

## Robert Harvey

### Safety Begins at Home

Proud, Prepared, Protected.

—Nevada Department of Homeland Security motto

Quick, a place. With no way in, no way out, a safe place.

—Samuel Beckett, *The Unnamable*

**E**ver since its post-World War II rise to the status of superpower, the United States and its citizens have had a conflicted attitude toward safety. Those of us who grew up here in the 1950s and 1960s can undoubtedly still remember those junior high school hygiene classes in which we received training in health safety that seems quaintly bizarre today. With our examination gloves, goggles, and safety shutoffs, our warnings about microwavable pets and Styrofoam coffee cups between legs, we convince ourselves that we have made a safe place in this land of ours—safe, at least, from work-related accidents. With regard to enemies that may lurk within, we are still armed to the teeth with handguns and automatic rifles. Since we became a superpower during the cold war, we have practiced and perfected a combination of fastidious self-defense and reckless foreign policy.

*South Atlantic Quarterly* 107:2, Spring 2008

DOI 10.1215/00382876-2007-068 © 2008 Duke University Press

Such “precautions” notwithstanding, until 9/11 we apparently did not realize how unsafe a somewhat isolationist population—increasingly convinced it constitutes an exception among nations—really is. Though spontaneously recalled when the World Trade Center went up in flames, filled the pristine sky with smoke, then collapsed, Pearl Harbor suddenly paled by mental comparison. In 1941, Hawai’i had been a distant possession; whereas, in 2001, the WTC was the behemoth double spinal column of capitalism at the very heart of *Kapital*. Nevertheless, the tacit discursive program to assimilate the subsequent “war on terror” to the United States’ World War II is symptomatic of a temporal dystopia wherein the United States hallucinates that it was a victim of the ultimate weapon of mass destruction used, in reality thus far, uniquely by the United States itself. This discursive program is part collective psychosis, part policy of the federal administration. Its dynamics is situated at the safety-danger nexus, which results, inevitably, in historical blindness and misguided relations to the world outside.

### **Are We Safer?**

“Are we safe now?” This is what we Americans are relentlessly being told we want to know. Yet, is it really imperative that we regain at all cost some nebulous level of safety that we took for granted before we heard much about al-Qaeda or anything at all about Mohammed Atta? How many people in this country ask themselves these questions? We’ve actually already forgotten how vulnerable we suddenly felt—suddenly, collectively, vicariously, and for the first time—in 2001. But for the few who continue to ask the questions that many so easily forget, quick and easy answers-meant-to-soothe can be had by consulting the Web site of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (on whose name I shall soon comment). Before the House Committee on Homeland Security, back in May 2003, former DHS secretary Tom Ridge asserted, “Today, we are significantly safer than we were twenty months ago.”<sup>1</sup> Several years later, with the Taliban back at operating strength in Afghanistan and al-Qaeda flourishing in Iraq, where none of significance existed prior to 9/11, we might be moved to wonder what Ridge’s assurances meant. Or we might consider this declaration made by New York Mayor Michael Bloomberg at the Republican National Convention in 2004, also proudly displayed on DHS’s Web site: “New York is the safest big city in the nation, and there will be no letup in law enforcement

anywhere in this city.”<sup>2</sup> It is not necessary to be a New Yorker to understand that control of the murder rate and enforcement of traffic and parking codes have nothing to do with keeping a city or the nation in which it is situated safe from the desperate actions of groups and individuals from a world where anti-U.S. resentment is partially justified. From yet another angle, in case we were in any doubt as to an intrinsic and necessary link between national safety and that other conservative project, the preservation of the heteronormative nuclear family, here is former New York governor George Pataki in 2004: “I’ve had people, as I’ve been around the country, say, ‘Should I come here the week of the Convention?’ The answer is, unequivocally, yes. I will be here, my wife Libby will be here, our kids are going to be here as much as they can, consistent with their school schedules, because this is the safest large city in America, and next week, it will be as safe as any place in America can possibly be.”<sup>3</sup> Meanwhile, the former chairman of the House Homeland Security Committee, Congressman Peter King, a Republican from New York, overtly endorses racial profiling as a sensible safety measure in our troubled times.<sup>4</sup> “Are we safer today?” King asked in 2006 at my university.<sup>5</sup>

We must remind ourselves that the safety we are told we aspire to is doomed to fail as a project because it is always safety *from* something. There always must be an enemy to safety against which would-be guarantors of safety must struggle. We long to be safe from them—whatever they may be.

### What’s in a Name?

Unifying all the U.S. policing agencies might have been an otherwise acceptable or even advisable reorganization in most people’s view, yet we may ask why that meta-administration needed to be christened the Department of *Homeland Security*. To get right to the point: What has changed in *this* America so bent on being safe that it has moved to embrace a term fraught with fascist baggage?

Post-9/11 safety is a function of our conviction that terror and terrorism are by definition *extrinsic* to our world. Our world is our people, however diverse they may look. Increasingly we think of our people as speaking English only and with one generic accent. Terror comes from the outside other or the other who has not assimilated. In the hours before we learned about “homeboy” Timothy McVeigh, we assumed that the Murrah Federal

Building in Oklahoma City was blown up by Arabic-speaking brown others. Terror is alien and aliens out there and among us incarnate terror. *Terror is other and we naturally "other" terror*. A terrorized population must therefore seek stability, familiarity, and comfort, however infantile and futile those efforts may appear. A "war on terror" is no time for regime change at home. Only elsewhere. The powers that be must don their masks of stern decision, take on responsibilities of apocalyptic scale, separate the patriotic wheat from the terrorist chaff, and distinguish between Bushian Allies and Axis powers: "You're either with us or against us."<sup>6</sup> "We" shall "stay the course" and be the sole restorers and guarantors of consolation for a wounded nation. Patriots of the *mère-patrie* will swaddle us and inoculate us against foreign bodies.

No wonder, then, at this historical conjuncture turned evangelical that a name like "Homeland Security" was chosen to designate the magnificently grandiose and vast bureaucracy that now unites all national and international U.S. policing agencies. "Homeland Security": This notorious case of semantic perversion declares, to all who will open ears and listen, our collective regression, our having taken refuge, our retreat to hearth and home, to warmth of womb.

We may have referred for centuries to our national territory as the "land of the free, and the home of the brave," but we have never before in our history called it the "homeland." In and of itself, the term is rather innocuous, and if it didn't have a history of its own—a "certain" history—it might be altogether unobjectionable. However, it has apparently disconcerted few (including the few "progressives" and "radicals" left in the United States) that the only other notable uses of this term in world history appeared in Nazi Germany and in South Africa under apartheid. True, our sense of our "homeland" striving for security under the enlightened leadership of Michael Chertoff appears to most folks to have little to do with the racist foundations of Bantustans and the Reich's *Heimatland*. Yet the sudden centrality of the term *homeland* in the United States would appear indicative also of the politics of safety and security at all costs that has been adopted and universally accepted, for better or for worse, against the other.

The homeland that was Nazi Germany was an ever-spreading *inside* whose safety was to be ensured by purging it of perceived parasites, vermin, and disease. Similar dispositions and gestures have been making their way into official U.S. policy over the past six years in order to appease the zealots of safety that we have become. But just how pathological has our terrorized

madness become when we resort to the erection of barriers to keep brown others from their southern infiltration—barriers whose scale would rival China’s Great Wall. This is the brown other who supposedly would take my job, he who would make my kid a drug addict or surely, one day, slip in a dirty nuclear bomb, he who might have the audacity to speak only Spanish (or, worse, Arabic or Farsi). Little wonder that we simplistically adjudge as nasty but necessary the security barrier erected by that other nation run by safety demagogues to keep their nasty brown others out.<sup>7</sup>

Anyone who has traveled anywhere since 2001 by any means other than foot, bicycle, or Hummer is acutely aware of a panoply of devices and measures to secure the homeland. We have almost fully interiorized the gesture of removing our shoes and forgoing our liquids and gels at airport safety checks. Because we have become a people who seldom question authority, we adapt for the sake of homeland security. It is not that difficult to pack differently so that we shall all feel safe. Yet, in our unchallenged madness, as long as we put them with our checked baggage, unload, and lock them, we can still travel with our rifles, handguns, and ammunition.<sup>8</sup> The advent of a supposedly secure homeland has dramatically altered the face of the Transportation Security Administration’s personnel. No longer do we encounter all those friendly, bumbling, slightly incompetent, well-meaning agents casually inspecting hand luggage and waving us through the security gate. Now it is only surly Transportation Security Administration agents who appear to come from the same economically stressed origins as those who populate our all-“volunteer” armed forces treating everyone the same. For the sake of a safe “homeland,” we are all just *this far* from being denounced as enemy combatants. The USA PATRIOT Act, which became permanent law in March 2007, provides for the suspension of habeas corpus as well as the detention and “extraordinary rendition” of terrorist suspects, including U.S. citizens.

By consecrating the nation in which the fantasy of absolute security must be achieved with the word *homeland*, we have reaffirmed the historical myopia and collective amnesia from which we have been suffering ever since we emerged as a superpower. It is as if making security that of the “homeland” we were consecrating our having achieved the status of sole superpower. This is an achievement devoid of fulfillment, however. It is an apotheosis immediately threatened with undermining by forces absolutely at odds with our conception of “home.”

## A Nation in Denial

Hawai'i was integrated into our "homeland" on August 21, 1959. With Pearl Harbor, however, the U.S. collective conscious has never come to terms that are grounded in some reasonable grasp of historical reality, as it can and should now, finally, be constituted. That is why we have never recognized what the rest of the world did immediately, fourteen years before Hawai'i was told to get rid of that glottal stop and was folded into the homeland: *On August 6 and 9, 1945, state-sanctioned crimes of war (if not against humanity) were perpetrated at Hiroshima and Nagasaki by the United States of America.* Yes, of course, the United States was at war with an intransigent imperial Japan. But impressively demonstrative scenarios for atomic bomb drops *other* than the ones that wiped out some 200,000 unwarned nonmilitary Japanese people were scrapped: *they simply would not have terrorized the population enough.*<sup>9</sup> Hundreds of thousands of civilian lives were deemed expendable when they were those of others (others "othered" as a fanatic civilian population). Vice President Dick Cheney's infamous "We don't do body counts"<sup>10</sup> indicates that for the powers that be today, little has changed. I therefore contend that it is our refusal to recognize "Hiroshima" *specifically* as a crime against humanity that fuels our delusion that crimes against humanity like the "kamikaze" attacks that took place in New York on September 11, 2001 — attacks that we rightly, but endlessly and obsessively, call unspeakable — are only perpetrated against us. "Why do they hate us?" we whine, when deep down, somewhere, we know that it is because we occupy ourselves solely with *home* safety. Is Manhattan the ground zero to which the now-sanctified term *Ground Zero* will forever be anchored? The answer to this question bears the most egregious of semantic perversions in an age of terrorism rife with discursive subterfuge.

With Tom Ridge having passed the Homeland Security baton to Michael Chertoff and universal acceptance — in the form of oblivion — of the USA PATRIOT Act,<sup>11</sup> we have slowly made our way back to a bovine sense of safety.<sup>12</sup> We satiate ourselves by chewing our national cud. Yet we delude ourselves: we are as vulnerable and impermanent as the versatile rhetoric that will get George W. Bush's successor — from either party — through the next election and into the White House. We continue to be singularly unsafe in a world that is changing right *beyond* the tips of our upturned noses and in ways we refuse to imagine. Thanks to our psychosis, whose principal symptom is the semantic perversion that has taken hold in our

twenty-first century and of which even the election of some fresh new face cannot ensure a cure, we are victims-in-waiting, on the installment plan, *morts à crédit* as Céline put it in the title of his first novel. (And Céline knew something of psychosis translated into the political realm.) Many of the terms in this lexicon of self-deception are fed to us by the Bush-Cheney White House. But some of the key terms, behind which aspects of our ailment lurk, are of our own handiwork. If we have taken false comfort in accepting that our security is to be in the hands of a megabureaucracy whose name starts with *Homeland*, we, as a collectivity, seem solely responsible for having declared that it all began at “Ground Zero.”

The bombs that the United States dropped on Japan in 1945 were instruments of terror. The atomic bomb has been used by one state—the one state that first developed it in a secret project named “Manhattan”—for the exclusive and officially sanctioned purpose of terrorizing the population of an enemy state. This *repressed and disfigured fact* alone should suffice to explain the spontaneously sudden currency of the term *Ground Zero* to consecrate the site of an act of *alien* terrorism perpetrated *within* the expansive borders of the United States.

Yet the evidence of the connection between 9/11 Manhattan and August 1945 Hiroshima is compromised by the collective denial subtending the origins of the term. The magnitude of the lock securing this state of amnesia may be measured by the vigorous censorship of an exhibition planned in 1995 for the National Air and Space Museum on the Washington Mall. Unit 4: Ground Zero was to be the first honest and complete display of the Manhattan Project’s results, of the military and civilian options for use of the new weapon of mass destruction, and of its eventual use. The exhibit was abruptly cancelled when various pressure groups—notably U.S. veterans of the war in the Pacific—determined the White House to intervene. As a result, not only has the U.S. public yet to learn that a WMD detonated at 800 meters above *ground zero Hiroshima* at 7:58 a.m. on a weekday without warning was *not* the only way to use the new tool, but Martin Harwit, museum director, lost his job by presidential fiat in 1995.<sup>13</sup> Once again we find ourselves safe and sound . . . from ugly but ultimately healthy truths.

Just like the assimilation of 9/11 to the attack on Pearl Harbor or Bush’s identification of an “axis of evil,” *Ground Zero* is one of those terms from World War II that the present administration has exploited to the hilt in order to orient public opinion toward acceptance of holy vengeance. But with *Ground Zero*, they are playing with fire. For to have embraced this term

is to have avowed, finally if still unconsciously, that *Ground Zero* signifies the trauma of a people, a place where a terrorist crime against humanity was committed that no punishment can expiate. In pronouncing *Ground Zero*, we simply have not yet realized that what we are also affirming is that we tacitly recognize that we, the just and the true, did this to the Japanese people. A return of this repressed historical fact could be explosive and revolutionary for both ethics and politics in the United States. If I were working in the interest of the powers that be in Washington, I would advise them to redouble their efforts at extreme caution with this repressed truth.

### Home Safety

The USA PATRIOT Act notwithstanding, we are not yet compelled to think along the lines suggested to us by network television and the experience of perception through that filter. Witness, by imagining the speaker's authoritative voice, what television in "our homeland" has become:

January 2007. CNN. "The Most Trusted Name in News." The network's "Special Investigation Unit." The unit's spokeswoman: Christiane Amanpour, CNN's chief international correspondent. [Tough; husky voice; war-zone fatigues; the authority that U.S. citizens feel viscerally through that British accent.] The report: "The War Within."

We might have guessed that rampant paranoia would bring us to this: we are not even safe from *those who are already here*. It is one thing to take precautionary measures against an "axis" consisting of a few "rogue states" by means of "preemptive wars"; it is quite another to attempt to guard against incursions by saboteurs who may come from anywhere—even from within! Hence Guantánamo, the USA PATRIOT Act, the unbridling of executive power, and the concomitant emasculation of a willing Congress. The safe and "sweet land of liberty" to which we sang in grammar school is neither safe nor free. The very mandatory patriotism, which requires a certain mindlessness, that consists of coercing kids to pledge or sing to a nation (as if it were their mother) has anesthetized us to the point of accepting the USA PATRIOT Act as the rightful substitute of the old U.S. Constitution and shiny new "law" of the homeland. Carl Schmitt, the historian of law and legal philosopher, developed the concept of *exception* to describe in legal terms how political regimes driven solely by ideology give birth to

themselves. When *laws of exception*—such as the USA PATRIOT Act, which indeed was openly presented to Congress as a corpus of laws of exception—*permanently* replace the *rule of law*, even the individual liberty the U.S. Constitution was meant to protect is no longer safe from suspension. Executive power is then safe to resume its mask of magnanimity by accepting judicial oversight of eavesdropping when every telephone in the land of the free is already wiretapped. Laws that we blindly believe will guarantee our safety and security will do so at the cost of turning citizens into enemy combatants the day after the next Ground Zero.

It is far—tragically far—from ironic that early in 2006 Congress made laws of exception the rule. Over the past twenty years (perhaps beginning in the Reagan years and the collapse of the Soviet Union), a mentality of exceptionalism has increasingly taken hold in this country. Whereas French exceptionalism has become a quaint residue of bygone colonial power, our sense that we are exceptional is current, fully operational, and expanding. The arrogant exceptionalism of twenty-first-century U.S. citizens is fueled by our obsession with fastidious safety: safety from the swarming hordes of Latinos pressing to enter the lower body of our nation; safety from the French, whose former president, however right-wing, vehemently opposed the second invasion of Iraq; safety, especially, from our own weakly repressed memory of terroristic trauma inflicted on a people of others.

When it comes to relations between disparate human groups, to regulating their relative peacefulness or bellicosity, there is nothing new under the sun. Isolationism is a main ingredient in most recipes for war. Some nation somewhere is always ready to think that by closing its borders and holding a cross (or other fetish) up in the face of an axis of evil it will exorcize the threat of invasion. Focusing first and exclusively on home—*my* parking space for *my* Hummer in front of the convenience store—blinds me to the picture everywhere else.

So, are we safer? In 2001, only a few dozen people in the world had either the will or the way to carry out a suicide attack on the scale of the one that brought down the World Trade Center towers. Now, thanks to the egregious destabilization of the Middle East by the “coalition of the willing,” hundreds and probably thousands are literally dying to copy what Mohammed Atta’s motley crew carried out. While candidates to renew the White House dither and equivocate, chaos, hypocrisy, and despair are spreading irreversibly, inexorably for the foreseeable future. Meanwhile, Iran’s Mahmoud Ahmadinejad has convinced more than a few as to the legitimacy of his country’s

atomic aspirations: after all, even the cynics say, *our* great allies, the righteous Pakistan and Israel, have the bomb (unconfirmed, of course, in the second case cited).

### Peace Instead of Safety?

We are and will remain for the foreseeable future far, far from safe. But let us not end on such a dire note. Achieving the sense of well-being, peace, calm, and security that the word *safety* harbors may be approached in two diametrically opposed ways. One would involve and indeed *does* involve the conceptualization, elaboration, and deployment of safeguards; the other way would require “continuing education” in cultural difference, economic and social divergence among peoples, diplomatic conversation, and magnanimity. The verb forms I have chosen for contrasting the two should indicate which has prevailed at exorbitant expense and with paltry results. The position from which the United States has been attempting to achieve safety since 9/11 consists almost exclusively of defensive measures accepted unquestioningly by a population that lives in a political dystopia fueled by historical amnesia. We have retracted into a patriotic shell in which we can only see the world myopically. This attitude, massively favoring defensive tactics over offensive ones, aligns us with Bush’s moronic mantra, “You’re either with us or you’re against us.” But an alternative vision is always possible. It is a vision *of* and *with* the other—one that includes cultural difference in peace. Against myopia, specifically, I am tempted to call it *panoptism*, or maybe even *panoptimism*.

If I am right that the topos of a global terrorist threat, inaugurated at Ground Zero, has led in the direction of monumentally botched wars for regime change and lamentably misguided safety programs managed by Homeland Security, there remains a utopian vision for a way out. The measures to take in order for us to be cured of our myopia, acquire 20/20 *foresight*, and work *with* the world instead of against it from our fragile bubble all involve the armed forces.

The first step is to advocate for and implement a return to the draft. Why, progressives ask, are there no mass protests against the Iraq quagmire when it is clearly as much a failure without aim as the Vietnam War? The answer is that the armed forces have been “voluntary” since the 1970s, and therefore, only the sons and daughters of the most alienated, poor, disaffected, and therefore blindly compliant of our population make up those

same armed forces. The danger that more privileged sectors of our society might be drafted would precipitate the inevitable withdrawal from Iraq. Then, once a full withdrawal of U.S. armed forces in Iraq is completed and we apologize for having led Mesopotamia into wrack and ruin, we need to convert the quasi-totality of U.S. armed forces into a *weaponless force* whose mission would be strictly (for lack of a better term) humanitarian. John F. Kennedy was on the right track when he created the Peace Corps, except that the Peace Corps has always been an accessory to the U.S. Army. My idea is for the U.S. Army *to be* the Peace Corps. This would require a revolution in foreign policy transcending a conversion from aggression to negotiation, diplomacy, and compromise: it would require that “humanitarians” jettison their naïveté. Such a utopia would serve, finally, to reinforce the mission of the United Nations rather than antagonize it.

One *more* last word. I would like to pay tribute to citizens of the world too easily forgotten. *Safety first* is the last thing the defenders of liberty, equality, and justice take into consideration. If Anna Politkovskaya had had safety first and foremost on her mind, she would never have become the most prominent critic of political corruption in Russia and Vladimir Putin’s autocratic ways.<sup>14</sup> If Hrant Dink had had safety first and foremost on his mind, he would never have become the most prominent revisionist of Turkey’s official account of the Armenian Genocide.<sup>15</sup> May such boldly intelligent journalists spread their words and their ways in the United States, and may they be safe.

## Notes

- 1 Tom Ridge, “Statement of Department of Homeland Security Secretary Tom Ridge before the House Select Committee on Homeland Security,” U.S. Department of Homeland Security, May 20, 2003, [www.dhs.gov/xnews/testimony/testimony\\_0013.shtm](http://www.dhs.gov/xnews/testimony/testimony_0013.shtm).
- 2 Tom Ridge, George Pataki, and Michael Bloomberg, “Remarks by Secretary of Homeland Security Tom Ridge, Governor of New York George Pataki, and Mayor of New York City Michael Bloomberg at a Press Conference Regarding Security at the Republican National Convention,” U.S. Department of Homeland Security, August 25, 2004, [www.dhs.gov/xnews/releases/press\\_release\\_0499.shtm](http://www.dhs.gov/xnews/releases/press_release_0499.shtm).
- 3 Ibid.
- 4 J. Jioni Palmer, “King Endorses Racial Profiling,” *Newsday*, August 17, 2006.
- 5 Radeyah Hack and Jeff Licitra, “Congressman Peter King Talks, Students Protest,” *Stony Brook Independent*, October 11, 2006, [www.sbindependent.org/node/1267/](http://www.sbindependent.org/node/1267/).
- 6 “‘You are either with us or against us,’” CNN, November 6, 2001, <http://archives.cnn.com/2001/US/11/06/gen.attack.on.terror>.
- 7 I have written this allusion to Israel and its policy with regard to Palestinian Arabs and

Christians in such a way as to suggest the radical equivalency of both groups under the one term *Semite*. I have argued for this equivalency elsewhere, notably in *Témoins d'artifice* (*Witnessworks*) (Paris: L'Harmattan, 2003), as have others, in their own ways. Two further references for this way of thinking are Denis Guénoun, *Un Sémite* (Paris: Circe, 2003), and Gil Anidjar, *The Jew, The Arab: A History of the Enemy* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2003).

- 8 When a friend read this, she was incredulous. I urged her to read the TSA's page on "permitted and prohibited items": U.S. Transportation Security Administration, [www.tsa.gov/travelers/airtravel/prohibited/permitted-prohibited-items.shtm](http://www.tsa.gov/travelers/airtravel/prohibited/permitted-prohibited-items.shtm) (accessed June 15, 2007).
- 9 See, for example, Gene Ray, *Terror and the Sublime in Art and Critical Theory: From Auschwitz to Hiroshima to September 11* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), in particular chapter 3, "Ground Zero: Hiroshima Haunts '9/11," 51–60.
- 10 General Tommy Franks may have been the first to use the expression in response to questions about how many Iraqi civilians had died in the "coalition" bombing and subsequent invasion. Former secretary of defense Donald Rumsfeld, however, is most famous for using the expression. He first pronounced it publicly in an interview with Tony Snow on *Fox News Sunday*, November 2, 2003, [www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,101956,00.html](http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,101956,00.html).
- 11 It is worth remembering that *USA* in this acronym does not stand for the United States of America and that *PATRIOT* should be written in capital letters because not only does it complete the acronym, but also it stands as the fetish term for mandatory unanimity cowing our country's legislators into blindly passing these laws of exception. The acronym unpacked is Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism.
- 12 See Robert Harvey and Hélène Volat, *De l'exception à la règle: USA PATRIOT Act* (Paris: Lignes-Essais, 2006).
- 13 In addition to Ray, *Terror and the Sublime*, see also Martin Harwit, "Academic Freedom in 'The Last Act,'" *Journal of American History* 82.3 (December 1995): 1064–84.
- 14 Anna Stepanovna Politkovskaya (1958–2006) was a Russian journalist and political activist. In her criticism of Vladimir Putin's autocratic and authoritarian methods, she was perhaps most well known (and reviled) for her persistent opposition to Russia's policy in Chechnya. She was assassinated in the elevator of her apartment building.
- 15 Hrant Dink (1954–2007) was a Turkish journalist of Armenian ethnicity. He was founder and editor in chief of the bilingual newspaper *Agos*. He was a defender of minority rights and steadfastly struggled for the Turkish government to officially recognize the death of some several hundred thousand to more than a million Armenians between 1915 and 1917 as genocide. He was tried three times for "denigrating Turkishness." "Hrant Dink's Final Article," BBC, January 20, 2007, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/6283461.stm>. He was assassinated in broad daylight in a street in downtown Istanbul.