreed and wanted some form of accountability.

Sierra Leone’s UN Ambassador Ibrahim Kamara rejected the idea that all child soldiers were traumatized victims. In the view of the Sierra Leonean government, the people of Sierra Leone would not look kindly upon a court that failed to bring to justice children who committed war crimes. The conflict between views was set aside when the prosecutor of the Special Court announced that he would not prosecute any person under 18 years of age. This decision was a result of both the limited resources of the Special Court and the prosecutor’s reluctance to put children on trial.

Aside from Sierra Leone, perhaps only one other international court has had the authority to grapple with juvenile cases. The Court of the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor was authorized to try offenses committed by minors between the ages of 12 and 18. Under the Court’s rules of criminal procedure, minors between 12 and 16 years of age were subject to prosecution for criminal offenses. However, they were only subject to prosecution for the most serious offenses, such as murder, rape, or a crime of violence in which serious injury is inflicted upon a victim. Minors over 16 years of age were subject to prosecution under adult rules of criminal procedure. But in accordance with the CRC, the Court was required to safeguard the rights of minors and consider their status as juveniles in every decision made in a case.

Child Soldiers in Domestic Courts
There is a striking difference between international and national or domestic courts in their treatment of children as war criminals. Where child protectionism has prevailed in the international arena, national courts have sometimes been extremely harsh. In the wake of the September 11, 2001, attacks, the United States held at least 12 juveniles at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. One of them, Yasser Talal al-Zahrani, hung himself shortly after arriving at the prison camp. The most widely known juvenile case from Guantanamo is that of Omar Khadr, a 15-year-old child soldier. He was captured and detained as an unlawful combatant after a firefight with American troops in Afghanistan in which an American soldier was killed. Khadr has been charged with
murder and attempted murder and is currently being held pending trial under the Military Commissions Act, which provides for the death penalty in such cases. Because Khadr is a Canadian citizen, however, the Canadian government successfully pressured the United States not to pursue the death penalty in this case.

Child soldiers have also been aggressively prosecuted in other domestic jurisdictions. In 2002, the government of Uganda brought treason charges against two boys, age 14 and 16, who were members of the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA). In a letter to the Ugandan Minister of Justice on February 19, 2003, Human Rights Watch (HRW) urged Uganda to immediately drop the treason charges and release the boys to a rehabilitation center. HRW also requested the government issue a public statement that children will not be subject to treason charges. The Ugandan government decided not to proceed in these cases, but it did not establish a national policy. Recently, Uganda charged another child soldier with treason—a child who, according to HRW, was abducted at age 9 by the rebel forces of the Allied Democratic Front (ADF), and arrested at age 15. In 2000, the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) executed a 14-year-old child soldier. In another instance in the DRC, four children, ages 14 to 16 at the time of their arrest, were sentenced to death by the DRC’s Court of Military Order. Following a meeting with HRW representatives on May 2, 2001, the lives of these children were spared.

Conclusion

Given the reported number of child soldiers and the widespread claims that children have been frequently involved in war crimes, the actual number of children tried and convicted in national courts is low. Despite this, there remains a gap between national and international notions of justice. International humanitarian law and human rights law increasingly define all persons under age 18 as vulnerable children in need of protection. However, these bodies of law have failed to grapple with the problem of child soldiers who commit war crimes. The silence of international law on this issue is deafening, but the record of harsh responses of national courts to war crimes committed by child soldiers may signal the need for the development of an international approach. The efforts of international human rights and humanitarian groups to provide blanket immunity from criminal processes to those under age 18 are well intentioned. However, it may be neither practical nor effective for international law to adopt the extreme position that all persons under 18 years of age must stand outside the judicial system. Such an approach stands in contrast to the general practice of most societies that have well-developed systems of juvenile justice to deal with minors who commit terrible crimes. Perhaps the next logical step is the development of new international law specifically directed toward war crimes committed by children.

Remember to visit Insights online for additional resources, including Chris Blattman’s studies of how war affects youth, teaching ideas, and links to testimonies from former child soldiers.

For Further Reading

Blattman, Chris. Uganda: Survey of War Affected Youth crisblattman.com/projects/sway/


Soldier Testimony Project. www.soldiertestimony.org


F O R  D I S C U S S I O N

1. Who is a child? How is a child different from an adult? Do you think it is possible to establish a universal definition of childhood, of who a child is? Would it include a specific age marking the transition from child to adult? Do you think it is possible to define legally who is a child in a way that is fair and just?

2. Do you think underage “child” soldiers accused of war crimes should be held legally accountable for their actions? If so, how should we judge their responsibility for their actions? Would it depend on their age, maturity, or other circumstances?

3. What should be the role of international law and international courts in matters concerning child soldiers, both to regulate the practice and to deliver justice?
When did you first enter into exile? How old were you?
I left my homeland, Pakkam village, Ganyiel Payam, Panyijiar County, Unity State, Southern Sudan, in 1987 as a result of civil war. At the time, the enemy (Sudan government) was set to exterminate boys as they viewed them as the future of the resistance movements of the Southern Sudanese. I was about 4-5 years old.

What were some of your experiences?
During my journey, I escaped the dangers of water predators especially alligators; survived from the jaws of lions, leopards, cheetahs; dashed the venoms of snakes;
survived the scorching heat of the time; crossed sandy and dry deserts; luckily escaped from craving thirst; survived hunger and mosquito bites; escaped from the deadly bullets from government ground attacks and aerial bombardments; survived hostile attacks and abduction by hostile communities; and survived deadly diseases. My survival in these situations rested in the hands of my fellow countrymen who at times gave me water, watched over my shoulders, gave me food to eat, took care of my wounds, or nursed me when I was sick. It was a remarkable journey that I could not have survived, thanks to God and those who he commissioned to help me.

Do you remember life prior to the start of the Second Sudanese Civil War?

Before the civil war there were no refugees, no soldiers roaming around, no confiscation of livestock and food. There was an abundance of food, milk, fish, and meat. There were traditional dances and ceremonies. My family farmed peacefully and did not worry about relocation and weren’t scared so much about another tribe displacing or chasing them away. After the civil war, a lot changed. When I returned in 2007 to Sudan, I was shocked. Before he died, my father had two wives; my mom, the oldest. He had three sons and five daughters. One of my brothers, one sister, and my stepmother were killed in 1995, at the time I was in Kenya. They were caught between two warring factions and were all burned in the bush alive. Before I left, two of my sisters were married. During my years in exile, three more were married. Unfortunately when I came back, only two had [surviving] husbands. All of my sisters have lost some of their children to diseases and hunger during the war. Almost all my sisters and their children are sick [from] one disease or another, which makes it difficult for me to think of how to help solve their health issues. My family was displaced many times, had trouble farming, and had to live on United Nations (UN)-dropped food. They went back to the place where I was born recently.

On the positive side, I managed to survive and now have [an] education. I am working and able to feed my family while providing schooling for my [nieces and nephews]. It is an opportunity they would never have had I not survived. I am confident the children I am feeding and schooling now will be the future of their households if they live to the best potential of their lives.

During your time in exile, did you recognize that you were a refugee protected by international laws?

I did not know that I was a refugee when I was in Ethiopia. I was a child soldier trained in 1989 awaiting growth to maturity before returning to Sudan to fight. I was fed by UN agencies at the time, but was not aware of why they were helping during those years. I became conscious of my “refugee-hood” when I went to Kenya in 1992. I was older then and realized that the UN [and agencies like it] were helping us. I came to know this because, after walking from a place called Pochalla on the border of Sudan and Ethiopia to a place called Boma in the South East Sudan, Red Cross vehicles came to pick us up from a place called Khor Agrape in Jonglei State and drove us to a place called Mogos in Eastern Equatoria State. The same Red Cross workers facilitated our travel to a place called Kapoeta, and then to Narus—a small garrison near the border of Kenya. The Red Cross also provided beans and maize for food. When we arrived in Kenya in late 1992, we met more agencies: the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), United Nations World Food Programme (WFP), World Vision, and the Lutheran World Federation (LWF). [These] organizations showed they were caring and contributed so much to our survival. Finally, when we settled in the Kakuma Refugee Camp in Kenya, agencies provided us with food, shelter, healthcare, and education.

It was in Kakuma that I enhanced my education, which I had started in 1988 in Ethiopia but was disrupted by the fall of Communism and the Ethiopian regime at that time. In Kakuma, I started in primary school, in class three up to class seven. I graduated in 1997 with a Kenya Certificate of Primary Education. I enrolled in Napata Secondary School, a refugee secondary school, in 1998 and would have graduated with a Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education in 2001, but I left for the United States three months before sitting for the final exam.

Would you tell us more about your time as a child soldier?

Initially we headed to Ethiopia to seek refuge. After getting there, we found that Ethiopia had [been] accommodating the Sudan Peoples’ Liberation Move-
ment/Army (SPLM/A)—the dominant South Sudanese guerrilla army waging war against the government of Sudan. Leaders of the movement came to the refugee camp and explained to us why they were fighting. I chose to join them.

Our training consisted of tactics such as ground crawling, sniper shooting, gun shooting, and gun cleaning. It was exhaustive training that required a lot of work and determination.

In January 1992, [several boys and I] left [the camp and training in] Pochalla and headed south toward Boma, Kapoeta, and eventually to Narus along the border of Sudan and Kenya. Two months later [this area] was captured by the [North Sudanese] government forces. [The army damaged] the town, people, animals, and properties. We then headed for Lokichogio, Kenya, [where we] planned to join [some] older boys to go fight. However, in Lokichogio, I had no chance to return to Sudan and again became a refugee. I [never came] back to Sudan until 2007, when I reunited with my family.

What kinds of activities, outside of school, were you able to do?

[Several] organizations provided us with sporting and recreation materials and facilities. I became a very good soccer player. I was part of the team that represented the refugees in the Kenya National Football (soccer) competitions. I also played for my high school at the refugee camp, and I was part of the team that won the Turkana District High School Tournament Championship in July 2001, just three days before I left for the United States. After I left, my

The toughest challenge in America was learning my way around. Fargo was too big, people were driving cars, and technology was too [sophisticated] for a poor boy from [an] African refugee camp to cope with. I also found it difficult to deal with cold weather, the opposite of where I had come from. My transition in America was quick because my interest was in getting to school. Luckily, I arrived in July, and was able to enroll in school starting in September the same year. Just a week and a half after starting class, the [terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 unfolded]; I watched the disaster in class that day. I attribute my success in adjusting to America to my teachers and classmates who did everything to help me learn and improve relationships within the school and the community.

Did you enter the United States hoping to complete an education?

My cousin, who was with me in Kenya and was dissatisfied with life in the refugee camp and returned to Sudan, wrote me a letter in 1998. It was the first communication I had with any family member since I had left in 1987. Before I received the letter, I had written letters to my [family] using Red Cross letters that were provided and delivered free by agencies to villages in Southern Sudan. The letter I received that day invited me to return home. I was convinced that I was of no help to my family, so it was not wise to go home. I thought it wise to pursue an education and try to go to college. I had the opportunity the same year when forms were brought to us [for resettlement]. I applied, followed all the legal processes for resettlement and in 2001, was invited to the United States. Therefore, my main aim of going to the United States was to [earn an] education so that one day I would be of help to my remaining family members in Southern Sudan. [Some of the challenges I faced as a student at] Fargo South High School [included] speaking [with] an America accent, [learning how to use] a computer, doing math [with] a calculator, and finding rides to school. However, continued on page 28
In the United States, child labor has come to stand for the worst oppression of a seemingly bygone era of industrial abuse. Abolished by legal regulation and economic change, the question of young people working for wages no longer takes center stage in public debates as it did a century ago. Outside of the United States, however, young people and industrial labor remain a hot-button issue. Over the last two decades a series of ironies have brought the issue to the fore. Among the most biting is the specter of children in Asia making toys for youngsters in the West. About 10 years ago, for example, press reports linked McDonald’s to child labor abuse in southern China. Children as young as 14, investigators found, toiled upwards of 16 hours per day to manufacture Winnie the Pooh and Hello Kitty figurines for the fast food giant. More recently, labor and immigration officials have discovered violations of child labor regulations inside U.S. borders. In 2008, for instance, investigators in Iowa discovered young Guatemalan immigrants working on dangerous machines in the meatpacking industry. As the twenty-first century proceeds, it appears that old issues are new again.

Young People and the World’s Work

These questions continue to arise because people in the modern world have never quite figured out where young people fit into society, especially with regard to work. One sweeping term, “child labor,” has come to stand for the variety of ways that young people might encounter the world of adult labor. Such was not always the case. For most of history, young people have worked in some capacity or other, at home or away from it. In most societies, the very young did very little; but as children matured, they took on increasing responsibilities in the economic lives of their families and communities. In agrarian communities, work might mean tending gardens or flocks, or it might mean spending time as a servant in someone else’s home. In Europe and the United States, these kinds of arrangements slowly came to be regulated by law. By the early modern era, Anglo-American law provided considerable guidelines for apprenticeships and service arrangements. For instance, masters had the duty to support and teach their charges, but they also had the legal right to beat unruly boys and girls. These
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James D. Schmidt (jschmidt@niu.edu) is associate professor of history at Northern Illinois University. His new book, Industrial Violence and the Legal Origins of Child Labor (Cambridge, 2010), examines in greater depth the role of industrial violence in the modern conception of child labor.
codes represent a first kind of child labor law, one that did not survive the transition to a modern economy.

Beginning in the eighteenth century, Europe and the United States experienced a revolution in economic life. Production of everyday goods began to move out of the household and into the factories. More people left the countryside to live in cities, where they owned nothing more than their own abilities. When moving to town, working people brought the assumptions of agrarian life with them. Parents expected young people to contribute to families, and more young people began to work for money away from home. In New England, for instance, that might mean the burgeoning textile industry, where teenage girls found work; or it might mean the whaling ships, where pay and adventure awaited boys as young as 12. After the middle nineteenth century, going out to work became common for youngsters older than 10. Many went to work at the requests of their parents, but many also found work on their own accord. For instance, William Fitzgerald, a 10-year-old North Carolina boy, secured a job in a woodworking plant in 1901 while his father was out of town. Similarly, Myrtice Ransom, an 11-year-old Georgia girl, took a position at an Atlanta confectionary without the knowledge or consent of her parents. Young people, in other words, sought industrial work on their own terms.

The dawning of an industrial childhood did not go unopposed. From early in the nineteenth century, politicians and reformers in Britain and America worried about the effects of wage work on growing bodies and minds. In Britain, Parliament passed a series of Factory Acts beginning in 1802. These laws began to limit young people’s work, though usually such restrictions were confined to the very young and the most dangerous jobs. At the same time, reformers in the United States began to push for similar legislation. Here, reform efforts connected to vital concerns about republican government and its schools. Horace Mann, also an education reformer, led the fight for compulsory education and child labor prohibition. “No greater calamity can befall us as a nation than that our children should grow up without knowledge and cultivation,” Mann declared. “If we do not prepare them to become good citizens, develop their capacities, enrich their minds with knowledge, imbue their hearts with a love of truth and all things holy, then our republic must go down to destruction as others have gone before it.” In the first half of the nineteenth century, several U.S. states enacted a series of laws that slowly raised the legal age of work.

By the beginning of the twentieth century, U.S. reformers had come to believe that a century of lawmaker had done little to stop the evils of child labor. Connected to other progressive era activists, they began a concerted push for vigorous enforcement of existing laws, restrictions on where and when young people could work, and ultimately federal-level prohibition. Reformers coalesced into the National Child Labor Committee in 1904. In Congress, Senator Albert Beveridge of Indiana led the fight for federal legislation. “Any industrial system that robs American children of their rights,” Beveridge intoned in 1906, “is a crime against humanity and treason against liberty itself.” Such efforts resulted in federal restrictions in the Keating-Owen Act of 1916, which the Supreme Court promptly ruled unconstitutional in the controversial Hammer v. Dagenhart decision of 1918. A new federal law and a new Supreme Court ruling in the early 1920s continued to keep child labor regulation out of federal hands, and throughout the 1920s, reformers pushed unsuccessfully to amend the U.S. Constitution to prohibit child labor. They finally won their federal-level battle in 1938, when the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) included meaningful national restrictions on young people who worked for wages in industry.

**The Law of Child Labor**

Many histories of child labor end the story with the FLSA. Doing so misses much of what actually happened. Federal-level reform proceeded at a glacial pace, to be sure, but the real action took place in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries at the state level. There, reformers built up a huge body of regulations, and the state courts invoked the state’s police power to make laws for health and good morals. A North Carolina Supreme Court promptly ruled unconstitutional the early 1920s continued to keep child labor regulation out of federal hands, and throughout the 1920s, reformers pushed unsuccessfully to amend the U.S. Constitution to prohibit child labor. They finally won their federal-level battle in 1938, when the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) included meaningful national restrictions on young people who worked for wages in industry.

**Key Statistics**

- There are 246 million children working as child laborers; 73 million of them are less than 10 years old.
- Child labor is not isolated to developing economies: 2.5 million children work in developed economies and another 2.5 million children work in transitioning economies.
- Every year, 22,000 children die in work-related accidents.
- Most children work in the informal sector, without legal or regulatory protections: 70% in agriculture, commercial hunting and fishing, and forestry; 8% in manufacturing; 8% in wholesale and retail trade, restaurants, and hotels; and 7% in community, social, and personal service, such as domestic work.
- An estimated 8.4 million children are trapped in slavery, trafficking, debt bondage, prostitution, pornography, and other illicit activities.

Data from the International Labor Organization.
Court justice noted in 1908 that state-level child labor laws had “never been successfully assailed” in the state courts. Such laws were “founded upon the principle that the supreme right of the State to the guardianship of children controls the natural rights of the parent when the welfare of society or of the children themselves conflicts with parental rights.”

Indeed, the courts had long upheld state-based child labor statutes, but beyond that, they also provided a legal forum for young workers and their families who had been injured on the job. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, such cases (along with similar ones for adults) flooded the U.S. legal system. Looking at these cases as historical sources, we can see that working people responded to child labor law with a mixture of resistance and accommodation. Unionized workers often welcomed child labor law as a necessary restriction on cheap labor, but young workers and their families also openly defied legal regulations, securing employment simply by lying about their ages.

Litigants, juries, witnesses, and numerous spectators could discuss dramatic happenings in their everyday lives. Industrial accidents, especially those that happened to young people, were among the most dramatic, often quite literally. For instance, when young Robert Jones became caught in the machinery of a textile plant in 1880, his fellow workers had to hang on for dear life. “Miss Vaughn and I ran to him and caught him by his legs and held him until the machinery could be stopped,” Robert’s cousin and fellow worker remembered. Unfortunately, the women were too late to save Robert entirely. “I was caught under my arm and all the flesh torn off to the bone,” he later recalled.

Countless young workers or their loved ones told similar stories. In one of the more heartrending examples, Bruce Holt, a young North Carolina worker, recalled his recovery after an accident in a woodworking plant. On July 5, 1917, a machine at the plant shot a board into Bruce’s midsection, crushing his intestines and leaving a gaping hole. Surgery eventually repaired his insides, but not after Bruce suffered for months in the hospital.

Horrifying injuries and recoveries such as Bruce’s were matched by accidents that ended in grisly death. Ben...
Hodges, a young African American worker at a Georgia phosphate processing plant, died in 1919 when he became wrapped up in a conveyor. By the time fellow workers got to Ben, he was “hanging by his left arm and shoulder with his heels down. As to the condition of his feet, both of them was whipped off, frizzled rags, sorter like a beef steak or a person had an old piece of knife or something beat up.” His mother, Minnie, came to the plant where Ben had been injured. “When I got there he was lying there all mangled up, his legs was all torn off,” she told a Georgia courtroom.

Stories such as Bruce’s and Ben’s can help us understand why the long fight against child labor was eventually successful. Working people themselves resisted that fight as much as they aided it. They had their own view of where young people might fit into industrial life, a view aligned with the long history of young people that saw them making slowly increasing economic contributions to their families and their communities. The violence of modern life made that vision quite difficult to carry out. In the United States at least, the courts provided a place where people could work through these difficulties.

**Final Thoughts**

The question of child labor seems to have been decided once and for all in favor of legal prohibition, but as Chinese toy workers and Iowa meatpackers make clear, the question remains open. In fact, the question is not as simple as it might appear. While the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child recognizes a universal human right to play and a universal duty to protect young people under 18 from the labor market, modern school systems still prepare young people to take their place in a wage-labor economy. Child labor law has created a situation where the rights of adult workers in that economy stand apart from those of the young. When the labor rights of children are thus severed off from those of adults, both sides suffer. Education pioneer Felix Adler recognized this fact over a century ago. “The adult laborer cannot be regarded as a mere tool,” Adler noted in 1905. “In him, as in the child, there is something sacred, certain rights that we must not violate.” As people around the world work out the rights of labor in a globalizing economy, Adler’s insight is more pointed than ever.

**Remember to visit Insights online for more resources.**

---

**FOR DISCUSSION**

1. Do you think children and young people today should work? What limits or restrictions should be placed on their working? What are possible advantages and disadvantages to their being in the workforce? For them? For their families? For society as a whole?

2. Why do you think American social reformers in the nineteenth century “usually paired” the fight for compulsory education laws, requiring young people to attend school until a certain age, with legislation that would prohibit or regulate child labor?

3. Do you think young people require greater protections than adults from potential physical dangers or harsh conditions in the workplace? Why or why not?

4. Why do some countries have higher rates of child labor than others? Do you think that is appropriate? Fair?

---

**For Further Reading**


Yes, the U.S. Legal Drinking Age Should be Lowered

by John McCardell

Since 1984, we have had, in effect, a national drinking age of 21. The law imposes prohibition—we must call this what it is—on everyone under the age of 21, including those age 18-20 who are, in the eyes of the law, in all other respects, adults.

We begin to see the dilemma this law creates, especially in the face of other laws that make 18 the age of majority. At age 18, one can serve on a jury, sign a contract, and be responsible for one’s debts. At age 18, one is able to put one’s life on the line in the service of country. But one may not buy a beer. (And do not be misled. To be sure, one may not rent a car or a hotel room at age 21. But federal law does not mandate these rules.)

Young adults find this single exception for alcohol impossible to understand. Age 21 seems arbitrary, and the explanations offered in support of it—that they lack judgment and maturity—at the very least call into question why they are deemed capable of exercising all other adult responsibilities.

Thus, the dilemma posed by current law: the 21-year-old drinking age is being routinely evaded. For example:

- Ninety-five percent of those who will be alcohol consumers in their lifetime take their first drink before age 21;
- Fifty percent of 18- to 20-year-olds consume alcohol regularly;
- Seventy-five percent of high school seniors, 60 percent of high school sophomores, and 40 percent of eighth graders have consumed alcohol;
- Five thousand lives are lost to alcohol each year by those under the age of 21. Of these, fewer than 40 percent are traffic fatalities. The vast majority—over 60 percent—of alcohol-related fatalities take place off the roadways.

What might we conclude? Current laws are not working effectively. Once again, consider the following statistics:

- Among college students, a decade’s worth of research in the College Alcohol Study found the proportion of students engaging in frequent binge drinking had increased. Compared to 1993, more 18- to 24-year-old students who chose to drink in 2001 were drinking excessively—as defined by frequency of drinking occasions, frequency of drunkenness, and drinking to get drunk;
- College students experienced a nearly 10 percent increase in the rate of getting drunk between 1993 and 2001, which corresponded to an increase in secondary consequences and treatment for alcohol overdose;
- National estimates suggest that among full-time college students, 690,000 are involved in assaults, 97,000 are involved in rapes, and 599,000 are injured as a result of alcohol.

Where is this behavior, known as binge drinking, taking place? And why? It is not taking place in public places, for the law has effectively banished alcohol consumption from those venues. It is occurring in clandestine places—locked dorm rooms, off-campus apartments, farmer’s fields, behind closed doors, underground, just as in the days of Prohibition.

Dare we contemplate there might be a better way without being shouted down? Dare we consider everything our laws and policies have wrought, intended and unintended? Dare we acknowledge that lives lost to alcohol in the dark shadows cast by the law are no less precious, and are increasingly more numerous, than those lost on the highways?

Of the total number of lives lost to alcohol by those under the age of 21, more than 60 percent are lost off the roadways. Alcohol takes a much greater toll off the highways. Yet debate will not occur in our state houses, so long as a highway fund penalty casts its long shadow over any attempt to frame alternatives to a one-size-fits-all federal mandate.

Moreover, if the drinking age is the best way to eliminate drunken driving, continued on page 21
No, Effective Public Policy Should Not Be Discarded
by Maria Carmona

The minimum legal drinking age, set at age 21 (MLDA 21), is the single most effective alcohol safety policy in the history of our country. MLDA laws were first established by states in 1933 after the repeal of Prohibition, with many states setting their MLDA at 21. In 1971, many states lowered their MLDA to 18 or 19 after the passage of the 26th Amendment, which lowered the voting age to 18. Studies in the 1970s and 1980s showed significant increases in alcohol-related crashes involving youth aged 18-20 in states that lowered their drinking age. In light of this evidence, the U.S. Congress passed the National Minimum Drinking Age Act in 1984. While respecting states’ rights to set alcohol policy for their state, the act provided financial incentives for states to raise their MLDA to 21.

Opponents of MLDA 21 often dismiss the traffic safety statistics, preferring to focus attention on other facts about underage drinking that are not caused by the MLDA law. One is that underage youth who drink regularly today (and it is important to remember that most underage youth are not regular drinkers) binge drink. Opponents of MLDA 21 use this fact to argue that because a minority of underage drinkers engages in highly dangerous drinking behavior, we should make alcohol more available to them by lowering the legal drinking age. In making this argument, they make no comment on how changing the law might affect the prevalence of drinking among youth who are not regular drinkers; that is, most youth. Let me comment by referencing studies internationally and in this country.

In 1999, New Zealand lowered its legal drinking age from 20 to 18. Effects of this public policy mirror what happened in our country during the 1970s and 1980s. A study of the New Zealand example in the American Journal of Public Health found that the rate of traffic crashes and injuries increased 12 percent for males aged 18 to 19 and 14 percent for males aged 15 to 17. Effects were even greater among females, with rates increasing 51 percent for 18- to 19-year-olds and 24 percent for 15- to 17-year-olds.

If one wants to consider the breadth of effects that are likely to result from lowering the legal drinking age, consider also statistics from Europe, where minimum drinking age laws are lower. The European School Survey Project on Alcohol and Other Drugs finds that a greater percentage of underage youth from nearly all European countries report regular drinking and binge drinking. Make no mistake about it. Lowering the MLDA in the United States will result in younger children drinking regularly and more binge drinking among younger children. Moreover, early drinking is associated with problem drinking later in life. According to the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, 40 percent of youth who start drinking before age 15 will become alcohol dependent at some point in their lives.

Another argument for lowering the legal drinking age centers on the fact that the age of 18 represents adulthood in many contexts, but in particular military service. The suggestion here is that young people should be rewarded with alcohol for their military service or that, because an...
An 18-year-old has been trained to wield lethal force, he or she can handle alcohol. I reject these suggestions for the same reasons that many military leaders reject them. Alcohol consumption by military personnel under the age of 21 threatens readiness; and physical ability to perform the tasks associated with military service.

Alcohol use affects adolescents differently than it does adults, specifically in terms of liver functioning and brain development and functioning. There is clear evidence that repeated exposure to alcohol during late adolescence can lead to lasting negative effects on behavior, emotional development, and cognitive abilities, influencing personality, learning, decision making, and memory.

Those who support lowering the MLDA to age 18 often argue that the negative effects of such a policy change can be avoided by better training and education for high school and college age youth. The problem with this solution is that there is little evidence to support it. Alcohol education programs can raise awareness and improve understanding about the harms and risks posed by hazardous drinking, but by themselves they generally do not lead to behavior change.

Real behavior change among 18- to 20-year-old college youth is possible when comprehensive approaches to preventing underage drinking are implemented. This involves maintaining and enforcing effective public policy such as MLDA 21, complementing public policy with institutional policies that are enforced, educational programs, and providing alternative alcohol-free options. While this may seem like a large undertaking, it is feasible. Many college campuses are doing this already because institutional leadership sees upholding a law that protects public health and safety as paramount. (Military bases are doing this in the interest of preparedness.)

And campuses across the country report that their efforts appear to be making a difference in terms of consumption rates and alcohol-related problems. Campus innovations include educating and training resident housing assistants on the importance of intervention and reporting alcohol violations; establishing parental notification policies for violations; prohibiting alcohol advertising on campus and alcohol sponsorship of college events; providing alcohol-free activities during late evening and early morning hours; scheduling Friday classes; working with off-campus housing landlords; targeting Greek organizations, athletes, and freshmen with information about the harms of underage drinking and the risks associated with violating campus policies; banning kegs from campus; and implementing local ordinances aimed at preventing the nuisances that develop when off-campus drinking occurs.

One of the most important duties of government at the federal and state levels is to protect public welfare through the establishment of public policy. The federal government acted to promote public safety by providing an incentive for states to “do the right thing.” Given the ample evidence to show that lowering the MLDA would do to the well being of our nation’s youth, and given that the vast majority of the American public supports the existing uniform MLDA of 21, it’s clear that lowering the drinking age is a very bad idea.

Maria Carmona is the senior program director at the Alcohol, Policy, and Safety Research Center at the Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation (PIRE). She is a graduate of Harvard College and holds graduate degrees in education and in anthropology from Columbia University. PIRE is an independent, nonprofit organization that is dedicated to merging scientific knowledge and proven practice to improve the public health and safety.

The National Minimum Drinking Age Act of 1984

The National Minimum Drinking Age Act of 1984 required states to set their minimum purchase and public possession of alcohol age to 21. States that did not comply with the act faced a 10 percent reduction in highway funds under the Federal-Aid Highway Act.

The law specifically prohibited the purchase and public possession, but not drinking, of alcoholic beverages. Many states enacted individual policies that restricted the drinking of alcoholic beverages by persons under the age of 21. Currently 19 states do not specifically prohibit the consumption of alcohol by persons under the age of 21, but all states are in compliance with the federal law from 1984.

The Supreme Court decided, in the case South Dakota v. Dole, that the federal government was acting within constitutional bounds by enacting legislation for “the general welfare” and that the means chosen to do so were reasonable. A reduction in highway funds was not “unduly coercive.”
then why stop at 21? Wouldn't raising the age to 25 save more lives? Somewhere, the logic breaks down. Somehow, we must acknowledge that the drinking age is a blunt instrument applied to a very specific problem, which affects all ages. There are far more effective ways to target, and eliminate, drunk driving without discriminating against an entire category of adult citizens on the basis of age. For example, ignition interlocks should be installed in the vehicles of every person, regardless of age, who is a first-time DUI offender. If a drunk's car won't start, the drunk ceases to be a menace on our roadways.

How can anyone look at the present state of affairs and plausibly argue that the current law is working, that the status quo is satisfactory, and that those who suggest that things might be changed for the better are putting lives at risk? Lives today, in increasing numbers, are being put at risk.

The Constitution is clear about where the right to set the drinking age resides, and that is with the states. The 1984 law skirts the constitutional question by allowing the states to set the drinking age where they choose; however, any state setting the age lower than 21 forfeits 10 percent of its federal highway appropriation. If this 10 percent condition were removed, the states would have restored to them a basic constitutional right. The federal government could no longer coerce a state into doing something the state wished not to do. States might then be free to seek a better way and develop better, even best, practices. That way begins with education—comprehensive alcohol education, which is more than temperance lectures and scare tactics but rather an education that prepares young adults to make responsible decisions about alcohol.

Imagine saying to a young person upon reaching legal driving age, “Here are the keys; there is the car. Good luck. All I can do is lecture you and show you some scary videos. If I were to get in the vehicle with you and help you learn how to operate it, you and I would both be arrested, and our state would forfeit 10 percent of its highway funds. So good luck. Maybe your friends can help you learn to be a safe driver.”

That, of course, is a ridiculous scenario. Yet it describes our approach to alcohol education today. We need to prepare young adults to make responsible decisions about alcohol in the same way we prepare them to operate a motor vehicle, through a partnership of home, school, and government.

Such reforms would encourage social life to come out of the shadows and into the sunlight, out of secretive locations and into the open. If so much as one life is saved, wouldn’t that be worth it? Adults could model responsible behavior, not simply deliver a message that is neither heard nor heeded because it patronizes, condescends, and denies reality.

Alcohol is a reality in the lives of young adults today, in this country as in most of the rest of the world. We can either continue to try to change the reality, which has been our attempt since 1984, and which, as is always the case in times of prohibition, has simply failed. Or, through enlightened public policy, we can create the safest possible environment for this reality. Current policies have created the least safe environment. It is time for us to consider better ways to put fewer lives at risk.

---

**Minimum Legal Drinking Ages Around the World**

The minimum legal drinking age refers to the earliest age that a person may legally purchase alcoholic beverages, which may be different from the age a person is permitted to consume alcoholic beverages. Ages vary across the globe, from 16 in many European countries, to 25 in India. Some Islamic nations prohibit alcohol consumption by Muslims, and others by anyone. Other nations have no minimum age requirements for drinking or purchasing alcoholic beverages. The chart below offers a glimpse at minimum legal drinking age laws around the globe.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nations in Which the Minimum Legal Drinking Age is</th>
<th>16-17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19-20</th>
<th>21+</th>
<th>Alcohol Prohibited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Kuwait</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>Yemen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: State University of New York Potsdam.

---

John M. McCardell Jr. is the founder and president of Choose Responsibility, a nonprofit organization dedicated to stimulating informed and dispassionate public discussion about the presence of alcohol in American culture and to considering policies that will effectively empower young adults age 18 to 20 to make mature decisions about the place of alcohol in their own lives. Prior to this position, McCardell was the president of Middlebury College in Vermont.
Students Debate International and Domestic Issues to Raise Awareness

Since its founding in 1934, more than 500,000 students have become more engaged and better-informed citizens through their participation with Junior State of America (JSA).

“JSA is a great opportunity for the student to pick up skills, gain confidence, and meet other students who care,” states Jeff Harris, Executive Director, Junior Statesman Foundation. “If there’s an issue they are concerned about, they have an avenue to make change.”

With more than 500 student-run chapters throughout the country, JSA promotes public discourse and leadership among high school students. While the Junior Statesman Foundation supports the JSA and administers the summer programs, it is the student members of JSA who are responsible for all the content of the conventions, the direction of their local chapters, and fundraising efforts to support their programming.

JSA has both a national and local component. At a national level, there are JSA states and territories. States are more or less structured like the United States, though can include specific regions and multiple states, such as the Northern California State, while territories also can include multiple states. At this level, leadership positions include “mayors,” “governors,” and “cabinet members,” and they are responsible for organizing national and regional conventions. The chapters are school-sponsored extracurricular clubs with a teacher advisor. The student leadership organizes debates, presentations, and activities, such as voter registration drives to engage their peers.

“One you give students some parameters, most of the time they go to it and rely on a collaborative process within their group or rely on other JSA chapters,” comments Mychele Hughes, director of community and corporate development, and government teacher and JSA advisor at Hooke High School in Texarkana, Texas. “I really just try to provide them with the tools they need to do their job, and some guidance, and to share my experience on how I was involved in the political process at a young age.”

The JSA chapter at Hooke High School has 31 members, accounting for 10 percent of the student population.

Students Speak Their Mind

“JSA gives students a voice so they can talk about whatever they’re passionate about, which translates into students being active in the democratic process,” explains Hughes.

JSA chapters and conventions are recognized as a place for students who are interested in politics. Debates and meetings allow students to voice their thoughts on issues, while listening respectfully to the opinions of their peers.

“You hear from people with various viewpoints and have debates with people who have different views,” explains...
Adam Raudonis, chapter president and senior at Westlake High School in Thousand Oaks, California. “You learn you can be civil with someone who you completely disagree with.”

The Westlake High School JSA chapter received the 2009 National Civic Impact Award from Junior Statesman Foundation for their success in engaging their peers and enhancing the awareness of politics and current events at their school. Their debates covered topics from abortion to the state budget crisis. Students initiated a job career shadow program at their school and also organized a community service project to translate the issues they were debating into action.

Students raised $500 for Achieve in Africa through a fundraising event at a local restaurant with 25 percent of proceeds being donated to the cause. Achieve in Africa, which was started by a former Westlake JSA member, provides children in Africa with a structured learning environment by rebuilding and aiding schools in need of reconstruction and supplies. The fundraising efforts on behalf of Westlake JSA went to rebuild a school in Tanzania.

Activism on domestic and international issues plays a role in many JSA chapters and conventions. The Northern California State JSA focused their activism campaign on human trafficking. In the past years, the Northern California State enhanced awareness about issues in Darfur and raised money to support schools in rural Afghanistan.

“It [the issue of human trafficking] was something I learned about in class and was really passionate about,” comments Ava Ghezelayagh, director of activism, Northern California State, and senior at Pacific Collegiate School in Santa Cruz, California. “My goal is for everyone to have a common understanding about the issue. I really want to expose as many people as possible to the topic.”

Ghezelayagh held informational sessions on how local JSA chapters within her region could get involved. She prepared flyers on how to create personal care item drives for victims of human trafficking and provided chapters with lists of companies who participate in fair trade to announce to their members and student body. She also helped a student prepare an article for the school paper on the issue of human trafficking.

“The key component is fundraising,” notes Ghezelayagh. “But at the same time we want to teach students and empower them and show them they have the strength to make a difference.”

At least 25 local JSA school chapters are participating in human trafficking activism efforts.

“JSAers are so focused on U.S. policy and its important to remember that the U.S. is just one part of the world,” states Ghezelayagh. “As future leaders, we can affect the rest of the world and influence certain issues.”

At the Pacific Northwest Convention held outside of Seattle in November 2009, 500 JSA attendees participated in a staged street demonstration to combat political apathy and create awareness for domestic and international issues. Students wore the same red T-shirts and froze in place at a busy intersection. The act received attention from local organizations and media. Issues debated and topics highlighted at the convention included the trade embargo of Cuba, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

“Politics of other countries affect our country,” comments Liza Romanow, Pacific Northwest governor and senior at Issaquah High School in Issaquah, Washington. “It’s really hard to be a successful nation if you don’t get along with other countries.”

The JSA Southeast Territory, which includes Florida, Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi, hosted an Afghan convention in January for local high school students and teachers.

Speakers included Pakistani and German generals, and an American admiral to inform students of military affairs in Afghanistan. A 45-minute Q&A at the conclusion of the presentation had panelists complimenting the students on their thoughtful questions. Debates and discussion topics covered

continued on page 30
The Convention on the Rights of the Child and the Debate over Ratification

Throughout the world there are differing values and perspectives on children and work. In some countries, children work in hazardous conditions, while other countries regulate the employment of children under specific ages. In the United States, for example, there are laws that restrict the number of hours and types of work that anyone under age 16 may perform. Such laws are designed to protect children’s educational opportunities and safety. In the most comprehensive international child rights treaty to date, the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child mandates that party countries establish a minimum age for child workers. The United States has signed the treaty but has not ratified it in the face of strong arguments. This lesson examines the use of child labor around the world, explores the differences between “labor” and “work,” and considers U.S. arguments for and against ratification of the Convention.

This Lesson Will Ask Students to:

1. Classify where, when, why, and how children might be forced to work;
2. Examine the international definition for “child labor” and “child work;”
3. Identify how the CRC prohibits child labor;
4. Consider the arguments for and against U.S. ratification of the CRC.

Materials

- Child Labor PowerPoint® presentation
- Labor vs. Work Photos
- Answer key

All handouts are available in the Learning Gateways section on the Insights Web site at www.insightsmagazine.org, and may be reproduced for educational use.

Part 1

1. Use the images from the Child Labor PowerPoint® presentation to introduce students to the varying ages of child workers around the world and jobs that they may perform. Explain that child labor is a global concern, as many children are exploited or unable to attend school while working or required to work in very hazardous conditions. Stop the presentation at Slide 14, or the cartogram of child labor around the world.

2. Ask students to answer the following questions:
   - Are you allowed to have a job? Why or why not?
   - How many of you have jobs?

3. Have students calculate the percentage of working students from the entire class. Percentage may be calculated by dividing number of working students by total number of students. Compare the class percentage to the national average from the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics: 26.1 percent of American teenagers work outside the home at paying jobs.
   - Does the percentage of workers in our classroom surprise you? Why or why not?

4. Ask students to discuss the following questions:
   - What kind of work do you do?
   - How often do you work?
   - What kinds of rules or laws must you follow at your job? Why?
   - Do you work at home? How is it different from working at a job?
   - Does your work at your job or at home ever get in the way of your schoolwork or time with friends? If so, how do you deal with it?

5. Provide students with the international legal definitions of child labor and child work (Slide 15 in the presentation): Child labor is work done by children under the age of 12, work done by children under the age of 15 that prevents school attendance, and work done by children
under the age of 18 that is hazardous to their physical and mental health.

Child work is work done by children age 12 and over, that does not negatively affect their health and development or interfere with education, and includes positive benefits and participation in economic activity.

Source of these definitions is the International Labor Organization.

6. In groups, have students review the individual images, using either the presentation or handout provided online, to classify each photo as “child labor” or “child work,” and explain what factors were involved in making their decision.

7. Discuss the definitions with the students:
   - Which category do you and your classmates’ jobs fall into? Why?
   - Why do you think international law differentiates between “child labor” and “child work”?
   - Why do you think age is a factor in defining “child labor” and “child work”?

8. Continue the lesson, noting that child labor and the distinctions between labor and work have challenged societies for some time, and that even though laws regulate child labor for safety, many children are still exploited in hazardous working conditions. Suggest that one way to establish laws between countries is through treaties. Review the treaty definition with students (Slide 16 in presentation):

A treaty is an agreement or arrangement made by negotiation, typically as a contract in writing, between two or more recognized political authorities, such as sovereign nation-states, formally signed by the representatives duly authorized and usually ratified by the lawmaking authority of the nation-state. The treaty may also be known as: agreement, protocol, convention, covenant, declaration, charter, pact, or understanding.

9. Distribute Handout 1 to students. Explain that there is an international treaty in place, the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, meant to protect young people around the world from child labor.

The handout provides a summary of Articles 1–42 of the CRC. Articles 43–54, not included in the summary, outline how the Convention will be implemented, and reafﬁrm the belief that the rights of all children should be protected and promoted. The original Convention, in its entirety, is available on the Insights website. Either the summary or the original document would work for this part of the activity.

10. Divide students into groups of three. In each group a student will identify the following items:
   - Which articles of the Convention protect children from child labor?
   - What else does the Convention protect children from?
   - What rights does the Convention guarantee all children?

11. Review group ﬁndings as a class, and discuss the following question:
   - Do you agree or disagree with any of the rights and protections outlined in the CRC? Why or why not?

12. Explain that for a treaty such as the Convention to have full force in the United States, it must not only be signed but also ratified. The United States has signed the Convention but not ratified it. Discuss the difference between signing and ratifying a treaty: when a nation signs a treaty, it is not yet party to the binding legal obligation, but demonstrating its intent to examine the treaty domestically and consider ratifying it. Ratification, then, signiﬁes an agreement by the state to be legally bound by the terms of the treaty.

13. Explain that there is debate in the U.S. Senate over whether or not the United States should ratify the Convention, and that they will consider some of the arguments within that debate.

Ratification of the Convention has been debated several times in the U.S. Senate but often fails to obtain the required votes for approval.

14. Distribute Handouts 2 and 3 to students. Students should work in groups to read the debates surrounding U.S. ratification of the Convention on Handout 2, and match arguments for and against ratification from Handout 3.

15. Regroup with students and review the debates and correct arguments, and then discuss the arguments with students:
   - Are these effective arguments for and against the United States’ ratification of the CRC? Why or why not?
   - Can you think of additional arguments?
   - Do you think the United States should ratify the CRC? Why or why not?

Additional Resources


Editor’s Note: These cases were decided just prior to printing of this issue of Insights. For information on the Court’s decision, please visit www.insightsmagazine.org.

In 1989, Joe Sullivan and two older accomplices robbed an elderly woman in Escambia County, Florida. Sullivan and one accomplice returned later that day and allegedly beat and raped the 72-year-old woman. Sullivan now faced trial in adult criminal court. After a one-day trial, a six-member jury convicted him and sentenced him to life in prison without the possibility of parole. He was 13 years old.

In 2003, Terrance Jamar Graham and two other individuals attempted to rob a restaurant. One of the other perpetrators hit the restaurant manager over the head with a steel bar. Prosecutors charged Graham as an adult with armed burglary with assault or battery and attempted armed robbery. He pled guilty to both crimes in December 2003. Pursuant to his guilty plea, he spent 12 months in a pretrial detention facility and was ordered to remain on probation for three years after his release.

Upon his release in June 2004, however, Graham was arrested after fleeing from police after participating in another robbery. His probation officer alleged that Graham had violated the terms of his probation from his 2003 conviction by possessing a firearm, committing a home invasion, and associating with persons engaged in criminal activity. The court revoked Graham’s probation and sentenced him to life imprisonment without the possibility of parole.

In two separate appeals heard on November 9, 2009, the U.S. Supreme Court heard the attorneys for Sullivan and Graham argue that just as the death penalty is unconstitutionally cruel and unusual punishment when applied to juveniles, so is life imprisonment without parole when applied to juveniles who commit any crime less serious than murder.

The Court is expected to decide this issue before the end of June, and it has numerous options.

- It could declare that a sentence of life without parole is unconstitutional for all juvenile defendants, just as it ruled regarding the death penalty.
- It could permit the harsh penalty of life without parole for only the most heinous offenses—murder—but ban it for all other crimes.
- It could uphold the sentence of life without parole in both cases before it.
- It could make a differentiation based on the juveniles’ different ages. In the past, the Supreme Court took this approach when considering the constitutionality of applying the death penalty to juveniles. In Thompson v. Oklahoma, (1988), it invalidated the death penalty for juveniles who were 15 and under, but then later, in Stanford v. Kentucky, (1989), upheld it for 16- and 17-year-olds. In 2005, however, the Court overruled Stanford when it decided in Roper v. Simmons that the death penalty may never be applied to anyone under the age of 18.

**SULLIVAN**

A question the Court will likely confront is whether Florida state law procedurally bars Sullivan’s claim. One of the questions Sullivan presented for the Court’s consideration in his appeal was: Given the extreme rarity of life imprisonment without parole being imposed on a 13-year-old child for a nonhomicide, and the unavailability of review in any other federal court, should this Court review the claim?

The state of Florida makes a two-fold argument. First, it argues that there was no new constitutional right created by Roper v. Sullivan regarding life imprisonment because Roper applies only to the death penalty.
Second, the state asserts that Sullivan, who is now in his early 30s, could have argued 18 years ago in his initial post-conviction proceeding that his life sentence without parole was cruel and unusual based on the Court’s reasoning in the death penalty case of Thompson v. Oklahoma. But he didn’t, and Florida contends that he shouldn’t be allowed to make that constitutional argument now.

For his part, Sullivan argues that Roper’s “constitutional logic” (that the death penalty can never be applied to juveniles) should be extended to a defendant who was only 13 when he committed his crime. To Sullivan, sentencing a 13-year-old to life in prison without the possibility of parole is just as bad as a death sentence.

Sullivan emphasizes how young adolescents are less mature and less responsible than not only adults but also older teenagers. “Not until age 16 do adolescents obtain something close to a mature sense of perspective,” Sullivan writes. “When Roper’s constitutional methodology is applied to the signature characteristics of young adolescents … a firm basis emerges for the finding that a child of 13 cannot legitimately be consigned to lifelong incarceration with no possibility of parole.”

Sullivan also emphasizes how “freakishly rare” it is to impose such a harsh sentence on 13- and 14-year-olds, and, this rarity is yet another sign that such a sentence is cruel and unusual. “Whatever may be the case for older children, life imprisonment without parole sentences for children of 13 are so vanishingly rare as to make their repudiation by contemporary American society unmistakable,” Sullivan writes. “There are only nine persons in the United States under life-without-parole sentences for offenses committed at age 13, and only 64 more serving life without parole for offenses at 14.”

**GRAHAM**

Unlike Sullivan, Graham does not focus on the age differentiation between younger and older juveniles, and for obvious reasons: he was an older juvenile. Instead, he focuses on the fact that his offense was less serious than a homicide and that juveniles are different from adults and should be treated differently by the criminal justice system. Graham emphasizes that “he is one of a handful of juveniles, in any state, who has been sentenced to life without parole for a non-homicide offense such as armed burglary.” He contends that the disproportionate nature of his harsh sentence can be seen by comparing the typically less harsh sentences given adult defendants who have been convicted of violent crimes or armed burglaries.

Florida responds that the “constitutional logic” of Roper does not extend beyond the death penalty into an area—in which different states have policies in place. In its view, further evidence that life without parole does not violate any “evolving standards of decency” is also provided by the many other states that also make that sentence available to juvenile defendants.

Florida emphasizes the violent nature of Sullivan’s crime—a “brutal rape of an elderly woman” and then cites a long line of U.S. Supreme Court decisions that refused to disturb state-court sentences of life without parole for defendants who weren’t even violent. And it cites the same cases in response to Graham’s arguments, noting that in one case the Court held that a life-without-parole sentence is constitutional for the mere possession of 672 grams of cocaine and in another that a life sentence was constitutional for the commission of three nonviolent theft-related offenses. Surely, Florida concluded, it is therefore constitutional to impose life without parole for Graham’s violent armed burglary.

Although none of the cases relied upon by the government involved 13- or 16-year-olds, but instead concerned adult offenders, Florida contends that a life sentence without parole is sometimes needed to protect society from certain violent, recidivist offenders—even those of a young age.
Significance

However the Court decides these cases, the justices’ reasoning will affect many people beyond Joe Sullivan and Terrance Jamar Graham. As Sullivan points out, juveniles who commit serious felonies at age 13 potentially are subject to life without the possibility of parole in 27 states. Further, 14-year-olds are susceptible to such a sentence in 41 states. The Court’s decision thus could have an immediate impact on juvenile defendants in those states.

These cases are also important because they come at a time when many states impose mandatory sentences for a wide variety of criminal defendants. The Court’s decisions in these cases could provide for meaningful proportionality review in noncapital Eighth Amendment cases.

Both cases also afford the Court an opportunity to discuss the relevance of international law when interpreting the U.S. Constitution. In the recent death penalty decisions of Roper and Atkins v. Virginia, (2002), the Court cited international treaties and human rights provisions that oppose the death penalty for juvenile defendants and mentally retarded inmates, respectively. Citing those foreign authorities certainly did not sit well with Justice Scalia, however, who wrote passionately about the issue in his dissents to both decisions.

Still, as Amnesty International explains: “Every other country in the world has rejected the practice of giving this sentence to offenders who were under 18 at the time they committed a crime. Although a few countries technically permit the sentence, no known persons are actually serving the sentence outside the United States.” ■

A Refugee’s Journey
continued from page 13

my teachers and friends at school were helpful and made my transition smoother than it would have been.

When did you return to South Sudan?
I returned to South Sudan in April 2007 and met my family for the first time since 1987, twenty years since I had departed. I met my mom, brother, his wife, their children, and my sisters and their children. A lot of celebration ensued and ten livestock (one cow, four sheep, five goats) were sacrificed. Nothing was the same [as before I had left]. My brother and sisters were older and had children, my mom was grey-haired, and now uses a cane to support herself when walking. Farms were claimed by grass, rivers are narrower, and some homes have been deserted. Fortunately, there are schools and dispensaries run by international agencies and government [officials] in the village. Some of my family are beneficiaries of these services.

How are you using your talents now to help people in your homeland?
At the family level, I am using my salary and other work benefits to support my family. At [the] community level, I act as the Democracy and Governance Project Specialist for Winrock International, implementing the USAID’s Sudan BRIDGE—Building Responsibility for Delivery of Government Services in Sudan—program. I am assisting in the building of the capacity of the state and local government in the areas of financial management, human resource management, planning and budgeting, and taxation administration.

In my village, I am working with my friends in the United States through the Panyijiar Community Development Services (PACODES) to build a library and provide education.

What are your dreams for your organization?
The main goal is to rebuild a devastated society through education. If we have education resources (facilities, books, teachers, and funds), we can build better schools and teach people new ways to cultivate [crops] and fish, maintain health and hygiene and sanitation, resolve conflicts, manage finances, pursue rights and justice from the government, protect culture, and incorporate foreign cultures into our own, all for the betterment of the generations of tomorrow. My organization would like to create a new global village where, through education, we can
Imagine you’re a young boy—maybe as young as three or four—separated from your family by civil war, traversing deserts and mountains with little food or water, no medical care, and no protection from wild animals. Imagine watching hundreds of your friends perish around you from hunger, disease, injury, and exhaustion. To most of us, it is unimaginable, but this was reality for “The Lost Boys of Sudan.” Approximately 150 Lost Boys currently reside in my community of Jacksonville, Florida. When they first arrived in the United States, most of the boys and girls needed instruction in basic daily tasks, and as one of their American mentors, I saw within them a tremendous desire for learning and for earning an education. While living in the refugee camps in Africa, the Lost Boys, many orphans, adopted the slogan “An education is my only mother and father.” They knew that an education would speak on their behalf when their parents no longer could. It was their primary objective when resettling in America.

In 2004, after watching them struggle working two jobs to pay tuition and living expenses and sleeping as little as two hours a night, I founded a 501(c)(3) volunteer foundation—Alliance for the Lost Boys of Sudan—to assist with their health and educational needs. To date, the Alliance has assisted more than 55 Jacksonville-area Sudanese with college tuition and books. Many have received their associate’s and bachelor’s degrees, while earning places on the Dean’s List, the President’s List, and the National Honor Society. One of our recent graduates, Simon Deng, returned to Sudan just two days after receiving his bachelor’s degree at the University of North Florida. He is now the Deputy Secretary of Secondary Exams for the Government of South Sudan. It’s so exciting to have played a small part in his success.

In Sudan, the Alliance partners with various organizations to provide humanitarian aid and financial assistance for numerous rebuilding efforts. For example, the Alliance recently provided funding for the construction of a modern X-ray and communications facility at the Lost Boys and Girls Memorial Hospital in Werkok, South Sudan, as well as for 30 beds for an orphanage in Yei and the construction (with a matching grant) of a house at the orphanage that will provide shelter for 10-12 children and their caregiver. The Alliance has also established and provided livestock for various women’s at-risk programs throughout South Sudan, along with donations toward the construction of a school, school supplies, life support kits, food, and medicine. One of the latest programs, “Go Green—Bring Light to Sudan,” provides solar flashlights to villagers via returning Lost Boys and Girls and aid workers. We’ve been extremely blessed by our supporters and are thrilled to be able to pass those blessings on to the people that the Alliance serves.

Following the signing of a comprehensive peace agreement between North and South Sudan in 2005, many Lost Boys are now returning to South Sudan in search of long lost family members and brides. Some have brought their mothers, wives, and siblings to live with them here in the United States, where they are hoping to start a new life, much brighter than the one they left behind. It is so exciting to see them reunited with their families after being separated for twenty years or more and to witness them achieve success beyond their wildest dreams.

Joan Hecht (joanhr@bellsouth.net) has worked as a volunteer on behalf of the lost boys and girls of Sudan since 2001. She is the founder of the Alliance for the Lost Boys of Sudan, the Chair of Education for the Lost Boys and Girls National Network, and the author of The Journey of the Lost Boys.
Students in Action
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education in Afghanistan, the legitimacy of the Karzai government, the merits of colonialism, and the benefits of NATO along the Afghanistan-Pakistan border.

“The response was absolutely great,” exclaims T.S. Allen, Southeast Territory governor and senior at Naples High School in Naples, Florida. “While the military officers in their Class-A uniforms were not just a little imposing, the speakers opened up on a range of military issues. The debates afterwards were highly productive, with major strategic ideas discussed with every turn of the arguments.”

JSA Abroad

The Junior Statesman Foundation hosts numerous summer programs to enhance young people’s understanding of the political system and government. This summer, however, they’re also taking their program abroad for the first time. The JSA Diplomat Program in Beijing will provide 20-25 graduates of any JSA summer program a 3-week educational opportunity in China.

Students will take a language course as well as a course in modern Chinese history and government since 1920. There will be presentations from experts in various fields, including industry, government and community service.

Students’ interest in global issues led to the decision to host an international program and the buzz around China as the “next big thing” made it a natural fit for JSA.

“We’re very excited for this opportunity,” remarks Elliott Nguyen, Director of International Programs, Junior Statesman Foundation. “There was a demand out there and an interest in giving students a world view. You can understand America better with a world perspective.”

Since many JSA activities center around students’ interests and experiences, organizers of the international program hope that students will return from China and share their experiences with their peers.

“In many ways they have the opportunity to bring a little bit of China back with them and give an unfiltered version of what China is like to their peers,” explains Nguyen. “They may have a heightened interest in international relations and how trade has a direct impact on American politics or have a better perspective on life here.”

The JSA summer programs, the Beijing Diplomat Program, national conventions, and local chapters provide young people with a platform to voice their thoughts on current issues and learn from their peers. In addition, these experiences build confidence and leadership skills for their future endeavors.

“Being in JSA has definitely defined my high school experience,” remarks Raudonis. “Anyone who is interested in the political process or engaging in our democracy really should get involved in JSA. It doesn’t matter what you want to do in the future; we can all gain from JSA.”

For more information on the Junior Statesman Foundation, visit www.jsa.org.

Talking with JSA Participants

“One of the great things about JSA is you meet people all around the country who are interested in discussing these topics, these complex political problems.” — Adam Raudonis, chapter president and senior at Westlake High School in Thousand Oaks, CA

“JSA has taught me to be a better leader and work with people. JSA showed me the importance of being an active citizen. It shaped my high school career.” — Liza Romanow, Pacific Northwest Governor and senior at Issaquah High School, Issaquah, WA

“JSA is the best way to learn leadership through practical experience.” — T.S. Allen, Southeast Territory governor and senior at Naples High School in Naples, FL.
EDUCATING THE PUBLIC ABOUT THE LAW

American Bar Association
Division for Public Education

The ABA Division for Public Education promotes public understanding of law and its role in society through the following programs and resources:

- **Insights on Law & Society**
  A magazine for teachers of civics, government, history, and law
  www.insightsmagazine.com

- **Law Day**
  May 1
  www.lawday.org

- **Focus on Law Studies**
  A biannual publication teaching law in liberal arts
  www.abanet.org/publiced/focus

- **The ABA Legal Guides Series**
  Consumer book series
  www.abanet.org/publiced/books.html

- **PREVIEW of United States Supreme Court Cases**
  A monthly synopsis providing expert, plain-language analysis of all cases given plenary review by the Supreme Court
  www.supremecourtpreview.org

- **Constitution Day**
  September 17
  www.abaconstitution.org

- **Law-Related Education Network**
  www.abanet.org/publiced/lre/lrenetwork.shtml

- **ABA Dialogue Series**
  Guides for leading discussions in the classroom and community on legal topics
  www.abanet.org/publiced/features/dialogues.html

- **National Online Youth Summit**
  National program encourages youth to understand current legal issues through an interactive, web-based approach
  www.abanet.org/publiced/noys

To learn more about these and other programs and resources, visit www.abanet.org/publiced.
Coming in the next issue of Insights

Law and the Common Good

*Insights* explores the ways in which the law intersects with parts of society, collectively known as “the common good.” Policies governing everything from health, education, welfare, and vice all stem from historic ideals that continue to change, and affect our everyday lives.