
Youth Truth



Official 'Zine of Americans for a Society Free from Age Restrictions www.asfar.org

Volume 2, Issue 1 January/February 2001

Why Children Die

Lisa Freeman

The past century in this country has been largely characterized by a concern with health and safety, with improving our quality of life and preventing death. We have been remarkably successful. The average life expectancy for Americans has risen about thirty years over the past 100 years, from about 47 in 1900 to about 77 today.¹ Much of our research continues to focus on eradication of diseases and greater protection for our citizens from danger and harm. We seem to feel that every death should be avoided at all costs.

When a very young person dies, however, we often feel a special sorrow and outrage when we ask "Why?" The mourning is especially great because of our sense of the deprivation of life's experience in the death of a youth. The deceased "never got the chance" to go on a date, or drive a car, or cash a paycheck, or cast a vote—in general, to experience the joy of freedom that adult life has to offer. Never mind that these restrictions were all imposed on the child by our laws and societal beliefs, and that the mourners probably never worried about this "deprivation" while the child was alive. We only seem to care that the child's life be preserved—that the child *survive*—long enough to reach the age at which we see fit to grant these rights and freedoms.

So, with regard to our youngest Americans, what causes the most fatalities? The *National Vital Statistics Reports*² of the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) divides causes of death into age groups of 1-4 years and 5-14 years of age, so let's look at people up to the age of 14. For this group, the number one cause of death is—and has been for many years—*accidents*. Accidents continue to be the leading cause of death for all of the CDC's age groupings up to age 44, and a major cause of death among people 45 and older as well.

What can we do about accidents? It seems we are already doing everything we can to keep children safe from accidents, often by depriving them of the opportunity to meet with accidents. In fact, since 1980, total death rates among children under 15 *have* steadily dropped, from about 54 to 48 deaths per 100,000

in this age group, largely due to the reduction of accidental death. For this rate to continue to fall, we must probably protect children even more. Perhaps they should never be allowed to ride in motor vehicles at all. Perhaps infants should never be held or carried, to avoid the risk of them being dropped. We could keep kids from swimming, bicycling, climbing, crossing streets. Some parents *do* use those strategies—to the point where many kids grow up lacking the skills or confidence to deal with everyday life. Although we often hear political figures state that "the death of even one child is one too many", at some point we must accept that some risk is unavoidable in a life that is in any way worthwhile and fulfilling, and that some accidents will simply happen.

The second most common cause of death listed by the CDC for people under 15 is "malignant neoplasms", or cancer. Cancer, too, is a leading cause of death among all age groups; here too, great progress has been made in reducing fatalities among all of its victims.

The third most common cause of death for Americans under 15 years of age is *homicide*. Unlike the previous two causes of death, the rate of homicide of 0-14 year olds has *not* decreased in the past twenty years, but has remained fairly steady. The threat of homicide is small for this age group, hovering around 2 deaths per 100,000 of this population each year. The risk, however, is greatest for those under 5 years of age.⁴

When we think of children being murdered, we generally imagine a kidnapping by a psychopathic stranger, or we may envision an innocent victim of a juvenile gang's drive-by revenge. But in fact, even when older minors up to age 17 are included among the victims (the years in which "acquaintance" homicides become more common), only about 25% of all underage homicide victims are killed by *other* minors, and only about 11% are killed by strangers. For homicide victims under 15, the killer is most often a *parent*; for victims up to age 5, when the identity of the killer is known, it is a parent in over 60% of the cases.⁵

continued on page 8

Peacefire Takes Aim at Censorware

Since the House and Senate passed corresponding versions of the Labor HHS Education Appropriations Bill (HR 4577) on Friday, with an amendment included to require the use of blocking software in schools and libraries that receive federal funding, it is likely to become law soon.

The American Library Association announced the passage of the House bill in the December 15 issue of the ALA Washington Office Newslines <<http://peacefire.org/censorware/alawon.12-15-2000.txt>>.

In response, Peacefire has released a bypass program—eponymously named “Peacefire”—which can disable all popular Windows blocking software (Cyber Patrol, SurfWatch, Net Nanny, CYBERSitter, X-Stop, Cyber Snoop, PureSight) with the click of a button. The program is available at <<http://www.peacefire.org/bypass/>>.

Bennett Haselton
<bennett@peacefire.org>

Correction

The title on the reprinted column by Wendy McElroy in volume 1, issue 6 of *Youth Truth* was incorrect; the column was actually entitled “New Whine in Old Battles”. Our apologies to Ms. McElroy.

To the Point of Absurdity

The age to be an elected official should disappear. After all, a younger person would have to put up a much harder fight to prove that he/she was qualified to do the job. I once said that the age for president should be eliminated and a teacher actually said, “No, we don’t need a 14 year old in office.” I guess she forgot that we *elect* our president and that dropping the age doesn’t mean that a young person automatically gets the job.

People say the same things about curfews: “We don’t need 13 year olds dealing drugs at 2 am” or “We don’t need teenagers running around causing trouble late at night.” I guess people forget that we *have* laws against dealing drugs and that the cops should just enforce those laws, instead of the one that makes it a crime to be the wrong age at the wrong time.

As for teens running around at night causing trouble, I also wouldn’t want *adults* running around causing trouble—or drinking and driving, which is a big problem for the 21-49 group, especially at night. Maybe we should propose curfews for *them* or make all the bars and liquor stores close early. Maybe we could change the times that *they* can be out or buy liquor, based on stats for their age. We could give everyone different color licenses.

Pedro P.

Hooray for Brooklyn

I was standing in line at the Brooklyn Public Library to apply for a library card. There was a woman and two small children (probably 3 or 4 years old) in line ahead of me.

When the woman’s turn came, she said she’d like a library card and she wanted to apply for a library card for each of the children as well. The clerk gave her an application, and told her to have the children each fill out an application as well.

“Oh, well, I’ll have to fill it out for them. They can’t fill out this application.”

“The rule is that if you can’t fill out an application by yourself, you can’t have your own card.”

Gee, that was simple. No reference to age. A reasonable test that measures skills relevant to the privilege to be granted. Why do most public institutions have so much trouble figuring it out.

Chris F.

Youth Truth (ISSN 1527-4489) is issued bimonthly, six issues per volume, by Americans for a Society Free from Age Restrictions. New volumes begin with the January issue of each year. The electronic edition is available at www.asfar.org/zine/ and is free of charge. Annual subscription rates for the print edition: Members \$2.00 per year; Nonmembers and Libraries \$10.00 per year. Printed copies of single issues are available at \$2.00 per issue. Checks should be made payable to ASFAR. Special rates may be negotiated.

Questions regarding the electronic version may be directed to <editor@asfar.org>. Questions about or requests for subscriptions to the print version may be directed to <swishnets@aol.com> or to *Youth Truth*, P.O. Box 11358, Chicago, Illinois 60611-0358.

Editorial and Publishing Staff

Editor in Chief: Justin Mallone <editor@asfar.org>
Electronic Edition Production: Justin Mallone <editor@asfar.org>
and David Schneider-Joseph <MachCU@aol.com>
Print Edition Production: Susan Wishnetsky <swishnets@aol.com>
Print Edition Design: Synimo Designs <synimo@aol.com>

ASFAR
P.O. Box 11358
Chicago, IL 60611-0358
e-mail: info@asfar.org
web site: www.asfar.org

Editorial correspondence may be addressed to <editor@asfar.org> or Justin Mallone, Editor, *Youth Truth*, P.O. Box 11358, Chicago, Illinois 60611-0358.

The Right to Choose

We might typically associate the above words with the abortion debate, but I use them in a different sense. I use them because I believe it's important to remember that there is a whole class of individuals to whom the most fundamental and basic rights and choices are denied, in the here and now, not some distant past.

Take the case of Clayton Giles, a fourteen-year old currently involved in a bitter dispute with his mother involving a tangled web of custody issues and nonsensical court rulings that have pushed Clayton to take action in the form of a hunger strike, hoping to "make the courts aware that kids are human, not property, and that we deserve to be heard at the same time as our parents."

The fact that one must go on a *hunger* strike to try and make the point that kids are human beings capable of making their own decisions seems typical of the absurdity surrounding the treatment of young people by the law today. In Clayton's case, for example, he is unable to leave the country on vacation, or even get a learner's permit without his mother's permission; (although after a long and arduous legal battle he is now able to live with his father, he is still required to get permission from his mother for many things).

Clayton resides in Canada, but the situation is much the same here in the United States. Indeed, Clayton should be thankful for his sympathetic father—I recall hearing about a case here in the States where a young person on a hunger strike had his rights violated by his parents, who had him force-fed intravenously. While one might sympathize with such parents (scared that their children might die of starvation), the fact remains that parents can only do this to their children because they are under that magic age of 18, and because children aren't recognized as much more than property. (Or maybe the better analogy would be that children are recognized as pets.

After all, there are limits and regulations regarding what you can do to your pets, and a certain minimum standard of care expected for pets by pet owners. But even pets are protected against physical abuse, something that cannot be said for children in many places within the U.S.)

The denial of basic respect for the rights of young people is further compounded by the absurdity that, being viewed—as they are—by the legal system as something below the status of human (or "person" or "citizen" or whatever you might want to call it, the particular word not really mattering because I've heard three different legal definitions of "citizen" alone!), that these enslaved young people don't even get the luxury of choosing their master when their parents get divorced. No, you see, these young people are "too immature" to make such decisions, too "ignorant" to take such matters into their own hands.

I suppose that it was in the same manner that the emancipated black people of the South were too "ignorant" to be able to vote, and thus the governments had to protect themselves by passing laws requiring special voting tests *exclusively* for black people, requiring them to deal with such absurdities as memorizing the whole Constitution of the United States (a document which I doubt a majority of the American population has read even ONCE). After all, those "emancipated" blacks had to be held to a higher standard for their own "protection" and the protection of local governments, just as youth seeking emancipation before the magic age of 18 today (only those 16 and above qualify mind you—so much for "liberty and justice for all"!)) have to be held to a higher standard for their own protection and the "protection" of local governments

President's Pen

Justin Mallone
President, ASFAR
<editor@asfar.org>

(who, one deduces, need protection from swarms of highly-interested and motivated young people seeking to participate in the affairs the adult world "before their time"). Thus, the mockery that is our youth "emancipation" (ha!) system is explained.

While the entrenched forces may at times seem too powerful to overcome, and the question "what can we do?" might at times seem to lack a sufficient answer—this is not one of those times! We should all do our part to encourage Clayton Giles in his effort to bring greater respect to the rights of the young. His email address is <claytongiles@home.com>. I'd also encourage you to visit his site at <www.legalkids.com>, which has a message board, guest-book, daily journal, and more items of interest (such as how to contact the court currently denying him his rights). And since it was his page that inspired the present article, it seems fitting to end it with a quote from this brave and eloquent young man regarding the lack of choice children have in divorce situations:

"The lawyers claim that all children are incapable of making rational decisions about where they should live after their family breaks up They could avoid the expensive applications and trials by letting us say what we want but then they would not make any money off our parents. But just because some kids can't explain why they want something, doesn't mean that they don't know what they want. We want to be heard."

— THERE IS A
WHOLE CLASS OF
INDIVIDUALS TO WHOM
THE MOST FUNDAMENTAL ...
CHOICES ARE DENIED, IN THE HERE
AND NOW, NOT IN SOME DISTANT PAST —

Perspective

Message from the New VP

A Strange Ally

Larissa Price
Vice-President, ASFAR
<larissa84@rocketmail.com>

I just thought I'd write something since I've recently been elected Vice President of this fine organization!

Some information about me: I've been a member of ASFAR since 1997 and I've served on the Board of Directors since the Fall of 1999. I affiliate myself with the Libertarian Party, but I have always believed strongly in keeping ASFAR a non-partisan organization. We are a group of liberals, conservatives, libertarians, and others. This is what makes us strong. We draw members from all different sectors, not just specializing in one.

I was drawn into being on the board of directors by my good friend, Justin Mallone; without him I probably wouldn't have taken the initiative to become more involved. So, of course, I definitely want to thank him here! Being a part of the youth rights movement has given me a chance to meet a lot of really interesting people. Most of them hopefully will become lifetime friends of mine.

I'm in it for the long-haul. My membership in ASFAR will not end when I turn 18 or when I'm 21. I've made the promise to myself to work for youth rights 'til the end of my days.

I hope that my leadership in ASFAR will prove to be effective and well respected by other members. I'm not in this to make enemies! My biggest concern is uniting youth rights organizations worldwide to create a stronger force against age-biased laws. We may have our disagreements, but our main focus is the same and we need to hang onto that in order to get anything done.

At 12:59 pm on January 11, freshman Rep. Tom Alciere (R-Nashua) of the New Hampshire state legislature resigned at the request of the state governor after ensuring that the bills he had proposed during his brief tenure would be sponsored by a fellow legislator, Rep. Gary Greenberg. The resignation came in response to local media coverage of several Usenet postings (self-described "rants") written before Rep. Alciere's election, principally a diatribe in response to incidents of police brutality in which he praised a black man in Virginia for shooting a cop who had been "harassing" him: "The gentleman resolved the confrontation by fighting like a man and defending himself. The Bill of Rights never got through the cop's head, but a .38 caliber bullet certainly did." Of course, as we all know, he is the first politician in U.S. history to make a rash decision at some point in his life, and his sponsorship (prior to his resignation) of certain highly radical and unpopular bills was mere coincidence.

continued on next page

Buzz

ASFAR Elects New Board of Directors

Following its annual general election concluded on November 27, 1999, ASFAR seated the following people as its new Officers and Board of Directors: Joshua L. Freeman, Director; Matthew Havens, Director; Justin Mallone, Director and President; Larissa Price, Director and Vice-President; David Schneider-Joseph, Director and Secretary; Oliver Traldi, Director; Susan Wishnetsky, Director and Treasurer. The new Board looks forward to an excellent year for progress in youth rights.

News Links

Try, Try Again

After their youth curfew law was declared unconstitutional, the towns of Shelbyville and Huntington Indiana are now trying a revised law with exceptions for children engaging in First Amendment activities. See comments at <<http://crime.about.com/news/issues/crime/library/blfiles/blsilly.htm>>.

Libraries Fight Filtering

An amendment to a federal appropriations bill passed in December 1999, which would require filtering in public schools and libraries, is being challenged in court by the American Library Association. A report on the planned lawsuit can be seen at <<http://www.zdnet.com/zdnn/stories/news/0,4586,2675701,00.html>>.

Giving Son Condoms Illegal

A Baraboo, Wisconsin mother who bought a condom for her 13-year-old son and his 15-year-old girlfriend has been charged with contributing to the delinquency of a minor after he confided in a police officer. The mother could face 15 years in prison and a fine of \$10,000. The story appears at <<http://www.jsonline.com/news/metro/jan01/condom15011401a.asp>>.

Report

Eli Naehner
ASFAR Member

The bills in question include several relevant to ASFAR. The following summaries were taken from Mr. Alciere's web page at www.TomAlciere.com.

LSR 306, relative to the custody of pregnant runaways. This bill addresses the cruel reality that "I'm keeping my baby, so Papa don't preach" can run face-to-face with parental pressure which all too often prevails, resulting in the baby being brutally killed in an abortion. LSR 306 will stop the government from interfering with people who would harbour the minor, should she leave her parents' home to escape such pressure ... The government would not track her down and force her back to her parents who want her baby killed. For pro-life people, this is a no-brainer. Pro-choice people must remember that the girl's choice is to keep her baby and not to live with abusive parents....

LSR 504, repealing the compulsory school attendance statute. Compelling children to attend school violates their constitutional right to the enjoyment of liberty, N.H. Const. Part 1 Article 2.

LSR 529, replacing public school with computer-based learning. Under this plan the State would provide students with computer systems and Internet connections, and allow them to download all the free educational materials from the Internet they want. The computers will be equipped for parental controls. Since the child and family select whatever educational materials they want, there is less chance for government-imposed bias. The State and the school districts would provide websites where they link to educational materials they approve, giving the student a starting point.

LSR 632. To repeal the drinking age restrictions. The government has absolutely no right to make thousands of innocent people second-class citizens, which the government chooses to do, purely out of malice. It's easy for the politicians to pick on people under 21, but it's also unjust and unconstitutional. Besides, the voters can no longer claim to be concerned about drunk driving, having elected a convicted drunk driver to be President of the United States.

LSR 658. To increase the fines and license revocation periods for drunk driving. Many politicians will oppose this change, because they are drunk drivers themselves. It's easier to pick on innocent people under 21, who are politically powerless ... This should put the MADD bigots on the spot: Will they devote their New Hampshire resources to promote the bill, or squander them fighting a bill to restore liberty to innocent people. We shall see.

Rep. Greenberg, who has agreed to sponsor these and other Alciere bills, stated that he did so "merely to facilitate his resignation" and that he will recommend the bills be killed without debate. Alciere had hoped for a roll-call vote on each bill, but eventually settled for the sponsorship alone.

Other bills sponsored by Rep. Alciere included legislation to end involuntary commitment in mental institutions, legalize drugs, and eliminate zoning restrictions. Despite these largely libertarian ideas, he is not a member of the Libertarian Party of New Hampshire, which refunded his dues and revoked his membership prior to his election. The local LP claims he violated that party's Statement of Principles, which prohibits the initiation of force to achieve social or political ends, and have recommended to the national party leadership that he be expelled.

The Nashua Board of Alderman may or may not hold a special election to fill the empty seat. Mr. Alciere refused to promise not to run in any such special election.

Senate President Arthur Klemm was quoted in *The Telegraph* as saying, "This means we can go back to focus on what we're here to do," echoing the sentiments of many of the legislators. Presumably this means preserving the status quo and insuring that no actual progress is achieved. Klemm mentioned such serious issues as "a two-year, \$200 million education funding shortfall, judicial reform, and a new state budget," said the *Telegraph*.

Mr. Alciere seemed mostly satisfied in the resignation message he posted on Usenet. "The proposals I am putting forth will stir up the hornets' nest again, which is what I wanted to do." And the post, like all of his posts, ended with his typically irreverent sigfile: "Over 90% of all crimes are committed by people wearing shoes. OUTLAW SHOES 8-)".

Since this writing, Tom Alciere has taken down his web site, removed his Usenet messages from the *Deja.com* archives and issued a retraction of his angry remarks on killing cops and domestic violence. He has also announced that he has no intention of pursuing further political posts, as he finds the media intrusion to be oppressive. The mainstream media has switched from portraying him as a dangerous hate-monger to painting him as a lonely and socially inept loser in desperate need of therapy, conveniently excluding itself from any responsibility to take him seriously. In other words, the threat to the status quo has been averted—score one for the establishment spin doctors.

Sue's Review

Susan Wishnetsky
Secretary, ASFAR
<swishnets@aol.com>

Written by seventeen different authors with expertise in psychology and law, nearly every chapter of *Youth on Trial* begins the same way: decrying the “tough on kids” policies of the past decade, primarily the parts which facilitate the trial of minors in the criminal courts, as adults.

The first chapter summarizes what can be concluded about the physical, intellectual, psychological and social development of children and adolescents and how they differ from adults. This summary is notable mainly because of its avoidance of firm, unqualified conclusions. The second chapter covers psychological disorders associated with delinquent or criminal behavior. This chapter notably avoids mentioning that the diagnoses are often based primarily upon the delinquent behavior itself, so that “kids in trouble” may be diagnosed with a mental illness largely *by virtue of* having gotten in trouble. For all the studies cited, the conclusions are few, but the remainder of the book generally proceeds with the assumption, despite the stated lack of evidence, that underage offenders are a different sort of creature from adult offenders, requiring special treatment.

The book is repetitious; the same cases and histories are explained in chapter after chapter; author after author cites the same studies and explores the same legal and philosophical issues surrounding the concept of maturity.

The book is intended for professional “youth workers”, and its use of jargon to classify a subset of human beings is frequently off-putting. Occasionally, it is just plain offensive, as when one author, noting the greater proportion of juvenile offenses which occur in groups, comments that “Adolescents are, for the most part, pack animals” (p. 27).

Some statements are clearly ill-conceived. One author asserts that if the role of the juvenile court and its dispositions may truly be regarded as rehabilitative and helpful, rather than punitive, then no safeguards are necessary to protect those who might be incapable of understanding their “offense” or their rights in the system; if the system is only there to serve their “best interests”, no protection from the system should be required (p. 275-276). But this is certainly not the currently accepted view regarding the adult mental health or residential nursing care systems, which also define their purpose as “treatment” or “assistance”, yet do require procedural safeguards to protect the rights of those they are “helping”, even when—and especially when—those individuals are incapable of adequately representing their own wishes.

But the citations are useful, and if one wades through, one can find plenty of quotations worthy of inclusion in a term paper or position paper. The “professionals” who co-wrote this volume are not *all* so far removed from the experience of youth that they interpret *everything* kids do and say as the result of “immaturity”. Several authors cautiously venture that it may be youths’ superior understanding of their own status in society and their own prior experiences with authority that cause them to take a different view than adults. For example, regarding studies which show that children—particularly those of minority races—tend to

News Links

Student Suspended for Origami Weapon

A twelve-year-old student in Newport, Virginia, received a 10-day suspension after his toy pistol, made from a sheet of yellow lined notebook paper, fell out of his backpack in class. The suspension was reduced to two days after his mother appealed to the principal. The full story appears at <<http://www.sierratimes.com/arnn110200.htm>>.

California Curfew Produces Backward Results

A “day curfew” instituted in October 1994 in Monrovia, California, designed to ensure minors’ school attendance and reduce juvenile crime, may have had exactly the opposite effect. In light of increased truancy and other non-curfew juvenile arrests since the curfew began, city officials are now reconsidering the measure. See the full report at <<http://www.cjcj.org/jpi/casestudy.html>>.

Editor's note: Content of reviewed books is not necessarily the opinion of ASFAR.

view a “right” as something one has been given *permission* to do (rather than an entitlement of law, not requiring permission), and defense attorneys as having authority over (rather than advocating for) their clients—perceived by some as an intellectual deficit which hampers them in their role as defendants in court—one author explains (p. 245):

Sadly, children’s understanding of their rights appears to be only further confused by their actual experience with the criminal justice system particularly in the juvenile justice system ... minors are likely to see rampant rights violations—counsel that is, at best, ineffective and, at worst, nonexistent; cases in which judges find against the accused on thin evidence presented in a procedurally inappropriate manner; and pleas induced by pressure from the judge. Even a minor old enough to grasp the concept of a right as an absolute and irrevocable entitlement may learn ... a very different, more contingent message about rights.

Regarding the causes of delinquent behavior, another author presents the following theory (p. 300-301):

... adolescents strive for elusive autonomy ... in a context in which most privileges of adult status are withheld youthful antisocial risk-taking acts are personal statements of independence by individuals who are not yet permitted to assume legitimate adult roles. Desistance in young adulthood is ... the adaptive response to changed contingencies as more legitimate adult roles become available. Delinquent behavior becomes costly rather than rewarding, as many young adults perceive that it threatens now available conventional opportunities and may foreclose future goals. In short, they come to realize that they have something to lose.

Grisso, Thomas and Schwartz, Robert G, eds.
Youth on Trial : A Developmental Perspective on Juvenile Justice. (John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation Series on Mental Health and Development.) Chicago : University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Some statements which seem to support full legal rights for youth are quickly retracted. After stating that “the biggest remaining difference” between the juvenile and adult court systems—the lack of jury trials for those tried as juveniles—may make the juvenile justice system less fair and more difficult to comprehend than the adult system, the author goes on to assure us that the juvenile court is still more “benign” (p. 252). Another author asks why “persons treated as nonadult for all other purposes are ... held to adult standards upon criminal conviction”, but goes on to present arguments in support of “staggered ages of majority” (for driving, voting, etc.), as well as “incrementally” increasing levels of presumed responsibility for one’s actions, rather than “making all transitions effective upon a single magic birthday” (p. 285-288).

Overall, *Youth on Trial* is a rather timid, vacillating book, consistent and forceful only in its outrage at the punitive policies of the current day. The authors would clearly like to see a return to the paternalistic policies upon which the institution of the juvenile court was created, but they fail to provide the clear evidence to demonstrate the superiority of these policies when dealing with kids in trouble.

News Links

British Schools Dispensing “Morning-After” Pills

To help reduce unwanted pregnancies among teenagers in England, school nurses may now dispense “morning-after” pills to public school students on demand—without parental consent or notification. The story, with comments from proponents and critics of the plan, can be found at <<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/et?ac=001851641145319&rtmo=kCeNb37p&atmo=99999999&pg=/et/01/1/8/npill08.html>>.

Pre-Teen a Successful CEO

Cyberteks, a Canadian firm specializing in “Macromedia Flash sound-and-animated graphics Web sites and electronic commerce,” founded and run by twelve-year-old Keith Peiris, claims annual revenues “in the six figures” and plans to go public in the next year or two. More information is at <<http://www.ottawacitizen.com/business/010104/5042896.html>>.

Why Children Die

continued from page 1

If we as a society approached the problem of children's death by homicide in the same way as we approach the other common causes of death, we might find that there *are* things we could do to address it. We might conclude that, while most parents love their children and do their best to provide for their physical, emotional and intellectual needs, there are some individuals who simply should not be permitted to be parents. We might decide that delegating the total responsibility of a young child to any one parent or couple, with no concern for their ability to care for a child (or for the possibility that they will murder the child!) means that, as a society, we are abandoning some of our young citizens to the whims of some very unstable individuals. And we might come to look upon parental rights in a different way.

Of the remaining common causes of death of young people (including congenital abnormalities, heart disease, and infections, among other illnesses), there is one other for which the rate has *not* decreased in the past twenty years, and that is *suicide*. For people younger than age 15, the rate of suicide has increased 113% since 1980.⁶ (For 15-19 year olds, the rate has increased slightly over the past twenty years, but has shown a dramatic increase of more than 300% over the rates reported in 1950.)⁷

Evidence suggests that the features of mental illness—primarily depression—which are commonly associated with adult suicides

are often not present in younger people who consider, attempt, or commit suicide.⁸ One possible explanation might be as follows: suicide is likely to be considered when one finds one's circumstances intolerable *and* one believes that:

- 1) one's circumstances are unlikely to change in the near future, and
- 2) one has no significant ability to change one's own circumstances.

These two beliefs *may* be caused by distortions in one's thinking (due to depression or another mental illness, or the use of drugs or alcohol), or they *could* be the result of a clear-headed and accurate assessment of one's situation. In the case of minors—especially younger minors—these two beliefs may often be quite rational conclusions. It may be that suicide by youth, rather than an always irrational act, is sometimes a quite understandable response to the inescapable position in which our society places them.

No one can predict how long any one person's life will be, and it is unreasonable to expect that deaths of young people will ever be completely eliminated. But we can try, to the extent possible, to ensure that all Americans have the opportunity to choose their own course, realize their dreams, and enjoy their lives, no matter how long their life span may be.

Sources

1. United States Department of Health and Human Services. *Healthy people 2010 : understanding and improving health*. 2nd ed. Washington, D.C. : GPO, 2000, p. 8.
2. United States Centers for Disease Control. *National vital statistics reports*. Vol. 47, no. 19 (June 30, 1999), p. 27.
3. United States Centers for Disease Control. *CDC fact book 2000/2001*. Washington, D.C. : GPO, 2000.
4. *Homicide deaths and rates per 100,000* <<http://www.cdc.gov/ncipc>>.
5. Snyder, Howard N. & Sickmund, Melissa. *Juvenile offenders and victims : 1999 national report*. Washington, D.C. : Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 1999, p. 16-18.
6. *Ibid*, p. 24; rates are per 100,000 within the age group.
7. *Youth suicide prevention programs : a resource guide* <<http://www.cdc.gov/ncipc/pub-res/youthsui.htm>> and *Suicide deaths and rates per 100,000* <<http://www.cdc.gov/ncipc>>; calculation of increase is based on comparison of rates given by these two sources.
8. *Report of the Secretary's Task Force on Youth Suicide* (description) <<http://www.cdc.gov/ncipc/pub-res/suireport.htm>>.

Please Please Please!! Don't discard this issue.
Instead, pass it along to someone else.

