

Look, I understand the word "child", regardless of an individual's frame of mind, is a catch-all-term for anyone who is a minor. Yes, you are right in this sense because in many cases, anyone under 18 is "legally" a "child", even if they are not biologically one. The problem lies within the perception of the public. There's no doubt that sex crimes are sensationalized by the media. Journalistic tabloids run amok with headlines that use loaded terms like "Sexual Predator" instead of sex offender or "CSAM" instead of "Child Pornography". But headlines and anecdotal reports don't necessarily represent the whole story. These terms are very incendiary and loaded for the sake of rousing reactions and emotionalism. What do you think the average person is thinking when they hear the term "child Sex trafficking"? They do not imagine a "15, 16, or even 17 year-old" offering money for sex. They are going to imagine this "Sound of Freedom -type of incident" and think of a small child 5,6,7 years being kidnapped and forced against their will (i.e. the fictitious pizzagate), rather than a willing post-puberty teenager offering money for sexual services. But "child sex trafficking" is going to appear on the ballot with a lack of context. Short political ads by 5-29 groups are to use terms to further "downbeat" their opponents. So basically, the maximization of these terms are going to incite fear into people who have done nothing but these little bits and pieces about "sex trafficking" from the press and those in the political arena. Sex crimes are easy to garner publicity and emotionalism simply from society's natural revulsion and disgust to what they perceive as "uncontrolled" sex. Anything to do with minors and sexuality is going to enrage people and make their heads explode. So, the problem here is that people are going to mindlessly vote on the ballot, without digging further into the context of those terms.

Sex crimes are portrayed shockingly and salaciously. Society loves them. I mean, what's getting more attention? A bank robbery or a sexual assault? The latter because sex is often seen as "personal" with society. You see it almost everyday and journalists are going to "pounce" on the next big story. From Harvey Weinstein, to the Nickelodeon scandal, to the now "P Diddy" story circulating at the moment, the train is stopping anytime soon. It's a business after all. Views and clicks are going to generate revenue. But do headlines by themselves accurately reflect the issue at hand? Let's dive further. Politicians, acting in the court of public opinion, often use the fear of crime and punishment to stoke their "tough-on-crime" or "good vs. evil" agendas. It is their way of getting votes. Everybody and their mother wants to be some "heroic" figure and the best way to solve "crime", including the ones that involve sex, is look them up and throw away the key, right? Afterall, nobody wants crime. Nobody wants to be a victim of crime. So opponents who often go against the narrative are labeled as "soft-on crime", a phrase that has undoubtedly haunted those in the political arena. So, you said "not letting people walk the streets" is the best way to solve the issue, right? Contrary to the extravagant claims made by politicians, crime rates (including violent crime) have gone down. Despite this, politicians often and lawmakers continue to "fight crimes" via mass incarceration. Ironic,

considering that the U.S. calls themselves "The land of the free", even though we have more people locked up than any other country, including China, India, and Russia.

<https://www.prisonpolicy.org/profiles/US.html>

Examples:

<https://bjs.ojp.gov/document/cv22.pdf>

<https://counciloncj.org/crime-trends-in-u-s-cities-mid-year-2024-update/>

Sex offenders, a very much loathed group of individuals, are actually a very broad category of people. When people think of sex offenders, their mind immediately thinks of rapists or child molesters. But that isn't always the case. It could be people who urinated in public to teenage relationships outside the Romeo and Clauses. They are all lumped together on the same registry, even if their crime involved no victims. Contrary to popular belief, sex offenders have some of the lowest rates of recidivism, even their crimes involved r*pe or child abuse. Stranger Danger is also a tired, old belief that anyone and everyone you don't know is a potentially dangerous individual. Aside from homicides (which can range from manslaughter, to accidental death, to murder) recidivate at lower rates. That makes sense since most people who kill are not serial killers and others are serving life sentences.

For example:

According to a Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) study, 3.5% of 9,691 male sex offenders released from prison in 1994 were reconvicted of another sex offense within three years:

Age group:

Percentage reconvicted

18–24	6.1%
25–29	5.5%
30–34	5.8%
35–39	6.1%
40–44	5.6%
45 or older	3.3%

"As criminologists Jeffrey Sandler, Naomi Freeman, and Kelly Socia wrote in 2008 in *Psychology, Public Policy and Law* (a peer-reviewed journal published by the American Psychological Association), several studies showed that public fears are fanned in part because of the media: The press "reported rapes almost 14 times more than their rate of incidence ... inspiring fear significantly more often than it does when reporting a homicide, robbery or assault."

Source: <https://washingtonspectator.org/koeppel-sex-crimes-and-criminal-justice/>

Further reading:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TCkFg7o733k>

(Frightening and High Myth debunked) - From the documentary "Untouchables"

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-watch/wp/2017/03/09/the-big-lie-about-sex-offenders/>

<https://www.nytimes.com/2017/09/12/opinion/when-junk-science-about-sex-offenders-infects-the-supreme-court.html?smid=pl-share>

<https://www.narsol.org/resources/s-o-myths/>

In 1998, a peer-reviewed meta-analysis by two Canadian correctional officers, Karl Hanson and Monique Bussiere of over 61 studies on sex offender recidivism concluded that the overall rate (of over 23,000 individuals) was around 13.4%. Though, different sub-reoffend at different rates, it is relatively low. This meta-analysis has appeared in the American Psychological Association's peer-reviewed, *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*.

Nevertheless, society's hatred goes beyond the rational data and the truth about sex offenders. Society is just full of these emotional animals who were never intellectually challenged and only feel this way because it makes us feel good.

Now, what about those long sentences? Surely, those keep at bay, right? Nope. Much like the prisons in the state of Arizona, are designed for-profit. It is a business and it has contributed to mass incarceration. From the debunked 1992 report "The Case for More Incarceration" by Bill Barr to California's Three Strike Laws, to the 1994 Crime Bill, the "lock 'em up and throw away the key" agenda is nothing more than a lazy, punitive solution to the so-called "problem." The reality is that the punitive criminal justice system isn't working. The policies directed at increased incarceration only serve society's vengeance and to make us "feel-good". It isn't reaching the "core" of the issue. It's literally private-prison lobbying disguised as the "protect the children" dogma.

Privatized prisons have to reach a certain occupational capacity, or else they can get fined by the state government. That is what happened to one of Arizona's prisons in the last

decade. Their job isn't to stop crime, but rather make money from people locked in cages. It has almost no effect on crime.

"Incarceration has been declining in effectiveness as a crime control tactic since before 1980. Since 2000, the effect on the crime rate of increasing incarceration, in other words, adding individuals to the prison population, has been essentially zero. Increased incarceration accounted for approximately 6 percent of the reduction in property crime in the 1990s (this could vary statistically from 0 to 12 percent), and accounted for less than 1 percent of the decline in property crime this century. Increased incarceration has had little effect on the drop in violent crime in the past 24 years. In fact, large states such as California, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, and Texas have all reduced their prison populations while crime has continued to fall."

- NYU School of Law, 2015

https://www.brennancenter.org/sites/default/files/analysis/Crime_rate_report_web.pdf

<https://www.nytimes.com/2011/05/19/us/19prisons.html>

<https://www.sentencingproject.org/reports/private-prisons-in-the-united-states/>

States are required to keep their private prisons full as much as possible.

<https://medium.com/@hrnews1/how-private-prisons-sued-the-state-of-arizona-for-not-having-enough-prisoners-9cff68de2581>

Moving forward, human trafficking is often synonymous with prostitution. Headlines claim that police "rescue" people, but by "rescue" I mean they are put behind bars given a criminal record, even if there is no pimp or john. Not only that but statistics are often bloated, exaggerated, and repeated by the pundits on major new networks. This video explains it further...

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eV6Ahz5GWQc>

Written sources:

<https://reason.com/2016/10/25/operation-cross-country-x-in-one-chart/?comments=true#comments>

<https://reason.com/2017/03/14/american-sex-police/?comments=true#comments>

<https://reason.com/2015/10/15/fbi-sponsors-operation-cross-country-ix/?comments=true#comments>

<https://reason.com/2017/10/18/fbi-operation-cross-country-xi/?comments=true#comments>

They do these stupid "To Catch a Predator" type of stings, which are borderline "entrapment". By borderline, they can have huge legal problems. There are no victims, just decoys, even though some have been charged with "attempted rape" even though there was no victim. Even human trafficking groups have criticized these operational stings. They are literally going after the low-hanging fruit. It's going to be some "pasty", lonely idiot who got caught because of some stupid catch-22. But whoop-de-day, they are automatically given the label of a "sexual predator" (no matter how considerate or lackluster their intentions are), because apparently we throw these monkey-shit terms to anyone in a conversation with someone below the age of consent. You literally don't know who these people are, yet we continue to make assumptions on them because of the "imaginary, exaggerated fear of the pedophile".

The federal government funds these human trafficking task forces, but since child sex trafficking is goddamn rare, they can't just sit around and do nothing. They have to make money and reach quotas. It is just some stupid publicity for the sake of boosting crime statistics.

"Lastly, stings like Net Nanny offer police an excellent opportunity to trumpet success in an area of criminal behavior that is notoriously difficult to crack. Critics, however, counter that the stings are more public relations stunt than successful policy. Martina Vandenberg, founder and president of the Human Trafficking Legal Center, said the stings are a waste of resources that "have not helped release one victim or child. My feeling is they should be doing real cases with real children."

<https://www.criminallegalnews.org/news/2021/jan/15/predator-or-patsy-long-sentences-those-caught-victimless-child-sex-stings/>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eV6Ahz5GWQc> (Just watch the video and you can see how stupid the "300,000" number is).

tl;dr: Human and child sex trafficking is nothing more than the modern satanic panic. The use of loaded, emotional terms as well as news coverage and claims for politicians distort public perception on crime. Crime rates have been going down for the last several decades, yet the fear and crime and 24/7 coverage by it is still strong. Many prisons, including the state of Arizona have prisons decided for profit and to keep inmates incarcerated for as long as possible (even if it has little-to-no-impact on crime), or else they would get sued or fined. Same with those "decoy" stings. State governments fund HT and CT task forces, so arrests and convictions quotes have to be met. But hey, plead guilty and you might as well get a lower sentence. They don't want people to challenge the law. Sex

crimes are committed by people known as the "victim", rarely ever by strangers. Recidivism for sex offenders is generally low. Lastly, "trafficking" and prostitution are used interchangeably. The people who downvoted back in July can go and eat shit. At least I cite my sources and can be willing to talk about this on a mature level, but yet, my thoughts are downvoted by people who were never intellectually challenged. Isn't that what this site was for? Discussion. This is literally the Spiral of Silence in action. We want to punish sex crimes so we can show "morally righteous" we are, not if even the punishment is rational or not.