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Preface

Over the past three years, Hunt Alternatives Fund has convened experts and commissioned research to inform its efforts to combat human trafficking for the purpose of sexual exploitation. This fact-finding has convinced the Fund of the need to proceed with greater urgency and to substantially increase the scope and scale of interventions. While pioneering work at national and local levels has produced significant accomplishments, the current pace of progress is unsatisfactory, with little evidence suggesting that the incidence or severity of sex trafficking is abating. A new and substantial infusion of resources is needed to support exemplary organizations and projects, to start initiatives that have been beyond the capacity of currently involved organizations, and to move more aggressively on multiple fronts to produce new momentum and accomplishments.

Hunt Alternatives Fund has pursued the feasibility of assembling substantial private investment to launch a large-scale National Campaign focusing on eradicating sexual slavery and other forms of illegal sexual exploitation. While potential donors have agreed in principal that such an effort is needed, they stress that a strategic plan is necessary to attract the capital required to launch and sustain a comprehensive set of initiatives with a national scope. To that end, Hunt Alternatives Fund launched a set of activities designed to produce a plan by the end of 2010. A National Planning Meeting was held May 8–10, 2010 in Cambridge, Massachusetts, convening key experts on human trafficking and prostitution, and a private research firm—Abt Associates Inc.—was commissioned to assemble briefing materials for the meeting. Abt Associates was also charged with conducting a landscape analysis and presenting a set of strategic frameworks that could be employed in a campaign.

This report represents a step in the development of a strategic plan for the National Campaign. The process of continually gathering input from the field and using this input to assist development, implementation, and refinement of programs and strategies will proceed throughout the development of the plan, and continue throughout the implementation of the National Campaign.

For this report, a team of Abt Associates researchers and collaborators assembled information from a wide range of sources. We reviewed hundreds of sources in the research and practice literature, agency and organization reports, and laws at the federal, state, and local levels. Much of this report’s content was supplied by those we interviewed who work in a variety of fields (e.g., criminal justice, public health, the military, business, journalists, and NGOs engaged in activism regarding sexual exploitation) to combat prostitution, human trafficking, and modern-day slavery. We received input on issues related to the proposed National Campaign from over 150 experts in law enforcement, modern-day slavery, violence against women, pornography, victim services, etc. Our project team conducted over 75 interviews with leaders and practitioners. Input was also gathered from more than 70 experts who attended the three-day National Planning Meeting. At the planning meeting, detailed notes were taken at all open discussions, workgroups, and breakout sessions, and further information was acquired through one-on-one discussions and interviews. While this project was ongoing we also delivered presentations about combating demand at two national conferences held by the U.S. Department of Justice (the National Conference on Human Trafficking, May 3–5, 2010; and the National Institute of Justice Research and Evaluation Conference, June 14–16, 2010) and attended the State Department release of the 2010 Trafficking in Persons Report. At these events, we held discussions another 15 people on issues directly related to the National Campaign.
Based on the information gathered, we provide the following for consideration by Hunt Alternatives Fund and the leadership responsible for the National Campaign:

- A review of programs and practices used to combat demand
- A review of federal laws and policies
- A review of state human trafficking and prostitution law
- A brief summary of principles of effectiveness derived from social marketing campaigns
- Guidance on how research can be used to support the National Campaign
- Guidance on building and maintaining coalitions
- Guidance on institutionalizing the National Campaign and establishing its leadership
- A set of principles and assumptions to guide the National Campaign
- A set of strategic frameworks
- A set of criteria for prioritizing lines of action within the strategic frameworks

This report is the foundation for developing a “game plan” for a National Campaign to combat demand for commercial sex. The goal of the National Campaign is nothing less than the elimination of commercial sexual exploitation. The Campaign endeavors to assist in producing a paradigm shift in the United States, eliminating the pockets of acceptance, tolerance, or indifference toward sexual exploitation that have both allowed it to thrive and allowed a lack of effective action and urgency by policy leaders to remain insufficiently challenged. The goals and objectives of the Campaign are highly ambitious, and unapologetically so. But they are also achievable, and the proposed effort is necessary and timely.

The report was commissioned to contribute to an ongoing process of gathering information on evidence-based practices, and to develop strategic options that could be pursued in a large-scale campaign. The immediate objective of the project is to provide information to be considered by Hunt Alternatives Fund as it develops the strategic plan. We assume the report will be circulated among those who participated in the National Planning Meeting, and those invited to attend who were unable to participate. Feedback from interested readers will be used to augment and refine the report as it evolves from a landscape analysis and presentation of strategic options toward a fully realized strategic plan. In the strategic plan development process, expected to extend into the fall or winter of 2010, the report will remain a “living document,” continually refined as additional information is acquired.

Not all the topics worthy of attention and consideration as priorities could be covered sufficiently in this report, but we expect information to continually accrue. Given that the campaign's scope is broad and comprehensive, the landscape assessment necessarily included examination of many topics. With finite time and great amounts of information to acquire and analyze, we could not write in detail about everything we learned, or everything worth writing about for consideration by Hunt Alternatives Fund and the National Campaign’s future leaders. We necessarily established priorities, and not everything could be covered at a consistent level of detail. For example, we examined research on prior social movements, and extracted lessons learned from past successes. The fingerprints of that analysis can be seen in our recommendations about strategic frameworks and tactics, but we did not include a chapter on social movements. Similarly, we gathered evidence on other issues such as survivor leadership, how to leverage male allies, business leadership, pornography, and developing curricula for training and education programs, but did not write extensively about them.
One of the basic principles behind our decisions about what to feature in the report on the landscape assessment was that we prioritized providing information that more difficult to acquire elsewhere. Thus, we focused on providing content related to the empirical case to be made for pursuing the tactics we recommend, and for establishing the strategic frameworks that we present. We provided detail about currently operational programs and practices throughout the United States, their strengths and weaknesses, and which ones are evidence-based versus unproven. That information is harder to come by elsewhere, so we featured it here. Others who are (or could be) involved with the formation of the nascent Campaign are better positioned to provide state-of-the-art analysis, so we did not focus our project resources on such topics. For example, many believe that pornography is a key driver of men’s demand for sex with prostituted or trafficked persons, and we expect that strategies for addressing the role of pornography will have a place in the campaign. We did not emphasize it in our recommendations for strategy or tactics, and we did not provide a detailed analysis. If the Campaign’s leaders want an analysis of how pornography contributes to sex trafficking and exploitation, there is access to leading experts, and a world-class task group could be readily assembled.

This report is primarily a description of what was learned through a series of information-gathering exercises. The vast majority of the facts and strategic options presented are from those presently engaged in working to combat demand, representing law enforcement, public health interests, human rights organizations, NGOs, etc. Few of the ideas or suggestions in this report emanate from the Abt Associates project team or Hunt Alternatives Fund. Many of those attending the National Planning Meeting had provided input into the development of the report prior to the meeting, and the meeting was designed to gather additional input.

This report is not the end of the landscape assessment and collection of ideas regarding strategies and tactics to be pursued by the Campaign. It is meant to be a beginning, although by saying that, we do not suggest that we are necessarily breaking new ground—obviously, people have been working for decades to combat sexual exploitation and have accumulated vast stores of knowledge. We have begun to assemble input from leaders in the field, and hope they will contribute in the future.

The report does not represent the authoritative voice on most of the issues addressed, with the exception of the national overview of programs and practices implemented throughout the United States. For example, we have begun an overview of state prostitution and human trafficking law, but to fully realize the potential for such an analysis, panels of expert legal scholars, prosecutors, judges, and police should be convened to identify strengths, gaps, and opportunities to improve law and its application. Such next steps are expected to be part of the overall planning process preceding the launch of law reform initiatives pursued as part of the National Campaign.

Finally, this report does not present final conclusions or positions taken by Hunt Alternatives Fund, and does not claim to represent the opinions or organizational positions of those we have interviewed—although we have tried to faithfully represent what we have learned from them. It is a collection of information and ideas gathered from extant reports, interviews, and other sources intended to support deliberations as the National Campaign evolves.

Acknowledgements

We are indebted to those we interviewed and those participating in the National Planning Meeting, including:
• David Abramowitz, Director of Policy and Government Relations, Humanity United
• Christopher Adams, Polaris Project, Director Of Operations
• Annjanette Alejano-Steele, Laboratory to Combat Human Trafficking, Research and Training Director
• Kayrita Anderson, Harold & Kayrita Anderson Family Foundation, CEO
• Hilary Axam, DOJ Civil Rights, Acting Director Human Trafficking Prosecution Unit
• Luis cdeBaca, Ambassador at Large, Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, U.S. Department of State
• Christina Bain, Program Administrator for the Initiative to Stop Human Trafficking, Carr Center for Human Rights Policy, Kennedy School, Harvard University
• Kevin Bales, Free the Slaves, President
• Julie Bindel, Journalist, Researcher and Feminist Campaigner
• Katherine Blakeslee, U.S. Agency for International Development Director, Office of Women in Development
• Rachel Boisselle, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Special Agent
• Theodore Bunch, A CALL TO MEN, Co-Director
• Cathy Boisvert, YWCA of Central Massachusetts Daybreak Coordinator of Special Projects
• Francine Braae, SAGE Project, Co-Executive Director
• John Chris Bray, Phoenix Police Department, Vice Enforcement Unit Sergeant
• Jimmie Briggs Jr., Man Up, Founder/Executive Director
• Elizabeth, Cafferty. Massachusetts General Hospital, Associate Director, Division of Global Health and Human Rights
• Brigitte Cazalis-Collins, Friends of Maiti Nepal, Executive Director
• Kristy Childs, Veronica’s Voice, Executive Director
• Katherine Chon, Polaris Project, President and Co-Founder
• Adam Cohen, NoPornNorthampton, Co-Founder
• Joseph Collins, Friends of Maiti Nepal
• Dawn Conway, LexisNexis, Sr. Vice President of Corporate Responsibility
• Janice Shaw Crouse, Ph.D., Concerned Women for America, Director and Senior Fellow at the Beverly LaHaye Institute
• Linda Daniels, Department of Defense, Program Manager, Trafficking in Persons Program
• Stephanie Davis, Georgia Women for a Change, Executive Director
• Gail Dines, Professor of Sociology and Women’s Studies, Wheelock College in Boston
• Rachel Durchslag, Chicago Alliance Against Sexual Exploitation, Executive Director
• Jesse Eaves, Children in Crisis
• Carol Edgar, Carol Edgar Communications, Media Consultant
• Gayle Embrey, Embrey Family Foundation, Executive Vice President
• Heather Faris, Air Change, Co-Executive Director
• Melissa Farley, Prostitution Research & Education, Director
• Amanda Finger, Laboratory to Combat Human Trafficking, Executive Director
• Ken Franzblau, Equality Now
• Eleanor Gaetan, Coalition Against Trafficking in Women, Senior Policy Advisor
• Donna Gavin, Boston Police Department, Family Justice Center, Human Trafficking Unit, Sergeant Detective
• Susan Goldfarb, Children’s Advocacy Center of Suffolk County, Executive Director
• Samir Goswami, Chicago Community Trust, 2010 Fellow
• Deena Graves, Traffick911, Executive Director
• Florence Graves, Brandeis University, Founding Director, Schuster Institute for Investigative Journalism
• Ruchira Gupta, Apne Aap Women Worldwide, Founder/President
• Marian Hatcher, Cook County Sheriff’s Office, Administrative Assistant to the Executive Director
• Kaethe Morris Hoffer, Chicago Alliance Against Sexual Exploitation, Legal Director
• Viveca Holst, Swedish Women’s Lobby
• Michael Horowitz, Hudson Institute
• Donna Hughes, University of Rhode Island, Professor and Eleanor M. and Oscar M. Carlson Endowed Chair; Co-Founder of Citizens Against Trafficking
• Kathryn Infanger, Marion County Prosecutor’s Office, Deputy Prosecutor
• Guy Jacobson, RedLight Children, Executive Director
• Cherie Jimenez, Kim’s Project, Coordinator
• Céline Justice, Peace is Loud, Program Director
• Jackson Katz, Anti-sexist male activist and Co-founder of the Mentors In Violence Prevention
• Nan Kennelly, Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, U.S. State Department, Deputy Director
• Amanda Kimball, Children at Risk, Director of Public Policy and Government Affairs
• Beth Klein, Esq., Klein-Frank P.C., Founder & Managing Shareholder; Fellow of the Colorado Bar Foundation
• Mark Lagon, Consultant on Corporate Social Responsibility and Human Trafficking (an independent consultancy); former Ambassador at Large to Combat Trafficking in Persons at U.S. State Department
• Carole Lombard, Sisters of St. Joseph Boston, Director of Justice and Peace
• Victor Malarek, Investigative Journalist
• Mohamed Mattar, Johns Hopkins University, Director of the Protection Project
• Katherine McCullough, A Future. Not A Past./Juvenile Justice Fund, Campaign Director
• Terrie McDermott, Cook County Sheriff’s Office, Executive Director
• Karen McLaughlin, International Organization for Victim Assistance, Director of Public Policy
• John Miller, former Ambassador at Large to Combat Trafficking in Persons, U.S. State Department
• Martin Monto, Professor of Sociology, Portland State University,
• Bradley Myles, Polaris Project, Executive Director and CEO
• Maria-Isabel Nieto, BAVARIA S.A., Director of Government Affairs
• Audrey Porter, My Life My Choice, Assistant Director
• Norma Ramos, Coalition Against Trafficking in Women, Executive Director
• Jendi Reiter, NoPornNorthampton, Co-Founder
• Deborah Richardson, Women’s Funding Network, Chief Program Officer
• Mary Robertson, Laboratory to Combat Human Trafficking, Research Assistant; University of Colorado at Boulder, graduate student of sociology
• Beth Schapiro, Beth Schapiro and Associates, Executive Director
• Jeff Sedgwick, Keswick Associates, President; former Assistant Attorney General, U.S. Department of Justice
• Jane Nady Sigmon, Ph.D., Senior Coordinator for International Programs in the U.S. State Department’s Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, Global Affairs
• Carol Smolenski, ECPAT-USA, Executive Director
• Melys Sperber, Vital Voices Global Partnership, Senior Program Officer for Human Rights
• Dorothy Stafford, Middle Georgia Alliance to End Regional Trafficking, Board of Directors
• Guðrún Jónsdóttir Stígamót, Counseling and Information Center on Sexual Violence, Spokesperson
• Karen Strauss, Polaris Project
• Lisa Thompson, The Salvation Army National Headquarters, Liaison for the Abolition of Sexual Trafficking
• Samantha Vardaman, Shared Hope International, Senior Director
• Steve Vienneau, FBI Boston, Agent
• Mary Rita Weschler, The Women’s Table, Sisters of St. Joseph of Boston, Director
• Linda Williams, University of Massachusetts Lowell, Professor
• Brian Willis, Global Health Promise, Director
• Alicia Foley Winn, The Boston Initiative to Advance Human Rights, Executive Director
• Thirteen police officers and sheriff’s deputies whose identities are withheld
• An additional 10 people who were interviewed but requested anonymity
• Relevant discussions were held with an additional 15 people during conferences and events convened by the U.S. Department of Justice and U.S. Department of State

The research discussed in this report was supported by a contract with Hunt Alternatives Fund. Also included in this report are research findings from Abt Associates’ evaluation of the First Offender Prostitution Program (grant #2005-DD-BX-0037 from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention and the National Institute of Justice), and portions of our ongoing national assessment of U.S. efforts to combat demand for commercial sex that have been approved for public release (grant #2008-IJ-CX-0010 from the National Institute of Justice). The chapter on research and development was initially developed by Abt Associates Inc. with the support of the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Assistance, Bureau of Justice Assistance, and was augmented and modified to focus on evaluating interventions designed to combat sexual exploitation. It was based on a project (McDonald, 2006) funded through the Department of Health and Human Services’ Program Support Center, contract number 282-98-0006, Task Order #37.

The findings and interpretations presented throughout the present report do not necessarily represent the opinions or positions of Hunt Alternatives Fund, the National Institute of Justice, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, or the Bureau of Justice Assistance. Any errors occurring in this report are solely the responsibility of Abt Associates Inc.

Overview of the Report

This report is divided into two major parts. Part I (Chapters 1 to 4) provides an overview of the planning processes to date, describes the principles and assumptions guiding the effort, and presents a strategic framework and a set of criteria that may be useful in prioritizing lines of action. We also present ideas regarding the Campaign’s structure and leadership, methods of managing large coalitions necessary for the Campaign, and how research and evaluation can be useful in a supporting role. Part II (Chapter 5 to 10) presents findings from several components of the landscape assessment, featuring reviews of current practice, policy, law, and research.
Part I.  Priorities, Principles, and Strategic Frameworks
“... it is not enough to look after some of the victims. We want human trafficking to end.”

Somaly Mam, survivor of sexual slavery, Co-Founder and President of AFESIP

Key Points:

- Hunt Alternatives Fund has committed to leading an effort to assemble a broad coalition and substantial resources devoted to launching and sustaining a National Campaign to combat sexual exploitation.

- This report represents one step in an ongoing process of gathering information and organizing a collaborative campaign. A steering committee with diverse representation will be appointed, and it is assumed that the steering committee and a Campaign leader and/or set of tasks leaders will make final decisions about the focus, scope, and timing of the Campaign. Thus, this report is advisory, and does not necessarily represent the views of the Campaign’s leadership, nor the direction the Campaign will take.

- The report provides foundational material from a landscape assessment of current practice, policy, and law, and proposes a set of principles, assumptions, and strategic frameworks to be considered as the National Campaign develops.

- Tentative working assumptions at present feature the Campaign addressing: (a) both sexual slavery and prostitution, since it is not possible to effectively separate the two when attacking the root cause—demand- and since both are illegal and harmful; (b) sexual exploitation of both children and adults; and (c) sexual exploitation in the United States. It is also assumed that the Campaign will cover a period of at least 10 years, and will seek to end sexual slavery and exploitation through focusing on demand for commercial sex.

- The landscape identified several acute needs that can be met by a well-led, properly targeted, and well-resourced National Campaign: support for education programs, law enforcement interventions, and social marketing campaigns. For these efforts to work properly and achieve results, they must have effective leadership, and make decisions guided by evidence, accountability, and a persistent focus on producing results.

- A good plan is a necessary condition for success, but not sufficient. It must be properly executed. To succeed, the right people must be selected and properly supported as leaders, a solid and diverse coalition formed and maintained, and the Campaign must proceed with a sense of urgency and clear purpose.

It would be difficult, if not impossible, to find a human rights and social justice issue more inherently compelling than slavery. While public and political ignorance remain obstacles, few people are unmoved and unsupportive of action once informed of the realities of modern-day slavery.

The realms of human rights, politics, and social policy abound with complicated issues, where society is faced with hard choices between competing sets of concerns and ambiguity about whether to act at all, and if so, how best to proceed. Many issues have two or more sides, with legitimate arguments for
and against them, such as immigration restriction, agricultural subsidies, drugs prohibition, capital punishment, and single-provider health care. Modern-day slavery is not such an issue. There is no “other side” of the argument. Those who enslave and exploit others are criminals, the egregiousness of their crimes is unquestioned, and they have no credible supporters. There is no question that the problem exists, and that we can and should do something about it. The only legitimate debates are strategic and tactical.

It is rare for an issue to be so clear, compelling, and free of credible opposition. Yet as of mid-2010, the size and shape of the problem are still not well understood, and there is no credible evidence that headway is being made in reducing its scope. It is unacceptable that more substantial progress has not been made, and it cannot be assumed that the current level of interest and opportunity to accomplish substantial change will remain for long.

It is undeniable that there have been many hard fought accomplishments. In the past decade, 45 states have passed human trafficking laws. The Trafficking Victims Protection Act (TVPA) was passed and has been reauthorized several times, expanded and strengthened in important ways. A new federal agency—the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons (hereafter, the TIP Office)—was established, devoted entirely to combating modern-day slavery. The TIP Office funds anti-trafficking efforts around the world and produces an annual report on global efforts to combat slavery. Other federal agencies—such as the Office of Refugee Resettlement within the Department of Health and Human Services, the Office for Victims of Crime, and the Bureau of Justice Assistance within the Department of Justice—have launched national programs designed to prosecute and punish traffickers, and to rescue and support survivors. Dozens of nonprofit organizations have been launched throughout the country, most of them designed to raise awareness and support survivors, and the media routinely covers news stories and produces dramatic pieces on trafficking.

There are also hundreds of devoted individuals who have made these gains possible. But it is also clear that the issue is not remotely where it must be, and that the pace of progress remains too slow. There is a possibility that we may now be at the crest of a wave of public attention and political opportunity that could pass by. It is imperative that before attention moves on to other issues—as it certainly will, sooner or later—that far more must be accomplished. Permanent changes must be made while the opportunity is here.

Our findings indicate that a solid foundation exists, in law and in a wide range of capable people and organizations eager to move forward. In addition, there is no reason to believe that significant accomplishments cannot be made within the first year or two of the Campaign, and with relatively modest resources. Our research team as well as key experts believe that most objectives of the critical early stages of the Campaign could be accomplished by a central staff of modest size, a steering committee, and up to four task group leaders (who should be compensated for their time on this effort), and expenses for targeted initiatives (e.g., convening experts, travel, pilot projects, the development of training and education curricula).

Longer-term projects to solidify and maintain progress may be more resource-intensive, but it is not true that all of the Campaign’s efforts must be on a very large scale in order to be effective. Many of the key objectives could be accomplished by a group of dedicated individuals, provided that they are the right people pursuing the right targets, and provided with sufficient support.
Project Background

For the past three years, Hunt Alternatives Fund has been engaged in a process of convening experts and commissioning research to inform efforts to combat the demand for commercial sex that drives both prostitution and sex trafficking. Last year, on the basis of input from numerous experts and advocates, the organization became convinced of the urgency to substantially increase its level of commitment to ending sexual exploitation. While there are numerous outstanding, pioneering efforts that have produced breakthroughs in law reform, public education, advocacy, research, and law enforcement, most would agree that we cannot be satisfied with the current pace of progress. Leaders in movements to end sexual exploitation agree that an infusion of new resources is needed to support exemplary organizations and projects, and to move more aggressively on multiple fronts to produce new momentum and accomplishments.

Committed to collaboration, Hunt Alternatives Fund convened a number of meetings with content experts in 2008–2010, and cemented its commitment to combating demand. These meetings made it clear that a much larger pool of resources was necessary to push the movement over “tipping points” and produce substantial change. The scope of the problem and the magnitude of the challenge are beyond the capacity of any single group or organization. To explore the potential for assembling a pool of resources from a coalition of private and corporate donors, a meeting was held in November 2009 with several substantial donors interested in combating sexual exploitation, particularly through anti-demand approaches. While the donors agreed in principal that a large-scale effort was needed, they also agreed that a strategic plan was necessary to attract the capital required to launch and sustain a comprehensive set of initiatives with a national scope.

The present document represents one step in the development of a strategic plan. The process of gathering input from the field and using this input to assist development, implementation, and refinement of abolition programs and strategies will continue during development of the plan and on an ongoing basis throughout the National Campaign.

Targeting Demand

Many people who have studied the problems of sexual slavery and prostitution, including practitioners who have worked in the field to assist survivors and prosecute traffickers, have independently concluded that mitigating or eliminating sexual exploitation requires attacking it at its source: consumer-level demand. Without the demand for commercial sex¹, there would be no market forces producing and sustaining the roles of pimps and traffickers as “distributors,” nor would there

---

¹ Key Definitions: By “commercial sex,” we refer to sexual contact exchanged for money or some other resource (such as housing or drugs). Throughout the report, when discuss commercial sex we are not referring to performing in strip clubs or the production of pornography (absent evidence of being compelled by a third party), nor to the general commerce in sex-related goods or services (such as adult book stores), unless otherwise specified. The primary concern is illegal forms of commercial sex, particularly prostitution and sex trafficking. The term “prostitution” is used when involving adults when no third-party force, fraud, or coercion is present, and “commercial sexual exploitation” and “sex trafficking” are used to refer to acts involving children, or when commercial sex is compelled by a third party using force, fraud, or coercion. These are the project team’s working definitions for the purposes of producing this report, and to guide their activity the National Campaign leaders may choose to define these terms differently.
be a force driving the production of a “supply” of people to be sexually exploited. *Supply and distribution are symptoms; demand is the cause.* (See Figure 1.1 for an illustration of a tri-partite economic model of commercial sex markets).

**Figure 1.1: Triad Model of Commercial Sex Markets**

![Triad Model of Commercial Sex Markets](source)

This is not to say that combating demand is more important than rescuing and supporting survivors, or targeting pimps and traffickers for arrest, prosecution, and punishment. Instead, the position of Hunt Alternatives Fund and this report (and many others, including many survivor-led organizations, government agencies, and leaders of the modern-day antislavery movement) is that a **balanced and comprehensive approach** is needed that addresses supply, distribution, and demand in illicit commercial sex markets. It is **not** the position of Hunt Alternatives Fund or the authors of this report that resources should shift from prosecuting pimps and traffickers or from supporting survivors in order to increase resources devoted to combating demand. **All need more support.** Instead, the contention is that there is presently an imbalance in the effort to attack these markets, with too little emphasis on demand. The National Campaign is intended to **add a new infusion of resources** to this neglected area, resulting in more balanced, comprehensive, and thus effective intervention.

Even the most optimistic cannot expect demand for commercial sex to be eliminated entirely, and so long as it exists, there will be a need for survivor services and investment in aggressive enforcement of sex traffickers. Both of those areas are so severely underserved that vast increase in resources would be needed even if there were success in shrinking markets for exploited sex. For example, there is such a tremendous gap between the need and available services for survivors that the size of commercial sex markets could be drastically decreased and survivor services vastly increased, and there would still be a gap in meeting service needs. Most credible estimates suggest a minimum of tens of thousands of persons who are illegally sexually exploited in the United States, and the number may be in the hundreds of thousands (e.g., Edwards, 2006; Estes and Weiner, 2001; Shared Hope...
Experts on survivor issues all agree that housing insecurity is a key driver of continued vulnerability to exploitation, and that residential programming is a key to ensuring safety and providing recovery support services to survivors. However we can find no source identifying more than 70 beds throughout the entire United States specifically for programs addressing the needs of survivors of sexual exploitation. Similarly, all evidence points to severe under-investment in efforts to attack distribution (the pimps and traffickers). Advocates for anti-demand initiatives argue for increasing the level of investment in survivor services and law enforcement capacity to attack distribution, in addition to increased attention to combating demand.

Assumptions about the Scope and Focus of the National Campaign

In our research for this project, we found a consensus from the field of practitioners and other experts that there is a need for a comprehensive initiative, nationwide in scope, designed to eradicate commercial sexual exploitation and sex trafficking in the United States. This is not to say that a new, central entity should supplant current efforts. Instead, a large campaign should include as its major component a new infusion of resources for extant “best practices.” In addition, new initiatives might be launched that have been beyond the capacity of extant organizations—such as sustained federal political advocacy programs or national public education campaigns.

Hunt Alternatives Fund has offered to help form and launch a National Campaign to combat demand. The specific objectives to be pursued and the organizational structure, participation, and resource levels of the Campaign have not yet been determined. These and other issues will be resolved in an ongoing collaborative process. Some tentative parameters for a National Campaign have been established as working assumptions. The Campaign would begin toward the end of 2010, last at least 10 years, and would be designed to:

1. **Provide a new infusion of resources** into the movement to eradicate sexual exploitation, particularly for activities focused on combating demand.

2. **Provide additional support for existing programs**, practices, and strategies that are effective or promising.

3. **Invigorate a national dialogue**, with the intent of shifting public opinion to where sexual exploitation is normatively condemned and opposed.

4. **Bring public pressure** to bear on lawmakers and policy leaders to inspire them to:
   a. **Prioritize eradication** of sexual exploitation, particularly through prevention efforts targeting demand.
   b. **Strengthen laws** against prostitution and sex trafficking, mandating more serious penalties and more treatment and educational programs for those who sexually exploit others.
   c. **Better enforce current criminal laws** by providing the support and incentives necessary for more frequent and effective investigation, prosecution, and application of appropriate sentencing and correctional interventions.
   d. **Appropriate funds** to pursue programs and practices authorized or mandated by current law, such as the End Demand provisions of the TVPA-2005.
e. **Provide support** and then **demand accountability** at the agency level for enforcing laws and implementing programs and policies.

5. Focus resources on **pragmatic, demonstrably effective, and sustainable** interventions.

6. **Discontinue investing in demonstrably ineffective** approaches.

7. **Focus on illegal sexual exploitation**, with the intention of eradicating demand for both prostitution and sexual slavery. No distinctions need be made between purchasing sex from persons compelled to provide it, and buying sex from persons without force, fraud, or coercion by a third party. While it is generally agreed that the most egregious crimes are sexual slavery and human trafficking, prostitution is also harmful and should be eliminated. Even if one were convinced that prostitution should not be targeted by the Campaign, it would not be possible to separate it from sex trafficking when focusing on combating demand: For prostitution involving adults, there are not separate markets for compelled and un-compelled providers of commercial sex. For commercial sex involving “providers” who are minors, there is no such thing as un-compelled commercial sex—it is all trafficking or sexual slavery.

8. **Be collaborative.** It is expected that a coalition will be formed to shape the National Campaign, and the coalition will determine the initiative’s basic assumptions, principles, and objectives. To be effective in its endeavors, it is crucial that the Campaign begin with clear goals and objectives, and a practical and transparent plan for their pursuit. It is also clear that the National Campaign’s ambitious goals can only be accomplished through collective action.

### The National Action Plan

The National Action Plan is a step in the development of the National Campaign. To attract the substantial financial resources and other support necessary to launch and sustain a National Campaign, a coherent and pragmatic plan is necessary. While there are many types of plans, the National Action Plan is expected to be a fully formed strategic plan, which will then inform a business plan. The present document is designed to help support a development process now in its early stages, by providing “raw data” about what is needed to combat sex trafficking, and to suggest a set of strategic frameworks for consideration by Hunt Alternatives Fund and the nascent National Campaign’s leadership. The Campaign’s leadership structure (including a director, task group leaders, a steering committee, possible involvement of Hunt Alternatives Fund board of directors or a new advisory board) is not yet in place, so we cannot say with certainty what the next steps will be, nor how the plan will look.

As working assumptions, we expect the National Action Plan to be designed to focus, calibrate, and launch the National Campaign. In addition, a good strategic plan will:

- Provide the initiative with a clearly articulated set of **goals, objectives, and strategic frameworks** that will help to successfully launch and guide the Campaign, and provide a framework for long-term sustainability and accountability.
- Serve as a tool to **attract investment**.
• Be developed collaboratively, if it is to launch and sustain a successful campaign built around collective action.

To be successful, we assume that the plan must be clearly articulated, grounded in evidence, and most importantly, focused on producing tangible results. It must also mobilize action on two levels:

• **Policy:** Including laws, appropriations of funds to support enforcement of laws and implementation of practices, and policies that encourage or mandate the mobilization and coordination of programs and practices.

• **Practice:** Programs and activities of agencies, organizations, and individuals that directly target demand.

The development of an empirical foundation for the plan has proceeded in two stages:

• **Landscape assessment:** Reviewing current law, programs, practices and policies, and seeking input from key individuals, organizations and agencies to (a) inventory what is currently in place; (b) identify gaps in programs, policies, and practice; and (d) determine what needs to be done to bridge or fill those gaps.

• **Developing a set of strategic options for the National Campaign:** The landscape assessment provides a foundation for developing several core plans of action to promote a comprehensive set of National Campaign policies, programs, and practices.

**Scope of the Landscape Assessment**

The substantive work underlying this report began in early April 2010 and was completed by the end of June, 2010. The information-gathering process pursued the following objectives:

• Develop an inventory of programs and practices for combating demand for commercial sex and sex trafficking, and key individuals and organizations that are, or could be, mobilized.

• Identify key challenges in implementation, sustainment, and improvement, and presenting solutions to those challenges.

• Examine and interpret the evidence regarding the effectiveness of each approach, and the actual or potential contribution of key stakeholders.

• For those approaches with adequate information, begin the process of prioritizing the approaches in terms of actual or potential return on investment
  - high probability of producing an impact
  - maximum cost effectiveness
  - minimum opportunity costs.

• Research ways to form and sustain coalitions, and ways of providing support to improve the cohesion and effectiveness of extant coalitions.

The landscape assessment included these main substantive components:
A review of anti-demand programs and practices in the United States. We compiled information approved by the Department of Justice for public release from our current project with the National Institute of Justice: the National Assessment of Efforts to Combat Sex Trafficking in the United States. We conducted additional phone interviews and collection of documents with individuals engaged in demand-reduction activity in 15 U.S. cities and counties. From this broad overview, we present summaries of innovative anti-demand efforts in four sites:

- **Cook County, Illinois.** This component of the project reviewed the history and current parameters of an ongoing, comprehensive campaign to attack demand in the greater Chicago area. The campaign includes a wide array of projects and approaches, including a curriculum for educating boys.

- **Atlanta, Georgia.** This component reviewed the history of a campaign that included a study of sex trafficking, and a high-profile, locally developed social marketing campaign. Illustrated here are the interactions of separate components of a campaign, and the formation of coalitions and partnerships to effect change.

- **San Francisco, California.** This component reviewed the history of a campaign that included founding one of the first anti-trafficking organizations in the United States, which in turn collaborated to found one of the first educational programs designed to combat demand. A formal impact evaluation of their “john school” program found the intervention to produce a substantial reduction in reoffending.

A review of federal law and policy. This component examined strengths and gaps in federal human trafficking law. Included is an assessment of what might be done to convince Congress to appropriate funds for substantial anti-demand initiatives already authorized under the TVPA-2005 and continued under the Wilberforce Act.

A review of state law and municipal ordinances. We reviewed statutes and ordinances specifically targeting, or applicable to, buyers of illegal commercial sex. We also reviewed relevant components of state human trafficking laws focusing on demand. These reviews focused on illustrating the range of current law, and identifying gaps and targets for efforts to strengthen law.

A brief review of social marketing/public education programs in public health and criminal justice. This component of the assessment examined what principles of effectiveness could be derived from evaluated campaigns in other fields, and what lessons might be transferable to a social marketing campaign targeting demand.

A brief examination of transferable lessons from past social movements/community activism. We briefly reviewed research and practice on social movements and identified models of coordinating and mobilizing community activism that could be applied to a new national campaign to combat the purchase of commercial sex. Social activism and organizing for social change are disciplines unto themselves, and the goal of our foray into this field was simply to begin the process of extracting some of the key lessons from past movements.

Input from survivor-led organizations. Input about what the priorities should be for a national campaign was gathered from several survivors of sexual exploitation and representatives of survivor-led organizations. We have also examined the importance of survivors for leading and collaborating on demand-focused initiatives.
Many other issues are imbedded in these broad components. For example, the motivations of men who buy sex and how those motivations develop—such as popular culture and pornography—were also examined. Again, there are entire sub-disciplines devoted to such topics and key experts should be involved to expand on the materials we have assembled so far as the process moves forward.

**Major Needs Identified in the Landscape Assessment**

The key findings of the landscape assessment\(^2\) are presented in Part II of this report, and many of the conclusions we reached are evident in the objectives and strategic frameworks proposed. To provide a foundation for the following discussions about objectives and strategic frameworks, the findings most critical for shaping the National Campaign are summarized as follows:

- There is sufficient support among practitioners, policymakers, and experts in the fields addressing sexual exploitation to **mobilize a broad network of collaborators** committed to a national campaign designed to combat demand.

- The primary **substantive needs** identified by those working in fields addressing sexual exploitation are:
  - **Education.** This was identified as a key need across many sectors of the population. There is a need for education initiatives designed to (a) directly impact actual and potential buyers of commercial sex, and (b) influence people who can be mobilized to combat sexual exploitation by implementing interventions for actual and potential buyers, including the general public, teachers, police, businesses, the military, public health professionals, and policymakers. **Curricula** are needed for programs reaching a variety of populations, **resources** are needed for training programs, and **access** to target populations must be acquired—especially access to school aged children, populations of men at risk of committing sexual exploitation, policymakers, and practitioners in professions combating sexual exploitation.
  - **Law enforcement.** In addition to educators, police are on the front lines in the fight against prostitution and sex trafficking, but most law enforcement agencies are under-resourced and/or do not prioritize sexual exploitation. There is a great need for information, peer support, and other resources police require for intervening with the buyers of commercial sex, as well as special programmatic interventions and

---

\(^2\) These observations represent an assembly and synthesis of ideas gathered in interviews and in our other information-gathering exercises. We do not cite the sources of all ideas, for a number of reasons: First, the level of divisiveness in the field makes it unwise to attribute some ideas to a particular source. Ideas that have merit may be discarded by some people due to their origins, and conversely, less worthy ideas may be given undue weight because they are proposed by allies. Second, some of these ideas spring from multiple sources or have been handed down, and we cannot determine where they truly originated. Third, we do not want to cause further dissent by misrepresenting any of these ideas, and having our mistakes cause problems for the person or organization cited as the source. We hope that it is sufficient for present purposes to acknowledge that this was a collective effort, and that all of the people and organizations we cite in the acknowledgements and references contributed. Abt Associates does not imply or claim that any of the ideas listed below are original or are our intellectual property. Whatever errors appear are claimed by the Abt Associates project team. Finally, we wish this effort to be driven by a focus on working together and pooling ideas and resources to produce results, and do not wish to foster an environment where people are unduly concerned with receiving individual accolades for their input. That said, we respect intellectual property rights and have properly cited published work and proprietary information, and we have no interest in claiming any unattributed ideas as our own.
collaborative community problem-solving approaches designed specifically to combat demand.

- **Public education and awareness.** One of the major impediments to productive action against sexual exploitation is the lack of political will to address the problem. This lack of political will is left unchallenged due to a lack of pressure from the general public, which collectively is either ignorant of, indifferent to, or outright supportive of commercial sex. To shift public opinion and generate political will, there is a need for the development of messages directly targeting actual and potential buyers of commercial sex, messages directed to the public, and to distinct segments of the population that can support and lead efforts to combat demand—such as lawmakers, agency supervisors, and practitioners from public health, criminal justice, social services, business, and education.

- To facilitate and support effective interventions, there are three clear needs:
  - **Leadership.** While we can name and celebrate the work of individuals who have accomplished great things at national and local levels, one cannot argue that the problem of sexual exploitation has been solved, or that victory is in sight. Effective leadership has led to the passage of human trafficking laws in most of the states, passage of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act and several reauthorizations, and local leaders have founded nonprofits and spurred police agencies into action. However, very little of this activity has addressed the root cause of sexual exploitation: for example, the demand-focused provisions of the TVPA 2005 reauthorization have been largely untouched, and only three of the 45 state human trafficking laws even mention the buyers of commercial sex or demand. In fact, nationwide, there are very few prosecutions of traffickers, few trafficking victims are offered or receive support, and few buyers of commercial sex are apprehended. Surveys find about one out of six men buy sex, and a substantial number of the general population believe that prostitution is a relatively harmless vice that should be decriminalized or legalized and regulated. Collectively, in spite of some victories and a gradual increase in awareness, there is far less tangible action than is necessary to get the job done, and just a few disparate pockets of intervention where there is evidence of effectiveness. It is clear that either current leaders need far more support than they currently have at their disposal, or that a new model of collective leadership needs to be established and provided with sufficient resources to support effective mobilization. The most important initial act of the Hunt Alternatives Fund is establishment of the National Campaign’s leadership structure, and institutionalization of the Campaign through creating a separate entity or expanding the capacity of an existing organization. A form of leadership that is invaluable and will be crucial for the Campaign is that provided by survivors of sexual exploitation.
  - **Research and development.** Whenever possible, it is preferable to have a solid empirical foundation to inform the development of new interventions, and to assess the performance of existing efforts. The key test of all the National Campaign’s efforts will be whether they produce results, and performance measurement systems and evaluations produce the most credible evidence. Research and development is an important support for action and accountability, and includes the gathering of new descriptive information about the range of the current practice and policy, performance monitoring of current and new demonstration interventions, evaluations of programs and practices, basic research on the causes and consequences of sexual exploitation, and disseminating research findings to benefit practice, policy, and effective interventions—including educational and social marketing efforts.
Money. While money is certainly not all that is needed, and in some instances is not the most critical need, one cannot avoid concluding that every sector (private, public) at all levels (federal, state, local; policy and practice) would benefit from additional fiscal resources. Most NGOs operate with limited resources, and the financial downturn of recent years has reduced their capacity and impaired their work. Similarly, government agencies have had budget cuts, curtailing enforcement of law and implementation of prevention programs. One of the frustrations we observed among law enforcement personnel was that many agencies and organizations have the knowledge, will, and awareness necessary to take action, but are prevented by resource limits from conducting the number or kinds of operations they believe are effective. For example, arresting buyers of commercial sex and educating those who are arrested are evidence-based practices (e.g., Poland et al., 2008; Shively et al., 2008; Weisburd et al., 2005). We know there are effective interventions (when properly executed), and hundreds of police departments across the country have identified the need for reverse stings, have the necessary skills to conduct them, and are convinced they are effective operations. Yet many police departments have severely cut or have eliminated the enforcement units that conduct reverse stings and other operations aimed at sexual exploitation.

We have tracked reverse stings for over three years, and have seen a sharp reduction in their numbers over the past year. Our interviews with police staff found that overall budget cuts have led to staff reductions across the board, and department leaders have had to rearrange priorities to stretch inadequate resources. Given that prostitution is classified as a misdemeanor crime or a civil ordinance violation, it is easy for police departments to justify de-prioritizing anti-prostitution efforts in order to focus on “more serious” crimes, that is, those classified as felonies. While most police personnel recognize that prostitution both attracts and generates the full array of felonies (kidnapping, rape, assault, drug abuse, robbery, weapons offenses, organized crime and gang activity, property crimes, and human trafficking), departments have to cut somewhere, and they choose to de-emphasize pursuit of misdemeanors when faced with staff reductions.

We are unsure whether direct grant-making is an option for the Campaign, but whether it is or not, there are other ways the Campaign can assist agencies and NGOs in finding or leveraging other resources. For example, the Campaign could offer technical assistance in grant writing, or referral to sources of such support. It could also provide assistance by gathering, packaging, and disseminating information about sexual exploitation and how best to combat it so that agencies and nonprofits can effectively advocate for prioritizing sexual exploitation, and devoting a larger share of extant resources to those efforts.

• Within the basic framework of education, law enforcement, and social marketing, a wide range of existing initiatives were identified that can serve as models for new or enhanced interventions to be supported by the National Campaign.

• The greatest consensus surrounded the National Campaign prioritizing the following:
  o Education and social marketing efforts aimed at preventing boys from growing into men who sexually exploit others, or to condone this behavior by others.
  o Research, education, and social marketing aimed at shifting social norms, from the current tolerance or support for commercial sex (“the oldest profession,” “victimless crime,” “sex work”) to seeing it as a serious crime and violation of human rights.
  o Education, and social marketing aimed at generating political will to establish effective laws and policies, and to commit the resources necessary to effectively combat demand for commercial sex.
A variety of initiatives directed toward **supporting practitioners** involved in education and law enforcement efforts to directly intervene with buyers of commercial sex. There are numerous tactics that can be supported by providing practitioners with training and technical assistance, generating peer networks and support through conferencing and web-based solutions, and micro-grant programs to support innovative or best practices.

**Leveraging existing resources and opportunities.** It would be a mistake to assume that little is already known and that new initiatives within the Campaign must start from scratch. The coalition should build upon a foundation of existing resources and opportunities whenever possible. For example, existing professional associations and programs with parallel interests could be prevailed upon to add combating demand for commercial sex to their current platforms, e.g., campus date rape training programs, corporate travel policies and human resource protocols, and military training programs could add messages about the harm of buying sex.

**Survivor leadership** has been critical in producing previous successes, such as law reform, inspiring police to focus on demand, and generating greater awareness of sexual exploitation in general—and the need to combat demand in particular—among policymakers and practitioners, the media, and the public. For the National Campaign, survivors will be very important in (a) developing the messages for, and perhaps being featured in, social marketing campaigns, (b) advocacy at all levels, including pressuring Congress for appropriations for the End Demand provisions of Wilberforce, (c) educating a broad range of people, and (d) facilitating local action. For example, survivor organizations have founded most of the “john schools” in the United States, and individual survivors have helped develop the curriculum and give presentations in the vast majority of john schools.

While Hunt Alternatives Fund and the National Campaign’s steering committee will make final determinations about what strategies to pursue, and what tactics and deployment of resources to prioritize in pursuing those strategies, we present our observations, findings, and recommendations derived from the landscape analysis.
Chapter 2. Strategic Frameworks for the National Campaign

“Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.”

13th Amendment to the United States Constitution

Key Points:

- This chapter provides recommendations for strategies and tactics that may be pursued by the National Campaign. The formation of a fully formed strategic plan and decisions to pursue specific strategies and to launch specific initiatives will be made by the Campaign’s leadership, which is not yet in place.

- Articulating the mission, values, core assumptions, and priorities will be the business of the National Campaign’s steering committee and other leaders, yet to be determined. What we present in this chapter is advisory, and intended to provide a foundation for their deliberation.

- The primary goal of the Campaign is prevention, to be achieved by a dramatic paradigm shift in how sexual slavery and exploitation is regarded and the intensity of efforts for its eradication. Social norms regarding sexual exploitation must be radically altered, away from the current widespread indifference or tolerance toward a default view that sexual exploitation is an affront to human dignity, a civil rights violation, and a serious crime.

- One of the core assumptions underlying the Campaign should be that the network of collaborators and the Campaign staff support a comprehensive approach to combating sexual slavery and exploitation. Given the current emphasis on supporting survivors and prosecuting traffickers, the Campaign will focus on underutilized strategies and tactics combating demand.

- Prevention can be pursued directly by reaching potential buyers of commercial sex, through education to change their base of information and produce better decision-making, and through deterrence achieved by the threat of criminal justice and extra-legal sanctions.

- Prevention can be pursued indirectly by institutionalizing change: implementing sound laws and policies, and providing education, training, and other resources to those mobilizing to combat sexual exploitation.
The **strategic framework** for action has three main components:

- **Education**, directed primarily towards actual and potential buyers of commercial sex, but also including educating those who can take action to combat exploitation, such as law enforcement, public health, social service, and community groups.

- **Enforcement**, ensuring that prostitution and human trafficking laws (as well as civil ordinances, conduct policies, and regulatory requirements) are enforced, and also serving as a key partner in collaborative problem-solving efforts such as assisting in public education and awareness efforts, shaming offenders, and contributing to john school programs.

- **Social Marketing**, conveying effective messages to the broad public and to targeted audiences, to help knit together other components of the Campaign intended to change social norms, and to garner support among policymakers and practitioners.

The structure for **supporting** those strategic elements has two main components:

- **Establishing leadership** and institutionalizing the National Campaign, involving formation of a steering committee and task groups, and establishing a permanent physical and virtual home for the Campaign by forming a new entity or enhancing an existing organization’s capacity. This is the most important element of the Campaign, because it will shape all the other elements and determine whether its initiatives will be designed and executed properly.

- **Research and development**, featuring gathering solid empirical information about the nature of the problem, monitoring the implementation and efficacy of various interventions, and tailoring information for effective communication to targeted audiences, such as the public, the media, policymakers, practitioners, and the ultimate targets: men who do or might buy sex.

- Within that framework, there are many options for pursuing specific **programs** and lines of **action**.

- To select and prioritize actions to be pursued by the National Campaign, we present a set of **criteria** that can be applied when weighing the possibilities.

- As an illustration, we apply the criteria and present a set of **initiatives that could be prioritized** for pursuit by the Campaign.

- Evidence supports focusing the Campaign on (a) combating **demand** for commercial sex, (b) addressing trafficking of both **adults** and **children**, (c) combating the trafficking of anyone, regardless of gender, race, or any other **individual traits**, and (d) targeting both **prostitution** and **sexual slavery**.

- **Framing** will be important in communicating about the Campaign’s mission, activities, and accomplishments. We discuss several key topics related to framing the issues addressed that should be addressed as the Campaign (a) establishes its leadership structure and institutional framework; (b) establishes its goals, objectives, and strategies; (c) communicates about its mission and activities, and (d) seeks support for the Campaign itself and for the various initiatives it seeks to launch or assist.

- A sense of **urgency** must drive the Campaign, particularly in its early stages. Public interest and political opportunity may be at or near their peak. A public and political **paradigm shift** must take place, and effective laws, practices, and systems permanently **institutionalized** before the spotlight moves on to other topics, as it always does.
Strategic Planning

Strategic planning is a large field unto itself, and there are many “off the shelf” systems and resources that the National Campaign’s leaders can choose to use in developing its plan. As we stated earlier, this report is not a strategic plan, but is a foundation of information and analysis useful in a plan’s development. Since there are many different strategic planning systems, and we cannot know the system preferences of the Campaign’s leaders since they are not in place, it would be inefficient and perhaps misleading to adhere closely to any specific strategic planning process. To help move the strategic plan forward, we present our information, analysis, and recommendations using generic strategic planning concepts.

In general terms, strategic planning is the formal and systematic consideration of an organization’s future course. It is a process of defining a general direction or line(s) of action (i.e., strategy or strategies), and a general guide for making decisions regarding allocating resources to pursue this strategy. Strategic plans generally address a few key questions, applicable across topics and types of activity: What does the organization intend to accomplish (goals and objectives), what should be done to achieve those goals (tactics, activities, initiatives, programs), and within what timeframe will these activities occur (schedule, timeline, performance period)? Also to be considered is how success will be measured (issues of accountability, performance measurement, and evaluation).

Strategic plans generally include the following sections, at a minimum:

- a mission statement
- an outline of goals, objectives, and activities
- an assessment of current resources
- a strategic analysis

In this chapter, we present discussions of the first two of these elements. In the landscape analysis presented in Part II of the report, we describe current resources and present empirical evidence useful in assessing the potential feasibility and efficacy of various strategies and tactics.

Vision and Mission

Strategic plans typically begin with mission and vision statements, and the organization’s or initiative’s key goals and objectives. It would be premature at this point to posit mission and vision statements for the Campaign. That will be a task for Hunt Alternatives Fund and the National Campaign steering committee, with input from task leaders and coalition members. For now, we present statements from the demand abolition program within Hunt Alternatives Fund, to serve as a starting point and a placeholder. We also present discussions of several issues for the National Campaign’s leaders to consider as they engage in the process of defining the Campaign’s parameters, priorities, principles and assumptions, values, goals, and objectives.
The following statements are from the website of Hunt Alternatives Fund—Demand Abolition. When reviewing them, please be reminded that they refer to the Demand Abolition program generally, and do not represent the mission statement or goals for the National Campaign.

“Demand Abolition” supports the movement to end modern-day slavery by combating the demand for sex trafficking and commercial sex in the U.S. By convening key stakeholders, conducting and disseminating research, and educating policymakers, Demand Abolition catalyzes systemic social change to reflect the dignity of all people.

“Individuals who assume the right to purchase another human being fuel the market that traffickers and pimps supply with victims. The sex trade is inherently dangerous to victims, degrading to perpetrators, and harmful to society. Until demand for commercial sex is eliminated, the sexual enslavement of children, women, and sometimes men will continue.”

“Our goals are to:

1. Convene and galvanize the modern abolitionist community and key allies to develop and implement a multi-year, multi-stakeholder National Campaign to eliminate the demand for commercial sex in the US;
2. Conduct research and disseminate information on demand-reduction best practices at the local, national, and international levels; and
3. Advocate to ensure the implementation of laws, policies, and programs that curb demand for sex trafficking”

The Focus on Demand

“The sex industry operates by standard supply and demand dynamics. Those who buy sex (usually men) fuel the demand that criminals supply with victims (mostly women and girls). The commercial sex trade drives both the international and domestic sex trafficking markets, including those within the United States. Although most nations lack legislation, political will, or capacity to implement laws against pimping and trafficking, a growing number of countries and cities worldwide have designed policies and programs to curb demand. It is more likely that we can curb the demand for commercial sex before we solve the social power inequities that allow the supply.”

The National Campaign to End Demand

“With a strong and committed group of partners, Demand Abolition is launching a multi-year, multi-stakeholder campaign to eradicate demand for commercial sexual exploitation in the United States and to cultivate a culture that does not tolerate the buying and selling of bodies. This collaborative effort will bring together practitioners, law enforcement personnel, survivors, academics, corporate leaders, and policymakers to begin a national dialogue on demand and to identify and implement pragmatic, evidence-based, sustainable demand-reduction interventions.”

http://www.huntalternatives.org/pages/7902_demand_abolition.cfm
Core Principles and Assumptions

A set of core premises should be established and agreed upon by the Campaign’s leaders and coalition members. Again, we stress that establishing a vision, mission, values, principles, and a set of core objectives will be the business of the coalition, and that those discussed here may not be the ones pursued by the Campaign. For the purpose of advancing the planning process, we present the following set of principles and assumptions for discussion:

- **Effectiveness:** If there is one word to guide the Campaign, it should be “results.” Every decision and every action must move the Campaign towards its objective of eliminating sexual exploitation by eliminating demand. The words and deeds of the leaders and collaborators in the coalition should be measured against the results they produce and their return on investment.

- **Effective and Principled Leadership:** While perhaps it should go without saying that the Campaign’s leaders should be principled and effective, it might be useful to state this is a central tenet of the Campaign. The Campaign’s leaders will seek to build and maintain effective coalitions, facilitating action, and find resources to support promising and effective interventions. The Campaign will be collaborative, and the Campaign’s leaders should not attempt to own or run the movement to combat slavery in America.

- **Collaborative Learning:** The coalition should consider following the principles of a collaborative learning model—accessing and fostering networks of experts and practitioners, generating and accumulating knowledge from the field, collectively vetting new information and identifying evidence-based practices, and making practical guidance and resources readily accessible to others. The home base of the National Campaign would be seen as the hub of the coalition’s network, focused on (a) building, sustaining, and growing a coalition; (b) helping to set a course for coalition activity, and bringing resources to coalition members to support their participation in those activities; (c) distributing support to where it is needed, investing resources in established successes and in existing models and demonstration programs; (d) recognizing the vast range and depth of experience and expertise distributed throughout the nation, and drawing upon that collective wisdom to develop effective initiatives and push the movement toward its ultimate goals.

- **Inclusion:** One of the themes repeated throughout our research is that potential allies whose goals and missions are generally congruent may not work together due to specific areas of disagreement or personal clashes. Rather than seeking common ground and opportunities to collaborate, some individuals and organizations have focused instead on areas of difference, and those divisions can become counterproductive to achieving common goals. While there should be values and principles that will not be compromised, collaboration requires some flexibility in thinking and reasonable compromises where possible. If the coalition intends to be comprehensive, it will require numerous partners engaging in many different collective activities.

- **Diverse Representation in Coalitions:** The signature element in most successful movements is the support and involvement of broad coalitions and networks of collaborators. Coalitions

---

4 This is not meant to imply that there have been or are no effective coalitions devoted to this cause, or that the Campaign must begin by building coalitions from scratch. Long-standing coalitions and members of coalitions have been in place and have accomplished much, including passage of the TVPA and its reauthorizations, 45 state trafficking laws, and numerous local achievements in the realms of policy and practice.
with diverse representation and support cannot easily be marginalized or ignored. Conversely, coalitions that can be pigeonholed as partisan and as a “special interest” can be easily dismissed by people aligned with competing interests. Coalitions seen as promoting special interests or narrow segments of the population are likely to be smaller and less likely to amass sufficient resources and political traction to exert the level of influence necessary for substantial change.

- **Bipartisanship**: The Campaign should consider prioritizing assembling a network and coalitions that are inclusive and nonpartisan. Sexual exploitation can be framed as a violation of human rights—as a fundamental form of debasement and an assault on human dignity that is intolerable. Presenting the Campaign as an effort to defend basic human rights such as liberty will appeal across political divisions, religions, ethnicities, and socio-economic strata. A strategy for addressing the limits of collaboration in a field with great diversity of opinion is to **pursue a network of issue-based coalitions** rather than try to establish a single coalition.

- **Prioritizing Action**: While its important to be prepared and thoughtful, there are points at which it is more important to mobilize than to develop the perfect plan, tool, or action. Obviously, there must be a balance between speed and seeking perfection, and it is equally important not to forge ahead ill prepared or with insufficient time to marshal needed resources. While careful planning and evidence-based decision-making are critical elements of success, action and momentum are also important. Over-planning and over-thinking (“paralysis by analysis”) can cause delays that in turn produce missed opportunities and demoralization and frustration of coalitions and constituencies.

- **A Diverse Portfolio of Initiatives**: The Campaign must be comprehensive, and this requires a diverse portfolio of actions and investments. This will have to be prioritized. No single initiative can bring the paradigm shift of systemic change that is the main working goal of the Campaign. However, while a diverse set of actions will be necessary to create a groundswell of support and produce significant and lasting social and political change, the Campaign could become overextended, its impact diluted, and its clarity of message and purpose obscured if it tries to be all things to all people.

- **Leveraging Existing Resources and Opportunities**: It would be a mistake to assume that we know nothing and must start all new initiatives within the Campaign from scratch. The coalition should consider building upon existing foundations whenever possible.

- **Cost-Effectiveness**: The coalition should commit to developing an organization that is nimble, creative, and innovative; supports practices that leverage existing resources and opportunities; and utilizes technology where possible.

### Key Objectives of the National Campaign

The primary goal of the Campaign is prevention of sexual exploitation, and true prevention cannot be realized without attending to the problem’s cause: the demand for commercial sex. Ending demand will require a dramatic and permanent shift in social norms regarding sexual exploitation, from one of indifference or tolerance to one in which sexual exploitation is widely viewed as an affront to human dignity, a civil rights violation, and a serious crime. Within the broader cultural framework, prevention requires changing how men think and behave, so that buying sex is not an option.

A paradigm shift regarding buying sex is needed in order to produce substantial and lasting change. Currently, the majority of men in the United States do not buy sex—but it is not universally
condemned, and a least one out of six or seven men in the nation buy sex from a prostituted person (e.g., Michael et al., 1994; Monto, 1999; Sullivan and Simon, 1998; see reviews by Sanders, 2008; Weitzer, 2007). A national survey of over 13,000 U.S. children in grades 7 through 12 found nearly 4% to have exchanged sex for drugs or money, which extrapolates to 650,000 teenagers who have engaged in commercial sex (Edwards, 2006; see also estimates by Estes and Weiner, 2001; Shared Hope International, 2009). A substantial plurality of the U.S. population believes that prostitution is a harmless vice and should be decriminalized or legalized (e.g., Cotton et al., 2000; General Social Survey, 1996; Gallup Poll, 1991; NJ.com, 2010). This indifference, tolerance, or outright support for commercial sex is a major impediment to combating demand, and should be one of the primary targets of the Campaign.

For men who cannot be (or have not yet been) educated or deterred, the Campaign should support practices and policies that ensure their behavior is dealt with in such a way that (a) justice is served, (b) punishments are commensurate with the crime’s severity, (c) responses to sex buyers serve to accomplish both specific and general deterrence, (d) sex buyers are educated and required to make restitution by funding survivor programs; and (e) arrested sex buyers are provided incentives or mandates to assist in investigating and prosecuting pimps and traffickers.

To reach the long-term goal of true and widespread prevention, a number of intermediate objectives should be pursued, such as supporting effective and promising practices at the local grassroots level, multifaceted efforts geared at changing common normative perceptions about commercial sex, law reform, formulation of (and adherence to) policies prohibiting buying sex, training practitioners, and conducting education and social marketing campaigns. We discuss the possibilities in more detail throughout the remainder of this report, but as an overview, some of the key objective that should be considered are:

- Eradicate sexual slavery by working to eradicate all illicit sexual exploitation.
- Contribute to a comprehensive effort by focusing on eliminating demand for commercial sex.
- Establish permanent system change to ensure sustaining the Campaign’s successes.
- Produce a paradigm shift involving elimination of general public tolerance of, or support for, sexual exploitation.
- Educate boys so that they do not become men who sexually exploit.
- Reform law:
  - Reform state laws so that buying sex is a felony, with increased penalties, mandatory education programs, and restorative justice components.
  - Provide penalties and/or incentives for johns to assist police in investigating and prosecuting sex traffickers.
- Enforcement

An online news poll (NJ.Com, April 7, 2010) found 68% of 377 respondents in New Jersey to say that prostitution should be legalized, although the result should be interpreted with caution since it was a convenience sample susceptible to selection and response biases.

Deterrence refers to discouraging people from committing crime (or other acts) due to the threat or application of sanctions. Specific deterrence refers to preventing repeating subsequent crimes of people already sanctioned, and general deterrence refers to discouraging offending among people other than those who have been punished.
- Advocate for rigorous enforcement of prostitution and trafficking laws.
- Provide support for gender equity in enforcement of prostitution law.
- Investigations, enforcement, prosecution, penalties.
- Shift focus from providers to consumers of commercial sex.
- Link buyer penalties to survivor services.
- Route buyers to education and treatment programs in addition to penalties.
- Leverage buyers to make cases against pimps and traffickers.

- Mobilize federal action
  - TVPA/Wilberforce Act—appropriations for the End Demand provisions in particular, and Department of Justice research and collection of data on buyers of sex.
  - TVPA/Wilberforce Act—compliance with other programming and reporting requirements.
  - Congressional oversight to ensure that agencies are meeting their obligations and complying with federal laws on human trafficking.

A Framework for Organizing the Campaign’s Objectives

Some of the Campaign’s objectives will be pursued through interventions targeting commercial sex buyers directly, while others work indirectly by focusing on facilitating action among those who operate programs that intervene directly with offenders. Strategies and tactics that most directly influence actual and potential buyers of sex can be categorized as either education (changing attitudes and beliefs about buying sex), or enforcement (deterrence accomplished through fear of legal, policy, or social sanctions). Examples of initiatives that work to combat demand indirectly include education and awareness campaigns designed to enlist the public to support laws and programs that educate or deter actual and potential buyers, and training programs for police and prosecutors.

Figure 2.1 illustrates these points by presenting a simplified model for indirect and direct influences on demand. This figure—like any model—is an abstraction and simplification. It portrays a linear model of influence, whereas reality presents more complex interactions and indirect effects. For example, public awareness/social marketing campaigns can reach actual and potential johns directly, and reach them indirectly by affecting their families and peers. However, like any model, it is intended to organize and to clarify central themes and basic principles. We present a model here as a way to organize objectives that may be pursued by the National Campaign.

The basic principle underlying the model illustrated in Figure 2.1 is that most interventions aimed directly at actual and potential sex buyers (Level 1) are either education programs designed to change attitudes and beliefs, or enforcement efforts designed to prevent the purchase of sex through deterrence and incapacitation of offenders. For either of those approaches to succeed, it must have a foundation of supportive staff and leaders who prioritize combating sexual exploitation in general (and combating demand in particular), and provide the necessary legal frameworks, policies, and other resources necessary to successfully intervene (Level 2). To prioritize combating demand for exploited sex and devote the resources necessary to be successful, there must be sufficient political will (Level 3). This refers to political will at local, state, and federal levels (mayors, police chiefs, school district superintendents, governors, state legislators, agency heads, Congress, etc.). Political will does not occur in a vacuum, and elected officials and political appointees are driven in large part by the will of their constituents (Level 4)—the public, including voters, donors, and the media.
Finally, what drives public awareness and commitment? Typically, it is leadership, and effective leadership (Level 5) involves a number of things (local grass-roots activism, information, means of conveying the right information to appropriate targets) in different combinations depending on the targets, such as the general public, lawmakers, and police chiefs.

**Figure 2.1: A Framework for Organizing National Campaign Objectives**

- **Level 1: Direct Action: Law Enforcement and Education.** The education component includes developing and delivering information directly to known johns, and to men and boys who may become johns. However, this oversimplifies and minimizes the role that education will play in the Campaign. Education is a critical element of all interventions, including public education and pressuring lawmakers to strengthen laws, appropriate resources, and demand action and accountability. The enforcement component includes police reverse sting operations for arresting johns, collaborating with communities, and various post-arrest punishments.

- **Level 2: Resources for Direct Action.** This includes (a) passing laws that mandate or allow effective action against demand; (b) formulating policies that prioritize combating demand and provide the authority and guidelines for its pursuit; (c) developing and providing the resources necessary (e.g., curricula for education programs, equipment and overtime for reverse stings) to conduct reverse stings and/or educate johns; (d) training and educating front-line staff such as teachers and police officers; and (e) training and educating
supervisors, agency heads, and political leaders such as mayors, governors and state legislators.

- **Level 3: Political Will.** Throughout our landscape assessment, interviews, and the National Planning Meeting, we repeatedly and consistently heard that a lack of political will was the key impediment to more effective action to combat sexual exploitation.

- **Level 4: Public Awareness and Commitment.** It is clear that there is little to no public support for sex trafficking and sexual slavery, particularly when addressing the plight of survivors and prosecuting traffickers. Public opinion is much more divided when it comes to arresting and punishing the men who buy sex, particularly from adults who are not known to be trafficking victims. Public indifference usually evaporates when presented with accurate information about the nature of sexual exploitation—whether classified as prostitution or sex trafficking. We speak of “commitment” because awareness of the problem is not enough. The Campaign must work to push beyond simple awareness so that the public commits to action, such as demanding that public officials commit themselves to eliminating sexual exploitation.

- **Level 5: Activist Leadership.** Perhaps the most important ingredient of effective social movements is leadership. This generally means grass-roots, bottom-up leadership (political leaders tend to follow after the trail is blazed by activists), but includes top-down leadership that is critical as well. Effective leaders are typically (a) expert in gathering information that can be useful, at packaging that information effectively to change hearts and minds, at conveying the right information to each distinct audience; (b) at forming, maintaining, and mobilizing coalitions to push public opinion and generate political will; (c) shrewd strategists, understanding what needs to be done, discerning where the ripe opportunities are, and thinking strategically about how to take advantage of those opportunities to achieve goals. In the effort to combat sexual exploitation, an invaluable form of leadership is that provided by survivors of prostitution and sex trafficking. Survivors have unsurpassed experiential knowledge about the nature and impact of sexual exploitation, and due to that experience and knowledge, and the courage and tenacity it takes to survive those experiences, they are credible and extremely compelling and effective advocates and leaders.

**Pursuing the Campaign’s Objectives**

Within this framework, any number of objectives may be pursued by the National Campaign. While there is a roughly sequential order to the pursuit of these objectives, it is unlikely to be a neat and linear process. As we have stated, we feel that the first and most important steps in the Campaign should be establishing the Campaign’s leadership structure, establishing a permanent physical and virtual “home base,” and providing the leaders and the organization with resources (funding, travel budget, support staff, training, etc.) sufficient for it to be successful. While there is some logic to the ordering of objectives beyond establishing an organization and leadership structure, the Campaign can mobilize in pursuit of each of these areas simultaneously, and does not have to go through a series of steps that will require waiting before tackling other steps. For example, the Campaign should launch development of education and social marketing campaigns immediately to begin a comprehensive push to change social norms, and can also support several practices intervening directly with actual and potential sexual exploiters that are already well established as cost effective.
The Campaign could quickly mobilize in support of some of the tactics used to pursue the objectives of educating and deterring buyers of commercial sex—for example, arresting men and educating arrestees are evidence-based practices, and the Campaign can and should quickly develop means of supporting the expanded use of practices that are known to work. Mobilizing to do things that can be done relatively quickly, at relatively low costs, and where the evidence of effectiveness helps to minimize opposition to the practices, all can help build success and momentum for the Campaign.

Other tactics are more resource-intensive, or the evidence may not yet exist to assure the coalition that its pursuit is a wise investment. In such cases, the smarter strategy would be to establish new programs and/or select existing ones as demonstration projects, install performance measurement systems, and conduct evaluations. At a later time there might be sufficient empirical evidence to guide decisions about whether the National Campaign should invest in these initiatives.

With such caveats in mind, the Campaign’s leaders may consider following lines of action within a strategic framework with the following main components:

- Leadership structure and institutional base
- Education
- Law enforcement
- Social marketing
- Research and development

While Figure 2.1 illustrates the direct and indirect influence on demand of different kinds of initiatives, Figure 2.2 presents the same elements as the basic structure of the Campaign. As we describe in more detail below, the three substantive elements are education, law enforcement, and social marketing. Proceeding from the assumption that the Campaign will be driven by a consistent focus on producing results, accountability, transparency, and evidence-based practice, research will provide a firm foundation of empirical evidence. Solid information will guide the development of new initiatives, and monitoring the performance and evaluating existing initiatives to guide deliberations about the relative merits of existing initiatives. The National Campaign’s fundamental business of social and political activism and evidence-based practice will be inspired, supported, and directed by leadership.

I. Establish the Campaign’s Leadership Structure and Institutional Base

As discussed above, the political will that leads to meaningful action—such as passing laws and mobilizing the resources to act upon them, and demanding accountability for results—is typically generated by strong activist leadership mobilizing action on a number of fronts simultaneously. A leadership structure will be established for the Campaign itself, and will feature a small core of collaborators who will form a steering committee, and task leaders each of whom will be responsible for pursuing key initiatives of the Campaign.
By leadership, we do not mean to imply that there are no current leaders and that new ones need to be invented. What we do mean is that the Campaign intends to serve as a mobilizing force, supporting current leaders who are already effectively working to eradicate sexual exploitation, and to leverage their leadership skills with an infusion of resources and other forms of support. Leadership refers primarily to people, but also to the combined effect of the resources brought to bear on particular issues, and the example being set by the Campaign in prioritizing and effectively executing meaningful actions directed toward the Campaign’s goals.

Figure 2.2: Illustration of National Campaign Components

There are many effective leaders already in the field who have been pushing forward for decades, most doing so with little reward or recognition, and others to great acclaim. They operate at different levels and focus on different issues, but together form a core which is a valuable resource that can be brought to bear on efforts to combat commercial sexual exploitation.

Leadership does not necessarily mean the heads of agencies and organizations, or politicians, celebrities, scholars, or others in high-profile positions, although it is clear that leaders exist in all of these realms, and are critically important. Both “bottom-up” and “top-down” leadership have created the foundation for successes over past decades, although the former is often overlooked. Leadership will certainly be critical to future success, especially by practitioners operating largely at local levels doing the hands-on work of implementing programs and practices that directly address the problem’s source and its victims. If one envisions the broad field of people and organizations mobilized to fight sexual exploitation as a pyramid, certainly the foundation is comprised of local nonprofit organizations, police departments, courts, city and state public health and social service agencies, and schools. Toward the top are the relatively few legislators, agency heads, and the like. While results
are most often produced by collaborative efforts that include both top-down and bottom-up leadership, the latter is the most frequently overlooked, and we hope that as the National Campaign takes shape and then moves forward that all levels of leadership and input are included and receive the support they need and deserve.

Strong leaders are expert in presenting their arguments clearly and convincingly, and tailoring their message to different audiences. They leverage whatever resources and opportunities they can, avoid reinventing wheels, and stay focused and on message. They understand how critically important it is to assemble and maintain coalitions that can offer support for anyone who champions their cause, and make it uncomfortable for those who fail to help or who throw obstacles in their path.

Given the vision of the Campaign as a comprehensive, multifaceted effort with a national scope and ambitious goals, multiple leaders will be necessary. For them to function together they will need to be organized, and either one individual or a committee of some kind will have to have the final say on important matters.

**Leadership Structure**

One of the decisions reached at the National Planning Meeting was to form a steering committee empowered to help guide development of the strategic plan and put into place the personnel and funding necessary to prepare for the National Campaign. At this time, Hunt Alternatives fund has asked for volunteers for the steering committee and has received several self-nominations. Beyond that, at the time of this writing the Abt project team knows of no decisions made about the leadership of the Campaign.

The National Campaign leadership model we recommend is illustrated in Figure 2.3. This option attends narrowly to the Campaign itself, and does not illustrate a board of directors, advisory boards, coalitions, collaborators, donors, or committees that may serve as lateral partners or provide oversight.

We believe the strongest model involves one person to be named as the Executive Director of the National Campaign (or a Coordinator may be a better title, if the wish is to have a facilitator rather than a CEO), who would coordinate and oversee a set of task leaders or task group directors. For the moment, we have assumed four task leaders, each responsible for tasks corresponding to those in the framework that we have proposed for the Campaign’s consideration: education, enforcement, social marketing, and research. Initially, the steering committee may be regarded as above the Executive Director in the Campaign’s organizational hierarchy, but once the Executive Director is installed, we envision the steering committee as lateral and serving in an advisory capacity. It may not work well to have the Executive Director answer to a committee, which in turn would answer to a Hunt Alternatives Fund Board of Directors or some other body (such as a new organization—e.g., the Donor’s Coalition, or the governing body of a new center devoted to combating demand, if the Campaign were to be an initiative of a new center or organization). Of course, arguments can be made for having the steering committee above the Executive Director, functioning like a Board of Directors that would supervise the Executive Director. However, this model assumes that a strong candidate will be found to serve as Executive Director, and if such a person is found and can be recruited for the position, it would be appropriate to empower them and have them take the ultimate responsibility for
directing the Campaign, rather than empowering a committee with ultimate authority and accountability.

Another model that the Campaign may consider is similar to the first, with one substantial difference: the steering committee would directly oversee the set of task leaders, rather than having an individual named as the director. This model has the advantage of being an option in the event that the right person cannot be found to serve as Executive Director. It might also be more appealing to those uncomfortable with placing primary responsibility for this substantial and collaborative effort in the hands of one person. If the right person cannot be found to serve as the Campaign’s director, there may be no other choice but to disaggregate leadership and empower a set of task group leaders. But unless forced to pursue this option, we believe it is a risky choice. It would place the leadership of the National Campaign in layers of committees: the task group leaders, accountable to the steering committee, which in turn would be accountable to some sort of board of directors, advisory board, or other governing bodies representing the interest of the host organization or sponsors. Given the broad range of initiatives that can and should be pursued to form a comprehensive effort to combat sexual slavery, the Campaign could become hobbled or paralyzed due to an inability to reach consensus, or could pursue uncoordinated or conflicting endeavors. If that occurred, the Campaign may struggle to quickly produce successes upon which to build momentum, broaden and strengthen coalitions, and attract further investment to pursue increasingly ambitious initiatives.

Whether the initiative is led by one person or a steering committee, one of the critical leadership functions will be to ensure that the task leaders work in a coordinated fashion. A challenge inherent in collaborations is ensuring that task leaders are on the same page about direction and priorities, and methods for pursuing them. Distributed leadership at the task level will be necessary, because for a large-scale and comprehensive effort, substantial tasks will occur simultaneously and will pursue varying challenges requiring a wide range of substantive knowledge and different managerial skill sets. This Campaign will not function properly if the task leaders wander off in different directions, work at cross purposes, duplicate effort, or cannot get along, and a strong leader will be important to ensure the collective effort stays on track.
**Individual Leaders**

According to many of those we interviewed for this project, leadership is regarded as the most important ingredient (or among the most important ones) of effective social movements and political action. The character and skill of the individuals placed will be at least as important as the shape of the leadership structure. There are many factors combining to determine who is an effective leader, and the individual qualities must be a good match for what is required in any specific endeavor. Hunt Alternatives Fund and the people likely to serve on the National Campaign’s steering committee are experienced managers and are capable of fitting the right people into leadership positions.

There are entire industries devoted to illuminating the general qualities of effective leadership, and we will not recite them here. For the National Campaign’s consideration, we offer a few thoughts about what will be required of the Executive Director and task leaders. In the building stages of social movements, leadership generally resides in the grassroots; political leaders tend to follow after the trail is blazed by activists. For the National Campaign, its leaders must:

- Inspire others to act
- Be devoted to pursuing the objectives of the Campaign
- Be able to clearly articulate ambitious and achievable goals and objectives
- Be committed to investing in lines of action that produce results
- Be accountable for producing results
- Position the Campaign’s staff and collaborators to succeed

Effective leaders are typically (a) expert in gathering information that can be useful, at packaging that information effectively to change hearts and minds, and at conveying the right information to each distinct audience; (b) skilled at forming, maintaining, and mobilizing coalitions to push public opinion and generate political will; (c) shrewd strategists, understanding what needs to be done, discerning where the ripe opportunities are, and thinking strategically about how to take advantage of those opportunities to achieve goals; and (d) inspiring, adept at mobilizing others to act who might not otherwise do so, and moving people already committed to a cause to devote themselves to it.

**Coalitions**

One of the key objectives of the National Planning Meeting in May 2010 was determining whether there was support for a National Campaign focusing on demand within a very diverse collection of people deeply involved in efforts to combat human trafficking, modern-day slavery, and prostitution. The answer was a resounding “yes.” While many people interested in attending the meeting could not be there, there was a strong feeling among those who were that a diverse coalition can be readily assembled to mobilize a campaign designed to combat demand.

Multiple coalitions are necessary. A broad coalition helped pass the TVPA and its reauthorizations, and some national-level initiatives the Campaign will pursue are likely to require a similar kind of coalition. Other initiatives are more divisive in nature and more localized in scope, and it may not be desirable or possible to have everyone aboard a single coalition. A solution is not to expect a single coalition, but instead to pursue a network model with multiple coalitions all aimed at ending sexual exploitation, but focusing on separate pieces that together constitute a comprehensive effort. For example, there is broad support for educating boys, and for establishing a broad network of coalitions...
to develop and implement programs. There is less agreement about john schools, shaming men arrested for buying sex, or pushing for particular law reforms such as the Swedish model or statutes requiring johns to register as sex offenders. Those who support john schools or shaming may coalesce around those initiatives; others who have collaborated to support a particular law reform or education program for boys may recuse themselves from other efforts that may conflict with personal feelings or their organization’s mission.

Systems from other fields have been established to support and facilitate effective coalitions, and build and maintain consensus. The current field of experts, leaders, and practitioners have worked together before and accomplished much. But there are also conflicts that have, by nearly everyone’s account, slowed progress or produced less than optimal results. If a comprehensive effort is to progress and create a critical mass of energy that can push public opinion and policy over “tipping points” of change, those leading the National Campaign should consider establishing rules and processes to manage the divergent opinions and interests of actual and potential coalition members. A set of detailed ideas about how to maintain diverse and widely distributed coalitions is presented in Chapter 3.

Establish a National Center Devoted to Combating Demand

For the National Campaign to be effective and sustainable, it must become institutionalized. It will need a permanent physical and virtual “home,” a staff, procedures, and operating systems, and these should be developed before the formal launch to provide direction and a base of operation and send the message that the National Campaign is here it stay. An established presence will make it clear it cannot be ignored by opponents in hopes it will soon go away, and lets allies who may want to invest in collaboration know that they can count on the Campaign as a partner.

We believe there are two main options for anchoring the National Campaign: (1) establish a new center or organization, or (2) enhance the capacity and expand the mission of an existing entity. It will be up to the Campaign’s steering committee or Executive Director to determine which of these options (or perhaps other possibilities) will best suit the needs of the Campaign and thus advance the cause of combating demand. There are many well-known and respected organizations that focus on combating human trafficking or prostitution that could serve as a base, and the Campaign could work with an existing organization’s leaders and donors and add more staff and support in order to conduct the Campaign.

With the information we have available to us, we would recommend establishing something new rather than launching the Campaign from within an existing organization. We believe a new center or organization would provide a fresh start, and there would be no concerns about having the Campaign’s mission conflict with that of an extant organization that may have been established to pursue different aims. With a new organization or center, there would be no concerns about having a new National Campaign drive attention or resources away from ongoing initiatives, as might be the case if the Campaign is launched from an existing organization.

A “Center for Ending Demand” or “Center for Preventing Sexual Slavery,” for example, could be a provider of wrap-around support for the Campaign’s multiple initiatives. Support could be provided for community organizing, assistance in performance monitoring and evaluation of demand reduction programs, facilitating access to funding offered by government agencies, etc. A center would be the
home base of the network of collaborators and the National Campaign. A number of options for its structure and location could be pursued. For example, it could be a new stand-alone 501c3 organization that operates the center and its multiple initiatives, or could be placed with an extant organization, such as a university.

There are advantages to having the Campaign be launched from a center devoted entirely to combating sexual exploitation, and to specifically do so by combating demand. A center that is well resourced, highly visible, has credible and well known and connected leaders, and has high-profile donors, champions, and well respected coalition members strongly signals that this effort is deadly serious and is here to stay. Opponents cannot just hope to wait it out for a year or two, as they can easily do with smaller initiatives that seem temporary and are really just programs driven by small grants with finite performance periods. A center with gravitas and a sense of permanence can quickly become the go-to place for inquiries by the media, policymakers, practitioners, and the public. Press releases could be issued from a center, and the Campaign’s leaders would have the center as their affiliation. The center could also be the host for awards programs and the sponsor of events. A highly successful example that comes to mind is the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, but there are many others.

One of the key functions of a center, in our opinion, is the provision of technical assistance for programs and practices. A center can coordinate, manage, synthesize, disseminate, and use information about effective and promising program, practice, and policy implementation through a technical assistance arm. This could provide a number of functions, such as an information clearinghouse where practitioners and policymakers could find practical information about how to implement and sustain interventions, law, and research. It would also provide a place where practitioners in need of assistance can contacts peers in locations that have established successful programs. A technical assistance function within a full-service center focusing on demand could also coordinate a response team of expert practitioners or researchers who could physically go to locations that need assistance and make presentations or help install programs or interventions.

II. Promote Public Awareness and Commitment to Action

One of the most important policy levers is the will of policymakers’ constituents. Key constituencies include the public—broadly defined—and any number of identifiable segments of the population. Depending upon the jurisdiction, it may be important to target faith-based groups; community leaders; heads of professional associations; affinity groups and associations; unions; and businesses, business sectors, or business associations. In generating public support, one of the most important allies is the media. Cultivating relationships with reporters and editors can be indispensable in moving public opinion and generating political will to take action against sexual exploitation.

To promote public awareness and commitment to action attacking the causes of sexual slavery, the Campaign should conduct social marketing campaigns. While social marketing is only one of many techniques for shifting public will and using that to generate the political will to take effective action, it is an important tool. For social marketing campaigns, content experts must take the lead in identifying key audiences and determining what these audiences need to hear to mobilize action.
Social marketing firms can help develop and convey messages effectively. We anticipate that a large, national social marketing campaign would be useful in knitting together the disparate pieces of a National Campaign, and helping to create broad “buy in” and recognition that there is a new social movement to combat demand for commercial sex. Such approaches have been effective in mobilizing action in Atlanta and Chicago, and appear to be effective in the United Kingdom. We also believe that there should be “micro-campaigns” targeting highly specific subpopulations such as lawmakers, judges, public health officials and practitioners; the general public (to combat the belief that commercial sex is a harmless and intractable behavior); and the buyers of commercial sex. Social marketing and other initiatives would work synergistically, and would be linked together in a coordinated campaign. Figure 2.4 illustrates how policy, practice, and public opinion can each be influenced by social marketing efforts, and how they can help create support for interventions working directly to combat demand.

Some social marketing campaigns can be targeted directly to the broad public, with the objective of the public insisting upon serious efforts to eliminate sexual exploitation. First, an educated and motivated public may pressure public officials to pass strong laws and establish and follow sound policies that effectively address demand for commercial sex. Second, the public could appeal to local authorities to commit the resources necessary to combat demand; for example, they could convince the mayor and the chief of police to prioritize combating sexual exploitation. Third, the public can more directly influence demand by failing to tolerate or enable sexual exploitation.

One of the tactics that would facilitate public awareness would be providing incentives for better performance by the media. The media should be monitored and responses developed to attack regressive language, destructive framing of the issue (“sex work”), the premise that prostitution is
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**Figure 2.4: Illustrating Direct and Indirect Influences of Social Marketing Campaigns on Demand**
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One of the tactics that would facilitate public awareness would be providing incentives for better performance by the media. The media should be monitored and responses developed to attack regressive language, destructive framing of the issue (“sex work”), the premise that prostitution is
intractable, etc. The media would be presented with the case that the National Campaign is a new effort to attack commercial sex comprehensively: combating consumer-level demand in addition to (and not instead of) more aggressively prosecuting pimps and traffickers, and rescuing and supporting victims. Libertarian arguments could be presented that require the state to prohibit prostitution, based on harm to others, and the Campaign could release those packaged arguments when the need or opportunity arose, such as when a related story breaks or when the media inquires. The Campaign could synthesize, package, and circulate evidence that legalization encourages illegal commercial sex markets, rather than eliminating them. Many people and organizations pursue these kinds of approaches already, but are stretched too thin to do it systematically and consistently. There should be an aggressive response to every relevant event or story, criticisms of regressive portrayals, and praise when media coverage is done well. Technology would be an ally in this kind of approach, and with proper “canned” responses and materials monitoring and responding to the media could be done efficiently with modest staffing. When something more substantial arises in the media, additional resources could be marshaled and a more substantial response mobilized.

III. Generate Political Will

When asked why a variety of programs, laws, and initiatives were progressing slowly or not at all, a “lack of political will” was most frequently cited as the ultimate cause by those we interviewed in our landscape assessment. With a slow economy and many demands on finite resources, competition is fierce. While few politicians deny the importance of combating sexual exploitation, even fewer consider the issue to be a high priority. One of the most important questions to be addressed by the National Campaign is, “How does one generate political will where it is currently lacking?”

As one reads through the following tactics for meeting the objective of generating political will, it is evident that these are not mutually exclusive and independent interventions. Political will is usually driven in large part by public support, and the ways of achieving both public support and political will interact. For example, social marketing campaigns can be an effective tool, and are most effective when leveraging and collaborating with media. The development of messages can benefit from a strong research foundation, and social marketing campaigns and media relations can benefit tremendously from cultivating high-profile champions of the cause, such as celebrities, business leaders, and prominent politicians. For appealing to both the public and to political leaders, there is no substitute for the testimony of survivors of sexual exploitation, and survivors who are effective communicators can be integral to education and social marketing efforts. Among the tactics useful for producing greater public awareness and activism and generating political will are the following:

- **Compile and present a compelling empirical case with both data and anecdotes.** The information must be not only valid and convincing, but easily understood. Instead of a recitation of disembodied statistics, equivalencies of simple figures that are meaningful should be presented: e.g., one in six American men admit to buying sex—double the proportion of the population who are left-handed (or some other comparison that will resonate and place the prevalence of sex buyers in perspective).

- **Present the issue as a political opportunity.** With severe time and resources constraints, lawmakers should not be asked to do the groundwork and raise support. Instead, a coalition and political advocates should present them with the issue, easily packaged and understood, and place minimal burdens upon them. They need to be presented with an issue that, for
them, is a political “winner.” The ideal approach is the message, “This issue is good for you, establishing you as a champion for human rights and protecting the interests of your constituents. By championing this issue, we can deliver votes, deliver resources from donors, and help to establish the fight against slavery as a highlight of your legacy.” Effective leaders can make it easy for politicians to champion the cause, and unattractive to ignore it. By saying this, we do not mean to suggest that self interest is the only thing politicians care about. Solving the problems of slavery and exploitation is the real target, and most policymakers will respond when presented with the right information. Our point in this discussion is to say that the National Campaign ought not to approach lawmakers asking for favors. The tone should be presenting them with opportunities to do the right thing, and to frame it as a “win-win” opportunity for them as well as for affecting change.

- **Link the issue to the interests of those whom the Campaign seeks to influence.** For example, if a key concern of a political coalition is a perceived erosion of individual liberty, then sexual slavery can be framed (accurately) as one of the most egregious violations of individual liberty. If another constituency is concerned about the rights of women or certain ethnic groups, then persuade by emphasizing the fact that sexual exploitation violates the rights of women, girls, and people of certain ethnicities disproportionately. While shaping the message to appeal to particular groups can be effective, care must be taken so that these targeted appeals do not frame the Campaign as a special interest. These targeted messages must be placed within the context of the broader message that sexual exploitation is a criminal violation of human rights, regardless of gender, ethnicity, etc.

- **Recruit and support high-profile and effective champions of combating demand.** This would be helpful in coalition building, social marketing, lobbying congress, fundraising, and doing public outreach. Possibilities include prominent lawmakers, celebrities, athletes, and business leaders. There are several effective champions currently in Congress, such as Representatives Chris Smith and Caroline Maloney, but they need additional support to push through appropriations and they need more committed cosponsors. Several celebrities are already involved or interested in combating demand, such as Ashley Judd, Ashton Kutcher, and Demi Moore. Other celebrities are involved in anti-trafficking efforts and could become interested in combating demand, such as Mira Sorvino, Julia Ormond, Ricky Martin, Tony Shaloub, Emma Thompson, and Ron Livingstone. Current corporate leaders include Manpower, Inc. and the Body Shop.

- **Support and utilize survivor leadership.** Survivors have led many of the efforts producing the successes bringing us to where we are today. Their involvement has been and will continue to be critical in shifting public opinion and generating political will to combat sexual exploitation.

- **Marketing to law and policymakers.** Messages can be tailored to reach legislators and public officials, who would establish laws and policies that would allow or require resources to be commended to efforts to combat demand

- **Marketing to practitioners.** Within the parameters of law and policy, practitioners often have discretion to pursue issues they regard as priorities. For example, health educators can choose to include or omit references to the special health consequences associated with sexual exploitation, and police can choose to conduct enforcement operations focusing on sexual exploitation, or to focus those resources on other issues if they regard them as higher priority.
Social marketing campaigns could be developed specifically to appeal to practitioners to prioritize and effectively pursue the demand driving sexual exploitation.

IV. System Change and Resource Mobilization

Raising public awareness and passing laws mean little if they do not result in concrete action, and concrete action requires resources. Furthermore, action intended to produce change must also lay the groundwork for maintaining and expanding upon the positive changes produced. We define resources and system change broadly here, including not only the people and materials needed for programs and practices, but also the laws, policies, and organizations necessary to authorize, mandate, or allow the commitment of resources to certain lines of action.

- **State and local law reform.** Before speculating about needed reforms, a rigorous analysis of the content the text of state criminal codes and municipal ordinances, as well as the establishment of a general coalition underlying the National Campaign and perhaps a separate coalition or task group, is necessary. Several salient issues emerge from the preliminary research:
  - In the absence of aggravating circumstances (such as concurrent offenses or engaging in commercial sex while infected with HIV), prostitution is usually classified as a low-level misdemeanor. While maximum penalties often include incarceration, that seldom occurs for those who buy or attempt to buy sex, absent aggravating circumstances or unless it involves a mandatory penalty for a second or third offense.
  - Many states have prostitution criminal codes that are role neutral, i.e., referring simply to soliciting prostitution and making no distinction between the “buyer” and “seller.” One of the implications of this is that it will be difficult to satisfy the Wilberforce provision requiring the Uniform Crime Reports to separate the two. Either state law must be revised, or law enforcement agencies must implement new tracking procedures that will allow them to make the distinction when they tally and report their prostitution crime statistics to the FBI.
  - Adopting the “Swedish Model” in the U.S. Many people working to combat sexual exploitation believe that states should adopt laws consistent with the Swedish model—decriminalizing selling sex while maintaining and enhancing criminal penalties for buying sex. The model promotes a therapeutic approach for survivors, and a punitive approach for “buyers” and pimps/traffickers. Among the relevant points of the discussion in debates over the merits of this approach are:
    - Decriminalizing selling in Sweden is coupled with referrals to social services for prostituted persons. In relative terms, Sweden has a robust social “safety net” of service systems. Services for sexually exploited persons are more readily available in Sweden than in the U.S. or most other countries. Law enforcement agencies in many U.S. cities contend that most of the modest services available for survivors are those linked to juvenile justice or correctional systems, and while law enforcement provided or referred services are imperfect options, they are sometimes the only forms of service support available.
    - Many people disagree with the preceding point, and argue that it is simply inhumane and unjust to arrest people who are victims rather than offenders—particularly minors who are being sexually exploited and raped. The costs to survivors due to
being treated as criminals are argued to be disproportional to the benefits of having the criminal justice system facilitate access to services (particularly since available services in the U.S. are often minimal or absent). These costs include developing a criminal record which hurts future employability, and many manifest harms to survivors. This represents being punished by the government for terrible circumstances over which they have little or no control.

- Some opponents of the Swedish model in the United States argue that the ability to arrest those alleged to be engaged in prostitution is one of the only means by which women and girls can be extracted from the control of pimps and traffickers, thus protected and perhaps linked to support services. Many police officers also argue that it is very difficult to identify potential victims without fingerprinting them, since they often lie about their identities (either to avoid arrest or due to fear of retaliation by their pimps or traffickers if they cooperate with police) and have false identification, thus making it difficult to know whether to treat the situation as child sex trafficking or prostitution.

- Those who disagree with the preceding point argue that police can still lawfully order the separation of women and girls from potential pimps and traffickers without arresting them, and that the identification challenges do not justify arresting and punishing those who are victims, particularly children.

- Tracking data suggest that the Swedish model laws are effective, but until more rigorous evaluation results are produced, it is unclear whether the low number of offenders (johns) reflects an improvement in the problem or lax enforcement. Most experts in the field believe the program has produced a positive impact, but a formal evaluation of the impact is underway that can provide a more definitive answer.

- Given how demand drives sexual exploitation, and how prostitution and sex trafficking are magnets for—and causes of—the full range of felonies, many people involved in combating exploitation believe that more severe penalties for buying sex are necessary. In addition, given the inherent risks and harms resulting from men buying sex, arrest provides an excellent opportunity to educate men about the consequence of soliciting prostitution—particularly about health risks and the trauma experienced by survivors. Among the possibilities:
  - Make the purchase of sex a felony.
  - Establish mandatory, substantial jail sentences for first offenses, and prison terms for subsequent offenses.
  - Require those convicted of purchasing sex to register as sex offenders.
  - Eliminate diversion options that allow johns to have their charges dismissed.
  - Mandate severe fines, and use the revenue to support “restorative justice” programs for survivors.
  - Mandate education for men arrested for buying sex, without necessarily offering education as an optional diversion in lieu of criminal sanctions.
  - Require men arrested for buying sex to assist law enforcement in investigating and prosecuting pimps and traffickers.
V. Support Local, Direct Action

While they can be combined and categorized as education programs and law enforcement interventions, there is a wide array of specific tactics that have been developed, and many of these tactics overlap categories in our strategic framework. There is vast expertise at the practice level that should be fostered and brought to bear on the collective efforts supported by the coalition and the Campaign. An effort has been underway for the past three years to inventory the range of extant demand reduction efforts operating at the local level in the United States. There are roughly a dozen distinct types of interventions that have been developed and implemented to combat demand, and many variations within each type. Specific approaches include:

- **Public education and awareness programs**
  - broad messaging—general public
  - targeting specific groups, e.g.
    - state and local policy leaders, such as mayors, agency heads
    - professionals—law enforcement, public health, activists, education
    - men who sexually exploit others
    - boys
    - community organizations
    - military—leadership and armed forces
    - business—leadership and the workforce
    - teachers—school administrators, classroom teachers, school psychologists
    - parents
    - legislators—federal and state

- **Police decoy operations (“reverse stings”) aimed at johns**
  - street-level
    - women officers posing as prostituted persons
  - web-based
    - police respond to real ads, replace prostituted persons with police decoys, continue taking calls from johns
    - police post decoy ads, set up reverse sting
    - police decoys respond to ads placed by johns seeking prostituted persons
  - brothel-based
    - police investigate brothels, make arrests, replace brothel staff with decoys, continue fielding calls and walk-in from johns
    - police use “black books” or other call lists to investigate “customers”

- **Shaming**
  - publicizing identities of arrested johns, via news outlets, police websites

- **Seizing or forfeiting autos**

- **Suspending driver’s licenses**

- **Geographic restraining orders (e.g., Stay Out of Areas with Prostitution, or SOAP orders)**
  - johns prohibited from visiting areas with known prostitution activity

- **Neighborhood action**
  - tips to police
  - citizen patrols
• **Community impact panels**
  - residents and business representatives speak to arrestees about harm of prostitution to residents and businesses

• **“John school” education or treatment programs for arrestees**
  - as sentencing options, coupled with other criminal sanctions
  - as diversion programs
  - one-day classes versus multiple-session counseling models

• **Community service programs for arrestees**

Based on feedback we received during the research for our landscape analysis, we recommend that the Campaign consider prioritizing support of the following tactics:

A. **Educate boys.** The issue about which there was greatest consensus in our interviews and other research is the need to educate boys. Fortunately, there are established processes and excellent examples of how to include new topics in school-based curricula. The basic steps of the process are (a) assembling panels of experts in the subject matter, education, and curriculum development, (b) develop a core curriculum, and then (c) include in the processes school boards and textbook publishers. There are past successes in implementing sex education, civility, bullying, and hate crime lessons in school curricula, and these successes can serve as models. The CAASE program in Chicago has already developed (in collaboration with other local partners) a curriculum that would be helpful in developing a model that could be refined, adapted, and replicated. A model curriculum would serve as the foundation for advocacy efforts pushing for adoption by state Departments of Education, then by individual school districts.

B. **Educate adult buyers and potential buyers.** Given the evidence that one out of every six men in the United States has purchased sex from a prostituted person at least once in their life, and the survey finding that it is normative to view prostitution as a victimless crime or harmless vice, opportunities abound to reach potential buyers and the general public who serve as bystanders or enablers. Broad-based education and awareness and social marketing programs are bound to reach men who may or do buy sex. More target-rich environments can be found anywhere men assemble in predominantly or exclusively male congregations. For example it is well-established that sexual exploitation is concentrated near military bases, at major sporting events, along business travel routes, and at truck stops and work camps.

C. **Educate practitioners who can and should mobilize to combat demand.** One of the most important targets for education is prosecutors. Police tend to follow the lead of prosecutors in their enforcement activities, since they don’t want to commit their time to investigating cases that are not carried forward for prosecution, or that result in minimal penalties. Where police know that prosecutors will pursue their cases against men who buy sex, they have incentives to bring those cases to prosecutors. One of the findings of Abt Associates’ national assessment project was that there is an inequity in the standards of evidence needed to prosecute providers of commercial sex compared to that needed to prosecute their “customers.” Police can simply observe persons known to be prostituted having conversations with men who approach them in cars, getting into some of the cars,
and then returning. Those observations are sufficient to arrest and prosecute for prostitution. They do not need to hear whether an explicit offer of money for sex occurred, nor do they need proof that sex occurred or was planned. In some jurisdictions, undercover stings are conducted where plainclothes male officers approach people suspected of engaging in prostitution. The sting interactions are usually unrecorded, with prosecutors satisfied to have the testimony of the officer as the primary or sole evidence, while for reverse stings many of the female decoys wear wires or recording devices, or have the interactions surreptitiously filmed as corroborating evidence.

The standard of evidence required for prosecuting johns appears to be higher than that required for prosecuting prostituted persons. Few courts are satisfied with evidence equivalent to that for prosecuting prostituted persons. When police watch a man in a car repeatedly pull up and speak to women, then have one hop in his car and be returned minutes later, they contend that they have insufficient evidence for prosecution. There is reasonable doubt, since they could say that the woman asked for directions, or was a friend they drove to buy cigarettes, or anything else. To arrest male buyers, most city and district courts require undercover reverse stings in which they have a recording of an explicit offer of money in exchange for sex. There appears no clear explanation as to why the standards differ. Off the record, some will say that the johns are litigious and less easy targets, whereas prostituted persons often have criminal records for prostitution, and are far less litigious—they or their pimps will simply plea bargain to get back on the streets and start the money flowing again. Training prosecutors may help to bring more balance to the standard of evidence applied to the buyers and sellers of commercial sex.

In addition, both prosecutors and police would benefit from training about the definition of sex trafficking/sexual slavery, particular in relation to pimping. In our National Assessment research we found that most police and prosecutors do not regard women working for pimps necessarily to be sex trafficking victims. However, any reasonable definition of slavery or human trafficking (i.e., service compelled through force, fraud or coercion; lack of compensation beyond subsistence; inability to leave freely) makes any pimp a trafficker, and any of the women “working” for them to be a trafficking victim. Education and training is needed. One of the challenges is that law enforcement is wary of the anti-trafficking movement pushing the definition of slavery into street prostitution, and federalizing what is a local or state crime. The training would have to make it clear that compelled commercial sex or prostitution is sex trafficking, but that prostitution without a pimp or trafficker is not.

D. **Insert anti-demand messages into existing education and training programs.** This leverages current infrastructures for efficiency, and takes advantage of ready-made procedures for access to populations that need exposure to these messages. There are numerous existing educational programs and systems that have interests parallel to, or compatible with, the abolition of sexual exploitation. Brief statements could be added to a number of extant efforts about how buying sex is exploitive and illegal, e.g.:

- Corporation and government agency-based **sexual harassment training**
- Corporation and government agency-based **travel policy training**
- University campus programs on **preventing date rape**
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- Programs educating men about intimate partner violence
- Military training programs on human trafficking
- Military basic training programs on health and risk behavior for infectious disease
- School health, sex education, civility, and human rights curricula

F. Support law enforcement. Aside from proactive education, most of the direct interventions with commercial sex buyers are dependent upon law enforcement. We have identified at least 10 different types of anti-demand efforts engaged in by police: street-level reverse stings; web-based reverse stings; print media reverse stings; publicizing identities of arrestees; neighborhood collaborations, such as tip lines and citizen patrols used to provide intelligence about sex buyers to police; auto seizure; community service programs; geographic restraining orders; letters sent to arrestees’ homes; john school programs; and driver’s license suspensions. Evidence shows that two approaches work: arresting and educating known johns (Poland et. al., 2009; Shively et al., 2008; Weisburd et al., 2006). Others are likely to be effective if directly targeted and properly executed (education programs and social marketing campaigns). The effectiveness of other approaches is still untested, and we do not know whether, why, or under what conditions most approaches are more versus less successful. Many tactics are either promising but untried (educating school-age boys), or are unevaluated and of indeterminate value (shaming, auto seizure).

There are a number of ways in which the National Campaign can and should provide support for this indispensable element in combating demand. In our national assessment and the landscape analysis we identified a number of needs. Among the most critical is practical, operational information about how to conduct demand reduction interventions, including research, peer support, and technical assistance. The National Campaign could support local law enforcement in their efforts to combat demand by facilitating the assembly and delivery of information to practitioners. We discuss a number of tactics for providing this and other support later in the report.

G. Support those collaborating with educators and police. In recent decades it has been established that public health and public safety interventions are less productive when operating in isolation. The more effective model is collaborative, where police, public health, social service, community groups, and businesses contribute to proactive problem solving and system improvement interventions (e.g., Butler et al., 2002; Carter, 2006; Smithey et al., 2002). Law enforcement efforts show the best results when they are part of comprehensive systems to solve particular problems. There are examples of effective collaborations working to combat demand that include partnerships among public health, law enforcement, community groups, businesses, and NGOs (e.g., National City Police Department, 1997; Shively et al., 2008; Tucson Police Department, 1997). The economic downturn has hit many collaborators hard. Law enforcement tends to be one of the last pieces of the public service infrastructure to experience severe budget cuts, while social services, education, and nonprofits often are decimated during economic hardship. While the National Campaign is unlikely to prioritize grantmaking as one of its primary contributions, there other ways that it could support organizations critical to effective local action. For example, the Campaign could centrally develop materials and
make them available locally to allow collaborators to stretch their own resources. The Campaign could also provide assistance in shifting public opinion and generating the political will for local governments and businesses to prioritize and devote resources to their anti-demand efforts. Other possibilities include providing grant writing assistance, and providing some grant support to exemplary programs or to a limited number of new demonstration projects.

H. **Businesses** can be enlisted to combat sexual exploitation. Among the ways they can (and sometimes do) contribute are:

- Inserting *educational material* about the harm of purchasing sex into policies and human resources materials, such as sexual harassment policies and training.

- Enforcing policies prohibiting *reimbursement* for commercial sex-related “entertainment” or services as a business expenditure, such as business dinners at strip clubs or pornography in hotels rooms during business trips. While strip clubs and hotel pornography are not illegal forms of commercial sex, which is the focus of the National Campaign, they are thought by many to be directly related to illegal sexual exploitation. While businesses cannot and should not prohibit legal acts committed during employees’ own time, or financed with their personal resources, employers do have a right to prohibit their resources from contributing to the commercial sex business, and are free to convey the message to their employees that they find commercial sex to be objectionable.

- Urging hotels to cease providing *pay-per-view pornography*.

- Training *hotel staff* to identify prostitution and human trafficking, and collaborate with police in identifying johns (as well as survivors and traffickers).

- Urging businesses to terminate the employment of *taxi drivers* who assist sexual exploitation by identifying and driving johns to brothels or prostitution strips.

- Educating and lobbying businesses to educate their *workforces* about the dangers and harms of purchasing sex abroad, and how purchasing sex in foreign countries violates the sex tourism provisions of U.S. federal human trafficking laws.

- Working with cities to develop and invest in regulatory procedures for businesses commonly serving as *fronts for brothels*, such as massage parlors, nail salons, and spas. Legitimate versions of these businesses can often be highly cooperative with law enforcement, since their image as legitimate is damaged by sexual exploitation occurring in analogous storefronts.

I. **Using information provided by johns to investigate and prosecute pimps and traffickers.** Currently, law enforcement relies heavily upon the testimony and evidence produced by sexually exploited persons to arrest and prosecute pimps and traffickers. A severely underutilized alternative is the store of information held by johns about the locations, identities, and operating procedures of pimps and traffickers, such as those operating brothels and web-based systems of exploitation. A current obstacle is that so few johns are arrested, and when they are, they are typically released and given minimal sanctions. They do not remain in custody for long, and there is little leverage to plea
bargain or otherwise elicit their knowledge about traffickers. If johns were routinely arrested and penalized more severely, they could provide useful information and relieve some of the pressure on victims when making criminal cases against those who exploit.

J. **Existing organizations and agencies should be encouraged to adopt combating demand and ending commercial sexual exploitation as priority objectives.** This effort parallels that of coalition building. While it is important to build and strengthen coalitions within the movement to combat modern-day slavery, it is probably more important to build coalitions within other professions and content areas whose primary mission is not combating human trafficking. For example, a way to push the elimination of sexual exploitation higher on priority lists is to work through professional organizations, affinity groups, and other extant organizations focused on government, public health, education, religion, business, journalism, the practice of law, law enforcement, tourism, the military, e.g.:

- American Association for Higher Education & Accreditation
- American Bar Association
- American Hotel and Lodging Association
- American Medical Association
- American Nurses Association
- American Prosecutors Research Institute
- Catholic Press Association
- Independent Taxi Operators Association
- International Association of Human Trafficking Investigators
- National Alliance to End Homelessness
- National Association of Women Business Owners
- National Association of District Attorneys
- National Baptist Convention
- National Catholic Education Association
- National Coalition Against Domestic Violence
- National Press Club
- National Scholastic Press Association
- National Small Business Association
- Police Executive Research Forum
- Southern Baptist Convention
- State Police Associations
- State-level Peace Officer Standards & Training (POST) centers
- The American Public Health Association
- The Anti-Defamation League
- The Association of Fraternity Advisors
- The Center for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Injury Prevention & Control
- The Fraternal Order of Police
- The International Association of Chiefs of Police
- The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People
- The National Association of Attorney’s General
- The National Association of Counties
- The National Association of Social Workers
• The National Coalition Against Domestic Violence
• The National Education Association
• The National Governor’s Association
• The National Organization of Women
• The National Sheriffs Association
• The Southern Poverty Law Center
• The United States Conference of Mayors
• Washington International Trade Association

K. **Grant programs:** A grant program could be developed to fund new demonstration projects or to support and expand existing exemplary programs. There are many options for lines of support to consider, such as a program for supporting innovations in combating demand, or a need-based grant program for communities in which political will and need are present, but resources are the main obstacle to mobilizing effort to combat demand. In our National Assessment we encountered dozens of police departments that have identified demand for commercial sex as a priority, and have had implemented programs and practices resulting in the arrest and education of hundreds of offenders. Yet many have curtailed or eliminated these practices due to shrinking budgets and competing priorities. While in some jurisdictions the answer may be to pressure or educate police chiefs and others about sexual exploitation so that they move it up the priority list, in some cases this will still not be sufficient to promote action, or to promote as much activity as is necessary. There are resource limits that are holding police and their partners back, and modest grant support may push willing agencies “over the hump” so they can more aggressively combat commercial sex. There may be value in having separate grant programs or mechanisms for police, public health, and NGOs.

One of the practical considerations in running grant programs is their administration and oversight. Establishing needs and priorities, issuing solicitations, reviewing proposals, and overseeing active grants is labor intensive, and if the National Campaign awards grants, it would be a mistake to under-invest in the infrastructure necessary to perform these management functions.

L. **Conference series:** The Campaign could support occasional or periodic conferences, and more frequent web conferences and teleconferences on specific topics.

M. **Awards programs:** Awards could be made to provide an incentive for, and recognition of, excellent work. They can draw public attention and support for those striving to combat slavery and end demand. Awards could be developed for advances in policy and law, excellence in law enforcement, cross-sector collaborations (e.g., public health, business, and police partnerships), neighborhood-led initiatives, etc. The awards could be synchronized with a conference series, announced through press releases, and presented by prominent persons such as policy leaders, celebrities, or activists to draw additional attention and support. We recommend that early awards go to practitioners, since they are the most important single sector involved in the battle against sexual exploitation, are doing the only work demonstrated to make an impact, and rarely receive recognition.
VI. Research and Development

After education, there was greatest consensus among those interviewed regarding the need for better information about the size and scope of sexual exploitation, prostitution, and sex slavery, and about the effectiveness of different prevention and enforcement practices. Many of those interviewed spoke of the “no data, no problem” challenge. Others spoke of breakthroughs in implementing change that were brought about by research. For example, the “Hidden in Plain Sight” study in Atlanta helped to launch the “Dear John” social marketing campaign, which in turn helped mobilize law reform and collaborations working toward establishing anti-demand law enforcement efforts. The Wilberforce Act authorizes and/or mandates over a dozen studies, reports, and data collection efforts, including requiring the Uniform Crime Reports (UCR) to distinguish between “buyer” and “seller” in prostitution events. Among the studies that could be initiated are:

- **For unproven initiatives, a system of evidence-based implementation, monitoring, and refinement should be established.** Some interventions have evidence of impact and cost-effectiveness, and a consensus could be reached to support certain endeavors early in the Campaign. For example, arresting and educating buyers of commercial sex is effective and inexpensive (e.g., Poland et al., 2008; Shively et al., 2008; Weisburd et al., 2006), and social marketing (when properly targeted and executed) can be a useful tool for helping to mobilize support for other interventions (e.g., Grier & Bryant, 2005; Noar, 2006; O’Keefe, 1985; Randolph & Viswanath, 2004; Salmon & Murray-Johnson, 2001). The effectiveness and efficiency of other options remains to be demonstrated, so it is critical to choose or design demonstration projects, coupled with feedback mechanisms to monitor performance and measure impact. As interventions are found to produce results, they can be adopted as core practices or strategies of the coalition, through established processes of consensus-building. Demonstrations that do not fare well under scrutiny will either be refined and further monitored, or abandoned by the Campaign if it becomes clear that they are not promising.

For example, there should be evaluations of “shaming” tactics. More than half (59%) of the 655 communities in the U.S. that are known to have conducted reverse stings publicize the identities of arrestees. For many police departments, revealing identities of johns proceeds from an intent to deliver a punishment that serves as a specific deterrent, and general deterrence—sending a message to potential johns that their identities will be revealed if they are apprehended for soliciting sex. There are compelling arguments both for and against shaming. Proponents argue that it is a powerful deterrent, perhaps more important than arrest and legal sanctions. Aforementioned surveys and anecdotal evidence lend support to this argument (e.g., Durschlag & Goswami, 2008; Farley et al., 2009), as does a body of criminology literature on the effects of social or extralegal sanctions on deterrence (e.g., Vold et al., 1998; Zimring and Hawkins, 1973). Opponents contend that the deterrent effect of this tactic is unproven, that shaming violates due process rights since identities are typically publicized upon arrest and prior to adjudication (American Civil Liberties Union, 2008), and that it negatively affects families of arrestees. Some cities that are very aggressive on combating demand (e.g., San Francisco) have chosen not to pursue shaming specifically because of the impact it may have on those associated with offenders, such as children and spouses. Given the prevalence of shaming and the potential for unintended consequences, it is critical to determine whether effectiveness justifies its use. To date, there has not been an evaluation of the efficacy of shaming.
As interventions are found to be feasible to implement, sustainable, and effective in meeting their objectives, they become evidence-based practices. For the National Campaign, standards could be put into place for defining and determining thresholds for what it will regard as sufficient evidence of effectiveness, and also for what kinds and levels of impact will be regarded as compelling. For example, lower recidivism rates relative to comparable groups are the typical measure of impact for offender treatment or deterrence programs. Education programs must be judged by different standards and success must be assessed using other measures, such as longitudinal surveys of treatment and control groups, or objective measures such as arrest rates. Studies using objective measures have advantages, since they are free of survey response biases and respondent deception, but they can be exceedingly expensive and difficult to execute.

The challenge in establishing standards of evidence is in determining the level or type of evidence required to convince not only the National Campaign’s coalition and leaders of a program’s value, but key stakeholders such as the agencies and NGOs operating and sponsoring the programs. Once the standards of evidence are established, there must be a determination of whether it is necessary or feasible to gather that evidence, given limits of time, expertise, data, and money available for performance measurement and evaluation. The general rule is that when programs are very costly, have high opportunity costs, or pose risks to subjects or to the public, then the standards of evidence rise. Conversely, when programs cost little and do not present great challenges or risks in their execution, then it is less urgent to have ironclad evidence that the programs produce significant impacts. For example, john schools cost little, those costs are typically covered by fees paid by offenders, and providing people with education poses little risk either to the public, offenders, or to program staff. Arguments can be made that the need for evidence of impact is less critical when deciding whether to invest in or promote those programs, compared to interventions such as programs requiring longer-term and expensive residential treatment or social marketing campaigns.

None of this discussion should be interpreted as an argument for acceptance of substandard evidence. The point is that the “gold standard” usually is costly, and is not always feasible to pursue, and that the major investments of time, skill, and money required to gather such evidence should be allocated for assessing interventions that are more costly or risky.

In addition to performance measurement and evaluation, there is a need for more basic research about the etiology of sexual exploitation that can inform effective interventions. For example:

- **Measuring treatment needs of arrested johns.** Most john schools approach all men with the same intervention, but we know that there are distinct sets of motivations that suggest different issues should be targeted by interventions. One of the principles of effective intervention is responsivity—matching the treatment with the needs of the treated. Ideally, one measures the treatment needs and risk factors associated with offenders, and provides treatment tailored to address those specific needs and risk factors. While this is an avenue worth pursuing, **there is one caution important to consider**, summarized by the phrase “the best can be the enemy of the good.” Providing multiple treatment modalities and implementing thorough needs assessments are each labor-intensive, and could raise the costs of treatment (john school education) to the point where it is unsustainable. Currently, one of the strengths of the john school model is that the vast majority of them operate little burden on public resources. Most are completely self-sufficient, supported entirely by fees or fines paid by the offenders. Current john schools also address a range of needs by delivering multifaceted education, so that the major
types of treatment needs are addressed even though all offenders receive the same intervention. While more individualized and responsive treatment is typically better, the costs could be prohibitive, and the prudent choice may be to continue with “one size fits all” interventions rather than having no intervention at all.

- **A study of the “demand curve.”** This research would focus on the points at which demand decreases in response to price. The concept can be expanded to examine how demand responds to availability of “supply” and the level of time and effort required to find persons to exploit.

- **Studying how men learn to buy sex.** While it is convenient and perhaps true that cultural forces (commodification of sex, inequities in gender roles, vulnerability of women and children, pornography, mainstreaming of prostitution culture) influence exploitation, the causal mechanisms are not understood. For example, most men are exposed to pornography, but the vast majority do not buy sex. It is unclear what portion of sex buyers would not have bought sex if they had not been exposed. We do not understand the “resistance” factors distinguishing non-buyers, nor conversely, the “predisposing” or causal factors distinguishing men who buy.

### Establish Criteria for Prioritizing Issues to be Pursued by the National Campaign

We have provided a strategic framework and listed a number of objectives to be pursued and tactics for doing so, but it will be important to carefully choose which initiatives to launch, particularly at the beginning of the Campaign. One of the themes stressed by the attendees of the donors’ strategy meeting in Los Angeles last November was that the Campaign should not spread itself too thinly, and should not try to do everything at once. Instead, the strategy for the beginning of the Campaign should be to focus on a relatively small number of achievable objectives, and develop a track record of success on which to build momentum and achieve broader support.

As discussed above, some of the initiatives that are candidates for National Campaign support could be initiated immediately or within the first year. Sufficient evidence exists about some interventions’ effectiveness that the Campaign could proceed with confidence to support them. For many other interventions, their ability to produce results is unknown because the programs are unevaluated, making them somewhat risky for the Campaign to support—particularly if they are resource intensive or are controversial enough to create divisions within the coalition.

To sort through the range of possibilities, it is important not only to place them within a strategic framework, but to establish criteria that can be applied to the options to help guide rational and systematic prioritization. We propose the following:

- **Time:** Refers to what can or should be mobilized sooner, and which interventions require more time to either prepare or to yield results. In order to grow the National Campaign and position it for long-term success, there may be a preference for selecting as earlier initiatives those capable of producing measurable successes and those that best represent what the Campaign wishes to be known for. Some initiatives cannot be mobilized before groundwork is done, such as passing laws to authorize certain initiatives, or conducting evaluations that establish which initiatives are worthy of investment.
• **Consensus:** Refers to what strategies would have greater consensus at the moment, and thus would be easier to launch soon and also to help establish and strengthen the early coalitions and workgroups. Conversely, starting with more divisive issues could break apart coalitions before they’ve had a chance to work together and build trust, cohesion, and momentum.

• **Resources:** We recommend prioritizing for earlier deployment those interventions that are less resource intensive, since we assume that the resources will be at lower levels in the early stages of the Campaign, and will grow as the Campaign builds upon success and attracts new donors. An “umbrella” strategy of the coalition and the Campaign is to start with discrete and manageable endeavors and accumulate “wins” to help build coalitions and thus the Campaign. Success will attract more capital and other forms of support, such as access to leaders and target populations, and will attract new partners to the National Campaign who bring useful capabilities.

• **Information:** As we discussed above, this Campaign should respect and rely upon evidence, insist upon results, seek to be efficient, and demand results proportional to investments. Those assumptions indicate a need to gather information before launching initiatives (as well as monitoring the performance of initiatives once they are underway). Therefore, strategic and tactical options about which we have information can be prioritized for earlier deployment, while those about which we have little information will be de-prioritized until the information gap can be filled with evidence of the potential for results.

• **Impact:** This is perhaps the most important criterion. It is critical that the Campaign starts out by doing something noticeable, substantial, and that will make an impact. In addition to being the whole point of the Campaign (make an impact, produce results), interventions supported by the National Campaign that have the potential to be very significant or will be proven demonstrably effective would energize coalitions and attract new investors. Using this criterion along with time (assuming we are focusing on initiatives to be launched earlier), we might de-emphasize education and mobilize behind political advocacy, a media campaign, or supporting local law enforcement efforts, for example. While education is ultimately very important—where initiatives interface with the targets, the johns—such projects may not be as exciting and inspirational. The message we have received from people who are knowledgeable about social movements and campaigns is that (initially, at least) a campaign needs to inspire as much as it needs to be pragmatic. Inspiration can push public opinion, which in turn can push law and policy and mobilize resources, which can in turn unlock more resources needed to support the nuts-and-bolts activities such as educating boys and men, and arresting johns.

• **Need:** It would reflect well on the Campaign if it targeted initially efforts that the coalition agrees are currently neglected, or have been beyond the resources of the fields to date. For example, other than local campaigns in Atlanta and Chicago, there have been few prominent social marketing campaigns.

**An Illustration: Applying the Criteria to Prioritize Initiatives for Early Deployment**

The following is an illustration of how the Campaign might unfold, when taking into account things that can and must be done immediately, and things that can or must be done later. Once again we qualify the following with the caveat that the Campaign’s leadership and the coalition will decide what to do and when to do it.
There are a number of reasons that some things cannot and should not be done at the outset of the Campaign. Some issues are more divisive than others. The question of whether to pursue some issues will spark debate within the coalition and among its leaders. While debate is unavoidable and can be healthy, it can also tear coalitions apart, particularly if there is not a firm foundation of experience in working together, mutual trust, and a track record of successful outcomes from their collaboration. It would make sense for the Campaign to begin by focusing on initiatives where there is greater consensus, and take on more divisive issues one the coalition has learned to work together and trust one another, etc.

Table 2.1: Criteria for Prioritizing and Timing Campaign Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria for Assessing When to Implement Initiatives</th>
<th>Timing of Initiatives</th>
<th>Indicates Suitability for Early Implementation</th>
<th>Indicates Need for Later Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consensus Within the Coalition</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources Required</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Information Required</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Need or Urgency</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Impact</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Social marketing/political advocacy.** A social marketing or political advocacy campaign—or a set of campaigns—is a good candidate for early deployment. One of the key objectives embedded in all of the other objectives and in the strategy itself is that the campaign must be inspirational. It must motivate people, not only the ones who were unaware and become aware due to the campaign, but those who know about the issue but for various reasons have not been moved to action. A properly executed and targeted social marketing campaign can help on this front, particularly if it features compelling survivor stories and links the damage caused by sexual exploitation to its cause, which is men choosing to buy sex.

When we apply the prioritization criteria, we find the following:

(a) There is substantial **consensus** within the coalition that social marketing is needed on a national scale, and that this is beyond the mission or capacity of most extant organizations.

(b) No new **information** is necessarily required, so there is no need to wait for new research to unfold. However, the main challenge in social marketing is developing effective messages, taking key pieces of factual information as well as compelling anecdotal information and transforming them into messages that hit their target—and doing that is an art as well as a science, and can take time to develop.

(c) Virtually everyone agrees that there is an **urgent need** to shift social norms and to generate political will that can support meaningful action. Social marketing is a method of pursuing both of those objectives.
The potential impact of social marketing campaigns can be high, although this can be difficult to isolate and measure, and assumes that the campaigns are well executed.

The only criterion that could be problematic in prioritizing social marketing is resources. Social marketing can be expensive. However, this can be overcome by being creative. The campaign need not make expensive media buys to be effective, and some forms of social marketing do not require media channels. As we saw in Atlanta, a local coalition cobbled together donated time on local television networks, and the same could be done for the National Campaign if resources are thin in its early stages. In addition, the Campaign could leverage the current range of “new media” (which by now should be considered simply the media), much of which transmits information to at little or no cost. If the coalition of donors wanted to support something early, they could invest in a good public relations/social marketing firm working with a task group or the coalition to develop branding ideas and messaging for the Campaign in general. A slogan or catch phrases could be adopted, a logo produced, and then printed materials and/or PSA spots produced.

Initially we would recommend that the first social marketing effort not be directed toward the broad public nationally, which is the most expensive audience to reach and the hardest in which to detect a tangible impact. We would instead recommend that a more targeted campaign occur first: for example, working with the media and the District of Columbia to have stories carried on NPR and perhaps picked up by local print and television media—all of which would be disseminated without cost, incurring only the investment in producing the messages and/or stories and doing outreach to the media. This could be coupled with local radio spots that are inexpensive relative to television. Given the compelling nature of this initiative the Campaign could garner pro bono or discounted support such as featuring celebrities already interested in contributing, leaning on media outlets, and working with sympathetic media production groups—like the Atlanta Women in Film did for the “Dear John” campaign discussed in Part II of this report. A comprehensive blitz would be primarily intended to catch the attention of policymakers and the informed and politically active public, and to lay the groundwork for specific efforts to reach policymakers with specific and well packaged appeals to take action to eliminate sexual slavery by focusing on its cause—demand.

Social marketing and political advocacy can blend and triangulate with other types of initiatives to produce synergies and cumulative effects. For example, the Campaign may advocate for Congress to hold hearings on federal performance in complying with and enforcing the TVPA. If the hearings were held, they would draw attention and could be media events. The National Campaign’s group that works to educate and monitor the media could help to ensure the accurate coverage of the hearings, and the Campaign’s education task group and research capacity could help to assemble information to Congress as they ask questions, and to the agencies answering them.

- Technical assistance for local initiatives. Social marketing is designed to draw attention, but one of the potential pitfalls is that once people start paying attention they may not know what tangible things should be done. This is where an over-reliance or exclusive focus on social marketing reveals itself as ineffective unless it is a complementary piece of more comprehensive action. Awareness alone does not create change; awareness must lead to action, and action must be well thought out and properly directed and executed if it is to
produce results. For the Campaign to be sustainable and maintain the long-term support of a broad coalition that includes front-line, grassroots practitioners out in communities who are arresting offenders and preventing crime, the first set of National Campaign activities should include a plan for helping them.

Using the criteria to establish priorities, we recommend that technical assistance be one of the first initiatives aimed at supporting practitioners. The benefit of this is that there is broad support and consensus about the need for it. Technical assistance can be inexpensive and can be mobilized quickly, and it can provide an impact by tangibly helping local programs, which would help to create a positive “buzz” about the Campaign at the grassroots level. The Campaign could also sponsor web-based or in-person conferences that could have additional benefits of garnering media attention. Obviously there is more to technical assistance than websites and conferences, but these options can be launched quickly and without large investments and then presented as victories of the Campaign quickly, inexpensively, and with little effort. The development of the technical assistance component could happen concurrently with the development of the social marketing campaign, but would not be publicized or pushed forward as the leading initiative of the Campaign. It would be intended to support the foundation of the field, which is comprised of practitioners who do the heavy lifting in the fight against sexual exploitation.

- **Political pressure on Congress for “End Demand” appropriations.** One of the efforts that could be launched immediately with little preparation and modest resources is to engage in political advocacy targeting the End Demand provisions of the TVPA 2005 reauthorization. $25 million per year was authorized by Congress in 2006, and still awaits appropriations. A strategy could be developed early, and could proceed relatively quietly while the other initiatives are moving ahead. It would be energizing if the National Campaign were successful in pushing through those appropriations. It would unlock millions of dollars in a grant program for communities to conduct additional reverse stings, or to implement, expand, or improve john schools, among other things. Unlocking those appropriations would be a tangible victory for the Campaign, and would energize and foster buy-in from practitioners.

- **Education.** This might not be the lead initiative in terms of visibility and immediate measurable outcomes, but ultimately may be the most important activity supported by the Campaign. There is great consensus in the coalition and in the field, and it is clear that education attacks the root causes of demand and therefore sexual slavery and exploitation. Rather than being an energizing early step, education provides a solid foundation as a long-term investment—and moreover, failing to address education would be a potentially fatal omission. If the Campaign in its early months appears uninterested in education, it would look superficial and reactive, rather than proactive and prepared to do the unglamorous, hard work necessary to combat the demand driving sexual exploitation. We recommend that a task group form and work on developing curricula for various audiences, particularly (a) boys, (b) business, (c) military, (d) heavily male affinity groups—such as college fraternities, certain sports groups, etc.

- **Survivor leadership.** Survivor participation and leadership is embedded in other categories of activity, but it is important to highlight it as a major part of the National Campaign and a separate tactical area that will be invested in by the Campaign. Survivors will be very
important in (a) developing the messages for—and perhaps being featured in—a social marketing campaign, (b) lobbying at all levels, including lobbying Congress for appropriations for the End Demand provisions of TVPA 2005, (c) educating a broad range of people, and (d) facilitating local action—e.g., they currently are critical to many of the john schools and public education efforts.

In Figure 2.5 we present a sketch of an illustrative timeline for various National Campaign activities, adhering to the categorizing presented earlier and relying upon the criteria for determining what kinds of activities can and should occur earlier versus later. It is not meant to be a comprehensive blueprint, but instead to present some ideas and a framework to be considered by the steering committee and coalitions.

The key idea is that some initiatives and activities can and should be started immediately: installing leadership, placing it within an institution, gathering support, collecting information, working on prioritizing targets and tactics, and carefully selecting a few endeavors to launch the Campaign in such a way that it builds success and creates momentum and additional support.

One consideration to be weighed when prioritizing activity and developing performance feedback mechanisms is determining what kinds of outcomes or measures of success to rely upon. Few initiatives will be able to produce evidence of effectiveness measured by impact on the Campaign’s major goals: reduction in commercial sex markets. Therefore, many initiatives will need to be judged by intermediate or process measures. For example, it will take years to learn whether boys exposed to education are less likely to buy sex; success for the education initiatives should be measured in terms of benchmarks or process measures such as whether a curriculum has been developed, piloted within a school district, approved by a State board of education, or fully implemented.

### Timing and Opportunity

One can argue that the timing is right for this initiative. Over the past 30 years, the pioneers have lit the flame and kept it burning. They identified a need, took action, and have brought us to a point where it is possible for governments to pass laws, and police to enforce them. They developed the language now used to describe modern-day slavery, commercial sexual exploitation, combating demand, etc. The Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons was founded and staffed, and produces an annual “report card” on nations’ performance combating modern-day slavery. Dozens of anti-trafficking organizations have sprung up throughout the nation, and the mainstream media routinely covers human trafficking events, law enforcement operations, passage of new laws, and human interest pieces on survivors. The artistic community has mobilized, producing excellent documentaries and dramatic films on human trafficking and prostitution. Celebrities have emerged as spokespersons and as donors through foundations focusing on exploitation. Major donors have begun to invest in anti-slavery and a few anti-demand initiatives, and it appears that a substantial new infusion of resources from private donors may be brought to bear on combating sexual exploitation, and may in turn produce the political will to increase the commitment of government agencies.
### Figure 2.5: Illustrative Timeline for Select National Campaign Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Establishing Campaign' Leadership and Institutional Framework</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appoint Steering Committee, Task groups, and Campaign Director</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish National Center to End Sexual Exploitation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish website, technical assistance vehicles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulate Mission Statement, Values, Objectives, and criteria for prioritizing and timing of initiatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form coalitions, establish processes for maintaining it and allowing members input to help shape the Campaign</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formalize Donor’s Coalition, line up resources and revenue streams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalize strategic plan/business plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage Campaign, support initiatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support the field: convening, advocacy, research, dissemination, technical assistance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Education Initiatives</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop model curriculum for schools</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot in states</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement in states</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop curriculum for prosecutors, police</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and implement media training programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Initial Social Marketing Campaigns</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct foundational research on information needs</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify target audiences, prioritize targets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assemble message content</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retain social marketing firms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produce initial messages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field social marketing campaigns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As new information &amp; resources accrue, new targets identified &amp; new campaigns developed and launched</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Law Enforcement Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Launch, maintain technical assistance program and website</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select demonstration programs various configurations; monitor and evaluate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support demonstration programs proven effective or promising</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support initiatives that are already evidence-based</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be argued that human trafficking is a “front burner,” “front page” issue at the moment. However, there are also signs it is not yet there, and also signs that public and political interest could be at peak and may recede before major, permanent changes are accomplished. Whether interest is still building or may be on the verge of receding, it is important to proceed with a sense of urgency. There may be no better time to leverage the current level of interest to support ambitious action, and the opportunity may soon close. However, the issue has room to grow in prominence, and the level of attention it now receives should not be cause for complacency or for feeling that victory over slavery is near. At a minimum, even if public and political interest and attention are still on an upward trajectory, one cannot be satisfied with where things are at the moment. More prominence, urgency, and most importantly, effective action is necessary for a paradigm shift to occur, or to tell when such a shift might be underway.

If the issue is at or near a peak of interest and opportunity, there are risks involved in being in that position. Issues cycle in and out of prominence in both the public eye and the “policy space” in which lawmakers and policymakers operate. Domestic violence, hate crime, and street gangs have all been front page news in recent decades, and while the nature of these problems has not changed substantially, they are no longer at the forefront of public and media attention, and therefore of political attention. Fortunately those movements institutionalized change, establishing solid, permanent presences in the form of centers and foundations, passage of laws and promulgation and implementation of policies, that have been sustained even as the spotlight has moved on to other issues. For example, the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children was established and has remained a robust force in the movement against the inhumane treatment of children. Similarly, the Southern Poverty Law Center, the NAACP, the Anti-Defamation League, and many other organizations have established a presence and sustained successful, long term efforts to combat hate crime and other forms of discrimination.

Human trafficking, modern-day slavery, and commercial sexual exploitation are relatively “hot” issues at the moment, but the level of attention will not last. The spotlight will eventually move on to something else, and when it does, it is imperative that the paradigm shift has been accomplished. If we are at the crest of a wave, there may never be a better opportunity to strike. If so, the luxury of a great deal of time to make the push necessary to produce a paradigm shift cannot be assumed. The National Campaign’s leaders and partners must make every effort to ensure this is done right the first time, because there may not be time to regroup if there are false starts. There are many ways to squander the opportunity, and they must be avoided. Among the biggest mistakes that could be made are:
• Launching piecemeal actions that are not carefully targeted and are uncoordinated.
• Making insufficient investments where more substantial investment is needed.
• Infighting, resulting in a weakening or fracturing of the coalition, obscuring the Campaign’s message and focus, and presenting a divided front, making it easy for opponents to take heart and for opponents to simply wait us out without taking action until our results fade, and the next big issue comes to the forefront.
• Poor staffing decisions. Even if everything else is done correctly, if the wrong people are placed in the key positions, the whole initiative could be derailed.

By substantial investments, we do not refer only to money, nor do we wish to imply that all of the most important types of action are highly resource intensive. For example, it is not necessarily costly to launch local campaigns of political advocacy, building public pressure on local agencies to fund authorized initiatives, enforce current law, and comply with statutory mandates. There are people, organizations, and coalitions that have led and collaborated on effective campaigns in the last decade; the capacity exists and could be re-mobilized with effective leadership and sufficient resources. A relatively small group of individuals working full-time on the Campaign may mobilize action and accomplish much, particularly early and on specific issues. While national social marketing campaigns can easily cost tens of millions of dollars—and might be excellent investments, provided that they are well-executed and properly positioned as complementary pieces in comprehensive, multifaceted efforts (and could be tragically wasteful, if executed poorly)—$200,000 to $500,000 might be sufficient to make a major push to mobilize the federal government to have oversight hearings on why so many of the TVPA and Wilberforce mandates remain unmet, and/or to appropriate the $25 million per year authorized in the TVPA-2005 for anti-demand programs, for example.

We believe it is critically important to support the base of practitioners if they are to be asked to work on behalf of, or in collaboration with, the National Campaign. Foundations are often willing to spend relatively large sums of money on social marketing/PR campaigns, but are sometimes more conservative when it comes to compensating practitioners with whom they collaborate. Failing to respect the time and limited resources of practitioners is not only unethical and exploitive, but it weakens their ability to serve as effective practitioners by adding burdens to already distressed budgets and time limitations. It also guarantees substandard contributions by collaborators, because they can only participate in their spare time, and they already are typically overburdened by their “day jobs” as practitioners.

When looking at a list of things that need to be avoided by the Campaign, it becomes even more acutely evident that the Campaign’s leadership will be absolutely essential to success. Its leaders must make wise investments of resources, must make substantial investments where necessary and conserve resources where we are uncertain or skeptical of the return on investment of certain actions or where relatively modest investments are sufficient to get the job done. Leaders must establish clear objectives and priorities and coordinate action, and sequence activities in such a way that the most urgent issues are attended to and that we pursue those things that we are prepared to pursue properly when we are ready. We can build upon success early to help the Campaign gain momentum and can attract support and investors. Leaders must be able to avoid conflict where avoidable, manage it properly where it is unavoidable, and hold together broad coalitions where they are needed for broad action with a national scope. Leaders must also be able to maintain smaller coalitions that will have
the consensus necessary to target specific issues, even if that same coalition could not be held
together to pursue other endeavors falling under the umbrella of the Campaign. Effective leadership
must facilitate and maintain collaboration where there is common ground, and partition the effort so
that people who cannot agree on certain issues can still be involved and contribute without having
other areas of disagreement make them abandon the Campaign altogether.

As a working assumption in the formative stage of the Campaign, Hunt Alternatives Fund has
stipulated that the Campaign should be designed to last for 10 years. There are many advantages to
establishing such a timeframe. A substantial timeframe conveys the message that the Campaign is
serious and substantial, and intends to see things through until its objectives are achieved or
substantial progress is evident. In addition, the key advantage of the decade timeframe is that it will
facilitate planning, and allow for a sequential rollout of initiatives and the establishing of information
feedback loops and refinement. Also, it will facilitate effective staffing and partnerships. For
example, if the Campaign is of the scope that is anticipated, there will be a core staff of leaders and
support personnel. People will make career decisions and take positions as leadership or staff tasked
to pursue the National Campaign, and it will be much easier to attract staff if they know that the
Campaign is designed to last, rather than push for a few years and then dissolve—much like many
grant-driven programs do. In addition, the Campaign will be comprised of a variety of targeted and
sometimes localized initiatives, and for people to prioritize the work of the Campaign and fit it into
already busy schedules and already stretched resources, it will be important to know that the
Campaign intends to operate for more than a very short timeframe.

While there are advantages to the 10-year timeframe, there is the potential for one disadvantage: it
could convey the message that substantial accomplishments cannot be expected soon. The way social
movements often work is that there are long periods of plodding work and plateauing, where progress
is slow and incremental, but that tipping points can be reached or opportunities emerge that allow for
quite sudden breakthroughs and monumental shifts to entirely different levels of achievement.
Hopefully, this Campaign will be a driving force behind a substantial and swift shift, and it should not
be assumed that 10 years will be needed to see results.

Given the amount of attention that human trafficking currently receives and the apparent readiness of
the field to be mobilized, there is no reason to believe that significant accomplishments cannot occur
within the first year or two of the Campaign. Even if breakthroughs occur relatively quickly,
commitment to a longer timeframe will still be necessary. Breakthroughs do not mean that the
problem is solved, and it is likely that there will be evident, tangible needs for the Campaign to work
for the entire decade and beyond to ensure that early gains are maintained, and to implement
programs and practices that may be authorized or funded early in the Campaign—but not yet
executed.

That said, it is important to proceed aggressively and to approach the first year with a sense of
urgency, fully expecting to achieve significant successes in mobilizing action that will lead to a
paradigm shift that is the ultimate goal of the Campaign. We also believe that it would be a fatal
mistake to proceed so deliberately that the Campaign is not expected to be at full strength until three
or five years out. While many initiatives cannot be launched immediately, and the knowledge
necessary to launch them will take years to assemble, those longer-term initiatives should be running
parallel while the most visible major efforts move quickly to push public opinion and political will
over tipping points immobilizing action.
Framing the National Campaign and the Issues it Pursues

How the issues are framed and presented will have important consequences for many aspects of the National Campaign. Part of the framing issue is addressed when the Campaign decides upon its priorities and actions. What the Campaign will be about and how it will proceed sets the boundaries of how its core issues can be framed. However, given a set of clearly defined issues, priorities, and a course of action, there is a great deal of flexibility in how they can be presented, and choices made about emphasis and communication strategy can affect how successful the Campaign will be in forming and holding its coalition, attracting donors, influencing the public, and generating the political will necessary to support effective interventions.

As usual, we qualify our comments with the caveat that Hunt Alternatives Fund and the Campaign’s leaders will first determine what the Campaign will do and how it will proceed, and our comments are advisory and based on assumptions that may or may not apply to endeavor’s final form. For the moment, let us assume that the Campaign will focus on the set of core objectives outlined earlier: impacting buyers and potential buyers of commercial sex by engaging in a number of efforts reaching them directly, such as education and law enforcement operations. The Campaign will also pursue objectives to make those direct interventions possible and effective: producing a paradigm shift in public awareness and political will, which will give practitioners the resources and the mandate to take effective action.

Within that framework, there will be a focus on particular targets, and on strategies and tactics that are concrete and can be described in ways that are easily understood. Once finalized, the values, principles, and assumptions driving the Campaign can be clearly understood among donors, the coalition, and partners. To date, those we have interviewed for the landscape analysis generally agree that the Campaign should focus on:

- Demand for commercial sex
- Commercial sex defined as both prostitution and sex trafficking/sexual slavery
- Commercial sex involving both adults and children

As we discuss elsewhere in this report, but summarize here as a reminder, there are empirical and logical reasons for choosing to pursue these issues: (a) demand is the key driver of sexual slavery; (b) when focusing on the buyers of commercial sex, it is neither possible nor necessary to distinguish between buying sex from prostituted persons versus buying from enslaved persons; (c) the Campaign’s current leaders are concerned with exploitation and enslavement of all people, so will not confine themselves to focusing on crimes against either children or adults.

The emphasis placed on certain initiatives and how they are described will be important. For example, the Campaign may work to combat all forms of sexual exploitation, but may “brand” the Campaign by presenting is as an anti-slavery effort. Obviously, the priorities and activities of the Campaign should be closely aligned with how the Campaign is publicly presented, but there are many choices in how to present an endeavourer that is comprehensive and complex. These choices will be important for branding the Campaign and aligning its nuts and bolts activity with its higher-profile media work, social marketing, training, and public education campaigns.
There should be consistency across the elements of the Campaign so that the larger effort and the organization providing its underpinnings do not become muddled or seen as disorganized or working at cross-purposes. Creating a clearly focused and easily understood public face for the Campaign will involve choosing words carefully in describing the Campaign, and being selective in choosing which activities or targeted initiatives to highlight publicly. Some of the specific endeavors undertaken may have more strategic value to publicize, because they may quickly produce tangible evidence of success or are less divisive. Other issues may be important in the long term, but may not be easily understood as valuable and may take years to produce evidence of effectiveness.

With these general parameters in place, the Campaign’s leaders will need to determine what to emphasize when communicating with the public and other target audiences, such as legislators, media members, educators, judges, police, and public health officials. Certain messages will resonate with some audiences but not others, even when they all refer to the same core objectives and activities. Among the most critical presentation or framing issues raised by those we interviewed for this project are:

1. Framing the issues as primarily about sexual slavery, sex trafficking, prostitution, or sexual exploitation
2. Emphasis on adults, children, or equal emphasis on both
3. Presentation as a cross-cutting human rights issue, or emphasizing greater occurrence in groups defined along lines of gender, race, or class
4. Emphasizing certain targets of intervention and tactics
   a. Police tactics
   b. Public health consequences
   c. Role of pornography as a causal factor in (or a form of) sexual exploitation
5. Language used to describe people, roles, acts associated with sexual exploitation
   a. Offenders: “johns” versus “buyers,” “customers,” “men who sexually exploit,” “rapists” (the latter being particularly appropriate for men buying sex from children)
   b. Offenders: pimps versus sex traffickers
   c. Prostituted person, sexually exploited, sex slaves

There no single or “right” answer when making choices among the options. For the National Campaign leaders’ consideration, we offer the following discussions about some of the key framing and presentation issues that arose during our research for the landscape assessment.

**Language**

One of the messages we frequently encountered during our research for this project was, “words matter.” The language used to describe commercial sex and those involved in it reflects different positions about the nature of commercial sex and exploitation, and how best to regulate or combat it. The right words can inspire, strengthen resolve, and mobilize action. The wrong choices can alienate potential supporters, fracture coalitions, and bring effective action to a halt.

There are instances where it is most appropriate to use a term such as commercial sex provider or prostituted person when describing those engaged in selling sex or being sexually exploited. There
was debate among those interviewed about whether the term “prostitute” should ever be used, and consensus that children engaged in commercial sex are never to be referred to as “prostitutes,” but instead as victims or survivors of commercial sexual exploitation or rape. Prostitute is seen by many as a pejorative, stigmatizing label that attempts to define people simply by their role in commercial sex. The term is regarded as failing to convey the force, fraud, coercion, and/or exploitation to which the providers of commercial sex are often subjected, and can be interpreted as implying a level of self-determination that is seldom experienced by those with pimps or traffickers. However, many survivors or providers of commercial sex refer to themselves as “prostitutes” or former prostitutes, and do not use the term “prostituted person” because they were not compelled by a third party.

Many opponents of commercial sex refer to prostitution with the term “commercial sexual exploitation,” and refer to those serving as prostitutes as “prostituted women,” “victims of commercial sexual exploitation,” or “survivors.” The buyers of commercial sex are described as “offenders” or “exploiters” rather than as “clients” or “customers.” The use of these terms is an attempt to describe commercial sex in the language of crime and exploitation, and to convey the sense that prostitution is something detrimental and done to women for the benefit of others, rather than something done by women to benefit themselves. Proponents of decriminalization or legalization prefer the phrases “the sex trade,” “sex work,” or “the sex business,” and refer to the providers of commercial sex as “sex workers” or “providers,” and to the consumers of commercial sex as “clients” or “customers” (e.g., Almodovar, 2006; Brents & Sanders, 2020; Delacoste and Alexander, 1998; Scoular, 2010). These terms seek to legitimate prostitution by describing it in the language of the conventional workplace. There was a strong consensus among those we interviewed that the term “sex work” is never appropriate, since it implies a legitimate form of labor, while the Campaign is based on the premise that selling sex is exploitation or slavery, and is never work.

**Supporting a Comprehensive Approach to Ending Sexual Slavery**

As we have discussed elsewhere in this report, the Campaign’s leaders have chosen to focus on combating demand, but should not allow the approach to be framed in ways suggesting that combating demand is more important than addressing supply or distribution, or that the resources devoted to demand will be at the expense of programs helping survivors and enforcing law enforcement’s work against traffickers.

To be effective, the combined effort to combat sexual slavery must be comprehensive and address all three components of the market. Historically, the emphasis has been on supply and distribution, and very little attention has been given to demand. The National Campaign’s focus on demand is intended to fill a gap, bringing balance to the overall effort to combat sexual exploitation (prostitution as well as sexual slavery) by providing a new infusion of resources and commitment to the market component that has been underserved.

The Campaign should be prepared for critics who will suggest that the Campaign will “rob Peter to pay Paul,” diverting resources away from survivor programs and efforts to prosecute pimps and traffickers. At a presentation at the National Planning Meeting, we argued that the Campaign will bring a new infusion of resources into the fight against sexual slavery and exploitation. One of the participants approached us afterward and argued that public and private support for initiatives is “a zero-sum game,” and that there is a finite pool of resources: if more are devoted for one particular
effort that must come at the expense of other programs, whose funding must be reduced. Our response was to say that the National Campaign anticipates that many of the prospective donors do not currently fund any efforts to address sexual slavery or exploitation, and those new donors will be asked to begin supporting anti-demand efforts. Those that already support supply or distribution-focused interventions will be asked to increase their overall giving by providing support to anti-demand programs, while maintaining their commitment to other interventions.

The chief risk in allowing the Campaign to be framed as shifting rather than adding resources to anti-slavery efforts is that it could alienate the majority of those involved in anti-slavery and anti-prostitution work. Given that most people and organizations with knowledge and capacity to fight sexual exploitation and sex trafficking are currently engaged in supply or distribution focused efforts, most of the potential members of the coalition and of separate initiatives supported by the Campaign will be from those fields. They would certainly resent (and will likely decline to support, if not actively oppose) the new National Campaign if they perceived it as undermining their core work, or effort that they rightly value that focuses on survivors and pursuing pimps and traffickers.

The Campaign should avoid unnecessary conflict by emphasizing that it seeks to expand the overall pool of resources available to combat sex slavery, and not to shift money away from other efforts. The Campaign should also make sure that that emphasis reflects the reality of its funding streams, in part by asking donors who already support supply and distribution focused programs not to reduce those levels of giving in order to support the demand focused Campaign.

**Focus on Primary Prevention**

Primary prevention refers to stopping events before they occur, or ensuring that people do not become afflicted by crime (or disease), rather than treating its symptoms. Secondary prevention refers to early detection, in an effort to minimizing harm, while tertiary prevention addresses recovery from fully realized afflictions. The majority of efforts in the United States described as preventive pursue tertiary or secondary approaches. Very little investment has been made in primary prevention approaches.

We recommend that the Campaign frame its efforts as pursuing primary prevention: reducing the number and activity of men who buy sex, and intervening so that boys do not grow up to become men who buy sex, is the most promising way to ensure that people do not become sexually exploited. An absence of men who want to buy sex would put pimps and traffickers out of business, because there would be no profits to be made, because there would be no “customers” for their “service” or “product.” There would be no point in attempting to sell sex, either independently or due to being compelled by a trafficker, because there would be no market. Obviously, total elimination of commercial sex markets is unrealistic as a short-term goal, but there is no reason to assume that the markets cannot be significantly reduced, resulting in fewer victims—and that is the hallmark of primary prevention.

To rightfully be considered preventive, it must be demonstrated that the approach reduce the prevalence and incidence of sexual slavery or exploitation. Approaches that simply displace crime from one street to the next, from the streets to indoors, from one town to another, or from one set of victims to another, may be considered effective by people at the original locations, but not by the new hosts of sexual exploitation or by the new set of victims. Similarly, programs that help survivors
recover from being enslaved or exploited, or punish those who profit from selling sex, cannot be considered prevention programs unless they reduce the overall markets (although we again stress that efforts to help survivors and prosecute traffickers are critically important to restore lives and seek justice, and should be strengthened and expanded).

The only methods empirically demonstrated to substantially reduce the size of commercial sex markets are those featuring a focus on (or including as a component) combating demand. There is a lack of evidence showing that attacking pimps and traffickers or rescuing survivors affects the markets substantially. Sanctioning “providers” of commercial sex is not only unjust and inhumane, but ineffective in curtailing illicit commercial sex markets (e.g., DeMuth & Steffensmeier, 2004; San Bernardino County Sheriff’s Department, 1993), and successfully prosecuting “distributors” (pimps and traffickers) is difficult and costly, and convictions are rare.

Reductions in commercial sex markets should not be expected as long as demand is strong. Efforts to eliminate drug trafficking and drug abuse by attacking supply and distribution have proven ineffective. From an examination of the logic and causal mechanisms of any market, and the history of efforts to suppress illicit markets, one should not expect secondary or tertiary prevention efforts to have a substantial impact, since they address the symptoms more than the cause. Applying these lessons to sex trafficking, one could expect that if every survivor were rescued and every pimp and trafficker were arrested tomorrow, others would quickly emerge or be trafficked to take their places. When demand is strong and the trade lucrative, as in the illicit drug trade, new supplies will be found if current ones are interrupted, and new people will step into the role of traffickers as long as there are profits to be made.

Assisting survivors is inherently reactive. Once sexually exploited, damage has been done, and no matter how widespread or skillful support services become, the clear preference that is difficult to refute is to ensure that nobody becomes sexually exploited or enslaved in the first place.

One of the challenges in pursuing primary prevention is that the prevented event or the deterred offender is harder to visualize and does not produce the same response as the villains (pimps and traffickers) and the victims. There is less of an emotional reaction to crime prevention in general, and targeting buyers of commercial sex in particular, than there is to addressing the profound needs of survivors or pursuing tough sanctions against pimps and traffickers. Anyone with a trace of compassion is rightly moved by the harsh realities of the treatment of survivors, and can and should be horrified by the actions of pimps and traffickers. There is demonstrably far less public or professional outcry for education programs meant to persuade potential johns not to buy sex, or for getting tough with those who do, in pursuit of primary prevention.

The men who buy sex are often viewed as fools too inept to obtain sex conventionally, and vulnerable to the enticement of prostituted women. Others view them as driven by the inherently flawed nature of males, who are predisposed by evolution to obtain sex by whatever means necessary, and enabled by patriarchal systems and misogynistic culture. In these portrayals, the individual buyers of sex are rarely viewed as the chief cause of all commercial sex and most sexual slavery. Frequently, police will raid brothels or conduct street operations and arrest persons engaged in selling sex, and occasionally arrest a pimp, but simply let the “customers” go without any intervention, or after receiving less serious sanction than the victims or pimps. The weight of the evidence clearly shows
that there is less interest in pursuing the buyers of sex than in helping survivors or prosecuting pimps and traffickers. The National Campaign’s leaders and coalition members should examine whether greater support for the Campaign can be mustered by framing anti-demand efforts focusing on the buyers of commercial sex as primary prevention interventions.

**Emphasizing Sexual Exploitation of Children Versus Adults**

As we mentioned previously, one of the challenges to be faced will be establishing priorities for the National Campaign’s activities and deciding how best to communicate about them. Most of those providing feedback in our landscape assessment said that the National Campaign should avoid focusing on either sexual exploitation of children or of adults.

There were other opinions, however. It was suggested by some whom we interviewed that the Campaign should focus on sexual exploitation of children—which is, by U.S legal definition, human trafficking or sexual slavery, in addition to being rape. Combating sexual exploitation of children was described as “the low-hanging fruit” and a focus providing relatively easy “wins” with which the Campaign could build momentum. The arguments for focusing on children are compelling: children are obviously more vulnerable, and it is easy for anyone to see the inherently criminal and repugnant nature of the crime. Conversely, with adults involved in commercial sex, there is a question about whether selling sex is compelled versus voluntary.

While few would argue about the special egregiousness of crimes against children versus adults, our research team believes it is mistaken to expect victories against sexual exploitation to be more easily found in efforts to combat crimes against children. In relative terms, the low-hanging fruit is to be found in pursuing sexual slavery involving adults. One of the reasons we believe this is based on known difference in the causal influences of sex crimes against adults verses children.

The two major categories of causes of committing sexual exploitation are (1) individual pathology, and (2) cultural influences or normative support (i.e., the nature versus nurture debate). There are elements of both influences involved in these crimes. There are individuals who rape and sexually exploit others due to psychopathology, compulsion addiction, fetish, or delusion. There can be a mixture of both individual pathology and social norms as influences in any particular instance of a crime, but in the aggregate, it is clear that pathology must be the primary cause of sex crimes against children, particularly for sexual exploitation of the very young. There is very little social support for commercial sex involving children, and the level of social support declines as the age of the child declines. There is virtually no normative support for sex involving prepubescent, very young children. Men who pay for sex with five-year-old children are operating from pure pathology, as there is no social support to account for such behavior.

Figure 2.6 illustrates an important point (although imperfectly). The graph depicts how, in the aggregate, individual pathology plays an increasing role in the commission of sex crimes against children as the age of children declines, and that there is more normative support (and hence greater prevalence as a causal influence) for sexual exploitation of adults. But if one were to interpret this graph too literally, it could be misleading, e.g., suggesting that individual pathology ceases at some point to be a factor as the age of victim increases, and this is not true (in fact, if one were to extend the graph, individual pathology would begin to trend upward as victim age becomes defined as “elderly”). The intent of this figure is simply to provoke discussion about the relative influences of
social versus individual factors, since the two types of influences requires far different interventions and have different amenability to change.

Responding to sexual exploitation against children, law enforcement and other responders know what to do, and it is not very complicated or mysterious: they *investigate* (in response to reports, or proactively through “sting” operations), *arrest* and *prosecute* those creating demand (the buyers of sex with children), and *segregate* them from society (prison). Those who will ever be released must be intensively treated, and receive aftercare and monitoring when they return to society. Detecting offenders is simple—so simple, in fact, that a special news report has turned into a regular program, NBC’s *To Catch a Predator*. The show has someone pose as a minor seeking sex, engaging in chats, surfing the web, or posting ads where sexual predators find their victims online, then arrange a time and place where a sting operation awaits. Investigators with whom we spoke said they could make arrests all day long, every day, if they had the time and staff to do so. The limiting factor is the resources they have available to them.

If the National Campaign wants to focus primarily on attacking the cause of commercial sexual exploitation committed against children, the challenge is relatively simple. It can raise money from donors and give it to law enforcement agencies to catch more predators and lobby legislators to allow for longer prison terms and mandated, intensive, evidence-based treatment and aftercare. There is little evidence supporting expectations that these crimes can be prevented through shifts in social norms or education to those who do or will sexually exploit children.

The better target for effective prevention and demonstrable results is sexual exploitation of adults. The reason for this is that social norms play a larger role in the sexual exploitation of women, and social norms are far more mutable with smart and determined efforts to change them. Evidence for the potential to change the social norms driving dysfunctional and criminal behavior abounds, and we discuss it in more detail in Part II of this report. But briefly, the past few decades have seen enormous gains in normative responses to date rape, domestic violence, child abuse, racial discrimination, attitudes regarding sexual orientation, etc.
While some of the men who buy sex are driven by various dysfunctions or pathologies, it is also known that a substantial portion of the general population accepts, tolerates, or approves of commercial sex (e.g., Gallup Poll, 1991; General Social Survey, 1996; Lagos, 2008). With this level of normative support, relatively normal men, who are not generally crime-involved and not motivated to buy sex by a desire to inflict harm, feel comfortable purchasing sex.

Studies have found that purchasing commercial sex is relatively common and that the profiles of consumers of commercial sex are fairly mainstream and unlike those of other offender groups, although the population of johns also contains some dangerous criminals and sociopaths (e.g., Holzman and Pines, 1982; Kinnell, 2000; O’Kane, 2002; Reichert, 2004; Sawyer et al., 2001). A substantial portion of men in the U.S. admits to having purchased sex at some point in their lives, with most surveys finding between 10% and 20% admitting to this crime (e.g., General Social Survey, 2000; Michael et al., 1994; Monto, 1999; Sullivan and Simon, 1998). The rates found in the U.S. are similar to those found in Australia and Europe (see reviews by Sanders, 2008; Weitzer, 2007). With one out of every five or six men admitting to purchasing sex, it is clear that patronizing commercial sex is not primarily the result of deviance or pathology. It is equally apparent that since most men do not purchase sex, the behavior is not entirely normative and cannot be considered an intractable problem beyond the reach of intervention.

Studies of male consumers of commercial sex find them to be similar to the general population in most regards, and quite unlike most populations of criminal offenders (see, e.g., Kennedy, 2004; Lever and Dolnick, 2000; Monto, 1999; Monto & McRee, 2005). For example, a comparison of men who had been arrested for purchasing sex to a nationally representative sample of men (i.e., male respondents of a large-scale national survey) found that those who had purchased sex were more likely to have attended college, and were just 15% less likely to be married (41% for arrested johns versus 56% in the national survey; Monto, 1999). Similarly, Shively et al., (2008) found that a large proportion of the men in San Francisco’s john school program were demographically similar to the general population of men, when comparing Census data to the program participants (i.e., similar distribution of educated, employment, and marriage, and few of the arrestee sample had extensive criminal histories. Similar results have been found in other studies (e.g., Kennedy, 2004; Lever and Dolnick, 2000).

Many studies have examined men’s motivation for buying sex, and the aggregate finding is that there is a wide range of reasons for procuring sex from prostitutes (see review by Sanders, 2008). The distinct motivations identified in these surveys can be categorized into a few main types: (1) seeking intimacy (i.e., a way to approximate intimate relationships they are unable or unwilling to develop); (2) seeking sex without intimacy (a way to get sex without the investment and compromises needed for intimate relationships); (3) seeking variety (fulfilling a desire for sex with women of various  

---

7 Refers to a San Francisco Chronicle report on the referendum results for Proposition K, which proposed to decriminalize prostitution in the city. Forty-two percent voted for decriminalization. Source: http://articles.sfgate.com/2008-11-05/bay-area/17127067_1_anti-prostitution-million-bond-measure-city-voters

“types,” based on ethnicity, size, age, hair color, etc.), (4) thrill-seeking (being drawn by the “thrill of
the hunt” and the illicit nature of prostitution); and (5) pathology (drawn by compulsion, addiction, or
by forms of sociopathy, psychology, or misogyny where the intent is to control and harm). These
motivation sets must be addressed to advance primary prevention, and the Campaign’s leadership and
public education efforts should be designed to ensure that addressing them is framed in the public and
policy view as primary prevention programs.

**Demand Reduction as an Effective Public Health Intervention**

Public health professionals have long known that involvement in commercial sex places individuals at
very high risk for infectious disease, injury, and death. For example, prostituted persons have the
highest homicide rates of any distinct group of persons ever studied (Brewer et al., 2006), and rates of
infectious disease are from five to 60 times higher among providers of commercial sex than in general
populations (Jeal and Salisbury, 2004). In a national survey of U.S. school children, 20% of the girls
who were prostituted reported that they had had a sexually transmitted infection, compared with 4%
of girls in the group who had never exchanged sex for money or drugs (Edwards et al., 2006).

Reducing the size of commercial sex markets would have public health benefits. However, to date
most interventions have focused on harm mitigation among those who are sexually exploited (e.g.,
urging condom use among prostituted persons). Breakthroughs in research demonstrating the
effectiveness and cost effectiveness of demand-focused interventions in reducing the size of
commercial sex markets (Poland et al., 2008; Shively et al., 2008; Weisburd et al., 2006) should help
garner support among public health professionals to adopt anti-demand programs as an evidence-
based public health intervention. The public health field has vastly greater resources at its disposal
than criminal justice, the component of the federal government currently doing the most active work
against demand.

**The Campaign Should Not Focus on Arresting Pimps and Traffickers**

Several of the experts interviewed felt strongly that the Campaign should not focus on demand, but
should instead aggressively pursue the pimps and traffickers who sexually abuse and enslave women,
girls, and boys. This view is apparently held by many others, because the majority of commentary and
effort addressing modern-day slavery focuses on either prosecuting traffickers or assisting victims.

As the steering committee forms and leaders are empanelled, this may be a subject of discussion. One
of the parameters of the Campaign that we began this analysis with was that the focus would be on
demand, but it may be useful to provide a forum for direct input about this. We recommend that those
hoping for the Campaign to focus on reactive enforcement and victim services make an evidence-
based case for expecting these approaches to advance primary prevention—diminishing markets,
lowering incidence and prevalence, and resulting in fewer and less powerful pimps and traffickers.

We can find no evidence to suggest that focusing on prosecuting pimps and traffickers will produce a
greater impact on commercial sex markets than will combating demand. There is a great deal of
evidence showing that when there is strong demand for any illicit product or service, interventions
focusing on prohibition (curtailing supply and attacking distribution channels) are ineffective. They
can produce temporary localized effects, displacing crime to other locations or to other similar
products or services, or driving up the price, but they do not reduce the overall size of the markets, nor do they ameliorate collateral problems.

It is possible that supply and distribution focused prohibition approaches make a marginal impact on markets and prevent some crime, where demand is weaker: prohibition may deter some very casual drug abuse that may occur without law enforcement pressures and threats. Prostitution “sweeps” focusing on prostituted persons temporarily clears an area of visible activity, and persistent pressure will cause prostitution to move indoors, online, or around the corner, and if so, it is possible (but has not been demonstrated) that some buyers of commercial sex may not seek out prostitution if it is not readily apparent and easy to access. But the collective evidence is that the majority of sex trafficking and illicit drug markets have robust demand and are unaffected by enforcement tactics focusing on supply and distribution.

The Abt Associates project staff who worked on this project and report also conduct research and evaluation on enforcement of drug trafficking law. Abt Associates researchers are among the world leaders in estimating the size and features of the illicit drug trade into and within the United States, and in evaluating the effectiveness of law enforcement efforts to curtail illicit drug markets. From our research and familiarity with the vast research and practice literature, we are well qualified to comment on the efficacy of various strategies for combating illicit drugs.

**Lessons from Combating the Illegal Drug Trade**

There is a vast body of research on U.S. and international efforts to combat the illicit drug trade, and the weight of the evidence clearly points to one conclusion: enforcement efforts can produce temporarily, marginal, and or local impacts on drug trafficking and abuse, but the drug trade thrives nonetheless and problems surrounding these efforts may be exacerbated, rather than ameliorated, by them (see reviews by, e.g., The Drug Policy Alliance, 2010; MacCoun and Reuter, 2001; McBride et al., 2009; National Research Council, 2001; Reiman, 1990). While there are localized, modest benefits and tactical victories, the overall magnitude of the drug trade and harms caused by addiction and collateral crime remain as robust an effort, after decades and hundreds of billions of dollars pursuing a model aggressively attacking supply and distribution. Among the costs are enormous investments in incarceration of drug consumers and dealers, and the opportunity costs of such investments rather than pursuing primary prevention by combating demand (in the anti-drug effort, this refers to drug treatment and public education).

> “Efforts against the drug trade will not be effective as along as efforts to reduce global demand continue to be underemphasized.” (Felbab-Brown, 2010)

This is not to criticize law enforcement personnel or organizations. In fact, our experience examining their practices in the field has given us the utmost respect and admiration for their efforts, and it is clear that they are effective in pursuing their tactics and meeting mission objectives. Yet the case agents and multijurisdictional drug task force leaders themselves often refer to their work as “playing whack a mole.” One of the key flaws in the “get tough with the traffickers” strategy as the primary mode of intervention is that when there are profits to be made, traffickers will innovate and work around any tactic that effectively hurts their business.
Abt Associates researchers studied multi-jurisdictional anti-drug task force efforts along the Mexican and Canadian borders, and saw that they have indeed effectively tightened the borders, interdicting millions of dollars of illicit drugs, arresting thousands of traffickers, driving up the risks and costs of doing business for drug traffickers, and producing interruptions in local supplies and thus driving up costs. In particular, agents were having great success in interrupting the flow of marijuana across and into Washington state from Canada. Once losses reached a substantial level, the traffickers quickly adapted by transitioning from smuggling marijuana into the state to producing marijuana within the state. The overall availability and volume of marijuana in the state bounced back to previous levels, and the traffickers’ change in tactics effectively neutralized or rendered obsolete the successful (and expensive) tactics employed by law enforcement to better secure the border.

We go into this level of detail simply to illustrate the point that if law enforcement were suddenly to increase its commitment to arresting pimps and traffickers, and if it began to have greater success against them, it is likely that traffickers would adapt by changing tactics or replacing those arrested. If enforcement were enhanced, the less organized and less competent small-time pimps would be the first to succumb to law enforcement, and could be replaced by more highly coordinated human trafficking, drug trafficking, or organized crime networks. Or perhaps the same slate of pimps and traffickers would change tactics to avoid whatever was working for police. We have encountered no evidence to suggest that tightening enforcement against distributors of commercial sex will solve the problem, although it is a necessary complementary piece within a comprehensive strategy.

What to Avoid

While establishing priorities and framing the issue for public consumption will be activities of the Campaign’s leaders and the coalition, we offer input based on the information gathered in our landscape analysis. We believe it would be problematic if the Campaign were to:

- **Define sexual exploitation as a “special interest” or identity-based issue.** Among those interviewed and providing input at the National Planning Meeting, some individuals expressed a desire for the Campaign to frame sexual exploitation as a violence against women issue, or an issue of race and class-based injustice. While it is true that the vast majority of survivors are women and girls, and that traffickers prey disproportionately upon the poor and ethnic minorities, it is a violation of human rights and a crime regardless of any individual victim trait or structural position. No class or group is exempt from exploitation. Some of the feedback we received suggested there was a benefit in framing sexual exploitation as a women’s issue—and perhaps they are drawing upon successes in Sweden, Norway, and Iceland in establishing progressive laws against sexual exploitation by pursuing a gender justice and gender equity path. Some proponents of this approach may also believe that it would mobilize a strong base to frame a battle against sexual exploitation as a women’s issue. Others we interviewed proposed framing sexual exploitation as a race and or class issue.

For a number of reasons, we believe that positioning the issue as identity-based would be a high-risk, low-reward strategy. First, it could cause conflicts when pursuing law reform. Nearly all criminal law in the United States has evolved to avoid distinctions based on race, gender, or any other accidents of birth. The obvious roots of this tendency in the law are
found in America’s history of trait-based discrimination and inequity—thus, we have attempted to purge individual traits from the law. The primary exception is that our law does make distinctions based on age. There are obvious developmental and vulnerability justifications for treating minors differently, both as offenders and as victims of crime. Similarly, some state codes provide penalty enhancements for crimes against the elderly, or against those with disabilities. The other most notable exceptions are laws prohibiting discrimination based upon individual traits (e.g., race, gender, disability). Aside from such exceptions, one is hard pressed to find reference to gender or race in U.S. law.

Second, if the Campaign is framed as focusing on problems affecting only certain categories of persons, it could alienate persons of other categories afflicted by the same problems. This would narrow and thus weaken the coalition or coalitions necessary to produce a true paradigm shift.

Third, it is unnecessary to take whatever risks there may be by framing the issue as identity based. Any of the Campaign’s initiatives can pursue any strategy and function well by seeking to preserve the dignity and rights of everyone. Any identity-based or affiliative group can and should be attracted to a campaign seeking to end sexual slavery and exploitation of all people.

We stress, as we have throughout this report, that the Campaign’s leaders determining it best to frame sexual exploitation in a particular way does not preclude, nor should it discourage, any of the participants or partners in the Campaign from pursuing their own individual or organizational framing. For strategic and pragmatic reasons, those who lead the Campaign may determine that it is best not to frame sexual exploitation as a gender, race, or class issue. Obviously, many of the leaders of prominent organizations that have pioneered the battle against sexual exploitation are adamant about framing the issue as driven by race or gender and/or socio-economic status. They have their reasons, and when the frameworks they pursue work for them, and they should continue to pursue them within the domains of their home organizations or jurisdictions. It is not possible for a National Campaign to pursue any particular framework that will satisfy all potential collaborators. We hope that potential partners with different missions will endeavor to find common ground with the Campaign, and decide to contribute if they believe the common purpose is compelling.

- **Frame the National Campaign as politically partisan.** This is related to the point above. When one examines the major breakthroughs in the recognition of human trafficking and modern-day slavery, and in establishing initiatives to combat it, it’s clear that bipartisan support and diverse coalitions were critical to success. We should expect no different now or in the near future. If the Campaign is seen as an initiative of the political right or left, it will unnecessarily alienate substantial blocks of potential support. It will also distract from one of the most important assets that the fight against sexual exploitation has: the inherently powerful and compelling truth that sexual exploitation is a toxic, aggressive violation of the most basic human rights. The harm of such violations knows no boundaries based on race, gender, class, or political stripe. Framing the Campaign in partisan or special interest terms would be a betrayal of the fundamental principles motivating the Campaign.
• **Neglect practitioners.** One of the key objectives of the National Campaign is to shift widespread social norms, to create a critical mass of action by knitting together disparate initiatives scattered throughout the country into a coherent social movement. It is understandable that initiatives to pursue federal law and action, and high-profile social marketing and education campaigns, will receive significant attention from the Campaign’s leaders. However, we strongly believe that it would be a mistake not to have the National Campaign support local action, such as education programs, reverse stings, john schools, and community activism. There are a number of reasons for this stance. **First,** nearly all of the activity that will impact directly the general public, potential buyers of commercial sex, and actual buyers funnels through education programs and law enforcement initiatives. Many of the most likely targets of the National Campaign’s activity exist on a different level—for example, efforts to inspire Congress to appropriate funds for the End Demand provisions of the Wilberforce act, or creating a model prostitution or sex trafficking law. However, most of these federal or national-level initiatives are designed to mandate or facilitate action that will occur locally. For example, the End Demand act within the TVPA-2005 authorizes a grant program to be administered by the Department of Justice for education programs for men arrested for soliciting sex (i.e., john schools). While the programs would be federally funded and administered, the end result will be a set of john schools operating locally in various communities. Nearly all roads to the ultimate target populations run through local programs.

**Second,** in the advent of a large infusion of new capital available to combat demand, it would be inherently unjust if little or none of those resources are made available to support those who have been doing the vast majority of the heavy lifting in the efforts to combat sexual exploitation. Most local programs—whether a nonprofit developing an innovative curriculum for middle school boys, or police departments conducting reverse stings to arrest men who sexually exploit others, or collaborative efforts to develop and sustain successful public education or john school programs—operate on a shoestring, and most could clearly accomplish much more than they already do with relatively modest additional resources. There is widespread burnout among those who have continued to fight this fight with little recognition or support.

If the Campaign were to neglect its true foundation of local practitioners, we would anticipate several negative outcomes. It would alienate—and in some cases disable—those best positioned to be mobilized to do the heavy lifting once the National Campaign is fully operational. If the Campaign is successful in its political advocacy and public awareness, and the political will is generated to inspire agency heads and politicians to authorize and fund initiatives designed to combat demand, eventually, awareness and higher order laws and policies must be translated into concrete action. Once people are paying attention and willing to act, then what? The answer is that it will be necessary to turn public awareness and political will into concrete action. And the people with the most experience and knowledge and readiness to act are the ones who have a proven track record of taking the initiative, gathering and producing knowledge, and taking productive action.

Many of those who have led local efforts to combat demand over the last 20 years or so are struggling to survive in the current economic environment. Agency budgets have been cut, and private donors have cut back their funding in response to stresses upon their endowments.
and other investments. Even when the economy was much stronger, most initiatives to combat sexual exploitation operated with modest and, quite frankly, inadequate funding. Many police departments with the awareness, the need, and the willingness to address sexual exploitation have had their budgets cut and have had to prioritize other issues.

If the Campaign were to initially invest in high-profile, resource intensive public awareness campaigns and not provide resources for local practice, it would make the Campaign appear superficial, or “more of a show horse than a work horse.” If so, we would anticipate practitioners to either fail to support the Campaign or outright oppose it. We believe that opposition by credible and accomplished practitioners, in the form of accusations that its priorities are askew and do not address ground-level problems, would be damaging to the Campaign.

- **Under-invest in core functions.** While it’s true that it is never wise to be careless when spending or investing, it is also problematic to under-invest. One of the areas where foundations—as well as many governments—sometimes under-invest is in research. Most people in movements to abolish human trafficking and prostitution (as well as the media, practitioners, and government representatives) believe there is a lack of fundamental information, such as the number of victims, the total size of the commercial sex market, and the efficacy of interventions. For example, among the many people interviewed for this project, there was remarkable consensus about the need to conduct more research and gather information that can be used to illuminate, educate, and inspire people to act, and to help determine the most effective and cost effective forms of action. Experts in the field rightly lament the fact that some of the simplest, most basic empirical questions remain unanswered, and how widely divergent or conflicting “guesses” that serve as substitutes for sound data have been counterproductive, sowing seeds of uncertainty about the true nature and magnitude of the problem.

For example, there is no adequate mechanism for counting or estimating the number of domestic trafficking victims, the number trafficked across our borders, or the number of trafficking events that occur annually. The State Department cobbled together rough estimates of cross-border trafficking that fell from over 50,000 per year to less than 15,000 per year based on refinements of estimation methods. These estimates appear too low when considering that they do not include domestic trafficking, and when compared with other studies finding or estimating that there are several hundred thousand children trafficked in the U.S. for purposes of sexual exploitation alone (e.g., Edwards, 2006; Estes and Weiner, 2001; Shared Hope International, 2009). Then, all of those estimates appear high when compared to numbers of trafficking victims certified through the TVPA-delineated definitions and procedures, which have identified fewer than 200 victims per year—which includes both sex and labor trafficking.

- **Overemphasize the structural and systemic “root causes” of demand.** Throughout this report we have argued that ending sexual slavery and other forms of sexual exploitation requires attacking its chief cause, which we have argued is consumer-level demand for commercial sex. However, the causes of that demand, while critical for addressing for long-
term solutions, may be beyond the reach of the National Campaign, particularly within its assumed timeframe.

It is tempting to define the project in broad, sweeping terms, e.g., we can’t tackle demand without taking on misogyny, pornography, gender inequality, patriarchy, racial inequality, capitalism, etc. While these hypothesized root causes provide useful frameworks for examining the etiology of particular problems, and can inform the thinking behind developing solutions, insisting upon focusing the National Campaign directly upon them is unlikely to be productive. Mission creep, lack of focus, and amorphous goals and objectives can result. To have a measurable impact, there must be a sharp focus on a particular outcome or set of outcomes that can be measured and quantified. Clarity is essential, as is pragmatism—particularly in the short term. If the Campaign is to produce tangible successes so that it can attract donors, produce a higher public profile, and gain credibility among policymakers and practitioners, root causes of demand are the wrong targets.

Several of the people interviewed at the National Planning Meeting and elsewhere referred to patriarchy, capitalism, or misogyny as targets for interventions to end sexual slavery. Others referred to pornography as a primary cause. While the Campaign can begin laying the groundwork for any kind of initiative at any time, efforts to combat sexual slavery by addressing issues of patriarchy, capitalism, etc. should not expect short-term results, unless someone in the coalition has a promising strategy of which we are unaware. For example, addressing pornography will require patience when seeking evidence of effectiveness, since broad coalitions have aggressively fought to further restrict or ban access to pornography for over 40 years, and by all accounts it is more prevalent and accessible today than ever.9

That is not to say that the Campaign should not pursue these targets. What we are suggesting is that attacking such broad structural causes or targets of intervention that have been impervious to date will be unlikely to produce measurable results during the first half of the Campaign, and thus would not be as helpful in building success and gathering momentum.

Some of those we interviewed for the landscape assessment urged the National Campaign’s leaders to resist the impulse to go after root causes, since demography, economy, culture, etc. are generally beyond the reach of intentional manipulation or direct intervention. The Campaign must recognize that there are many intervening variables, each of which is likely to affect only a small portion of the target population. A “one-size-fits-all” solution is likely to be inappropriate and inefficient: it will apply to people who are not likely to buy sex in any case. Hence, multiple targeted interventions—or a menu of interventions—is needed. Focusing on one particular cause or one particular population (e.g., pornography, misogyny) will leave too much of the problem untouched.

Another possibility is that pornography may not occupy an “upstream” position in the causal chain leading to prostitution or sexual slavery, but instead may be parallel. Attraction or addiction to pornography may have the same causes as attraction or addiction to commercial sex, and perhaps the effective approach to combating pornography is the same as combating sexual slavery. Both are driven by demand, so perhaps treatment and education would lower demand for both. So far, focusing on supply and distribution has had little impact on curtailing either pornography or prostitution/sexual slavery.
How the National Campaign’s leaders handle the issue of what level of causes to address will have implications for how the Campaign will be led, and how effectiveness of the Campaign’s initiatives will be measured. For example, in light of the above, a significant achievement for the National Campaign would be to leverage a particular type of collaboration: the willingness of individual actors with proprietary programs to recognize that their programs may not be the best or most effective response to the particular problem at hand in a given community. A desirable outcome of the National Campaign would be to see groups reaching out to one another and saying, in effect, “I am dealing with the problem in my community that, quite frankly, you are more effective in remediating.” So I’m asking for you to take leadership on this problem; I’ll follow and support you.” In other words, the National Campaign should endeavor to leverage, create, and sustain a form of democratic leadership in the field.

At the practice level, we find this to be more common. In our experience working with practitioners who are combating commercial sex and sex trafficking locally throughout the United States, it seems to be the exception rather than the rule for police departments to contact other departments and ask for their advice or support. However, this seems to be less common at the policy level and among the major organizations focusing on modern-day slavery. Many of the organizations in “the movement” appear to be engaged in ideological or tactical disputes that prevent collaboration. There is also a practical barrier to NGO collaboration: to put it bluntly, NGOs compete with one another for funding, and to have their agendas and heard by donors, policymakers, the media, and the public. While it is common to see communication and some level of collaboration, is us a tall order expecting nonprofit organizations to recognize or admit that others may have found more effective solutions.

Assuming that the issues of addressing intermediate causes and collaboration are resolved, then the challenge of performance measurement and outcome evaluation come to the forefront. There are multiple causes and multiple types of offenders (purchasers of sex); the appropriate responses will therefore be multiple or numerous, as will necessarily be the performance measures and outcome evaluation protocols. Decisions about how to manage intervention with particular offender types will test the National Campaign’s strategic thinking and planning processes.

Preventing Opposition

There will be opposition to the National Campaign, particularly if it becomes highly visible and influential. One of the key drivers of sexual slavery is that it is lucrative (which, of course, is a direct function of the extent and robustness of demand), and there are powerful vested interests in maintaining or expanding markets for commercial sex. If the Campaign is perceived as a threat it will come under attack. While it may be unwise to think too defensively and better to focus on moving forward with evidence-based and promising practices, it was suggested by people we interviewed that it is important to prepare for opposition.

People engaged in combating human trafficking and prostitution are aware of the presence and nature of the opposition, and are experienced in handling it. People likely to serve on the steering committee or other positions of leadership for the National Campaign know the major arguments and tactics of
“sex work” advocates, and are adept at responding to their contentions. While individually and as organizations they have may have their arguments and tactics worked out, the National Campaign must establish its own identity and determine how best to respond coherently and cohesively. For example, proponents of legalized or decriminalized commercial sex often attempt to dismiss the arguments of abolitionists as pursuing a “moral crusade” (e.g., Weitzer, 2010). Faith-based organizations may be comfortable having their efforts portrayed that way, and may not argue the point. Other more secular organizations may want to argue that there are other bases to their opposition to commercial sex, such as the evidence of high risk of physical harm to “providers,” and finding that the average beginning of a “career” in commercial sex starts when providers are minors (and thus victims of various forms of rape and sex trafficking). The choices of whether and how to engage opponents must emerge from the identity to be carved out for the National Campaign.

A Libertarian Argument for Prohibition of Commercial Sex

To prepare for opposition sure to materialize, we present the following as illustrations of packaged responses that can be tailored and quickly disseminated as the need arises.

It is evident that most of the arguments for decriminalizing or legalizing commercial sex are founded in versions of—or principles shared with—libertarianism (e.g., Schrage, 2006; Weitzer, 2010; West, 1998). “Sex work” advocates who identify themselves as feminist contend that selling sex is a choice that should be made by women, that selling sex can be an expression of individual freedom or exerting control over what one chooses to do with one’s own body, and that the state has no business interfering in these personal choices. Other supporters of decriminalized and unregulated commercial sex are politically libertarian, and argue that there are no victims when two consenting adults agree to exchange money for sex, so people should have the right to make this exchange without government interference. Often, selling sex is grouped in with other “victimless crimes” like consuming illicit drugs or gambling. Many of these arguments include discussions of how people should be free to engage in risky behavior, provided they do not place others at risk. A statement by a judge in a recent prostitution hearing is presented in Appendix B, and an essay on prostitution published on a libertarian blog is presented in Appendix C, together illustrating many of these arguments.

Therein lies the fatal flaw in libertarian arguments for decriminalization: the erroneous premise that consensual commercial sex is harmless to others. This “no harm” premise is demonstrably wrong, and decriminalization as a strategy for protecting providers of commercial sex is misguided and certain to fail.

Libertarians argue that if one wants to take personal risks, so be it. But one of the foundational principles of libertarianism (as well as U.S. jurisprudence) is that government has the right and the obligation to prohibit behavior harmful to others. This legitimate protective role of government is acknowledged by even the most fervent libertarians. In the classic 1859 essay, “On Liberty,” John Stuart Mills—one of history’s greatest champions of individual freedom—writes: “…the only purpose for which power can be rightfully exercised over any member of a civilized community, against his will, is to prevent harm to others.”
Those for and against decriminalization argue over whether people are generally forced or coerced into prostitution, or are willing participants. But under libertarian principles, freely choosing to sell sex is irrelevant if it risks harm to others, and the evidence of that is overwhelming. “Customers” or johns frequently seek and pay a premium for unprotected intercourse and oral sex (e.g., Jeal and Salisbury, 2004; Strathdee et al., 2008), which greatly increases the risks of contracting and spreading STIs, HIV, hepatitis, tuberculosis and more (e.g., Fernandez et al., 2005; Gil, 1996; Remple et al., 2007; Simonsen, 1988). Surveys of prostituted women find that those insisting on always using condoms face income losses of up to 79%, because most customers prefer sex without condoms (Rao et al., 2003). Between 35% and 55% of samples of prostituted women said they had engaged in unprotected commercial sex, and 10 to 35% never use condoms while engaging in commercial sex (e.g., Hong-Jing, 2004; Jeal and Salisbury, 2004; Peralta et al., 1992; Rhode Island Family Life Center, 2009; Strathdee et al., 2008). Disturbingly, surveys have found just 47% of prostituted women to know whether or not they are HIV-positive; less than half had had health screenings in the prior year despite having sex with an average of 17 different men per week, and 45% were infected with hepatitis C (Jeal and Salisbury, 2004; Rhode Island Family Life Center, 2009). Other research has found clients of brothel prostitutes to have unprotected sex with both the women in brothels and their wives and other sex partners, providing an infectious disease “bridge” between commercial sex markets and the general population (Gomes and do Espirito Santo, 2005). With evidence such as this, one could entirely concede the point about voluntary participation, yet still have an ironclad libertarian argument for the state prohibiting prostitution.

If consenting adults want to put themselves at risk, they should be free to do so, but with prostitution others pay the price—particularly spouses and partners, whose health is also threatened. If a john doesn’t disclose or treat his disease, his partner may unwittingly pass it on to their children. The public health risks are present whether prostitution occurs indoors or elsewhere, or whether they are trafficked or “choose” to sell sex.

Even the staunchest libertarians agree that the state does not require that harm actually occurred in any given case in order to rightfully intervene. It must only be established that the behavior places others at risk. For example, drunk driving is illegal because the risk to others is unacceptably high, and indoor smoking is regulated to prevent harm to non-smokers. Most drunk drivers make it home without incident on any given day, but inebriation elevates the chance of causing harm, so drunk driving is illegal even when there has been no accident. U.S. courts have repeatedly upheld the government’s right and obligation to protect all citizens, even those who claim they do not want or need protection.

Opponents of criminalized prostitution argue that most of the irrefutable danger and dysfunction results from the illegal status of prostitution, and not in the nature of the “business” itself. When prostitution is not driven underground, they say, conditions improve. The premise that one must accept in order to believe that decriminalization improves conditions for “sex work” tortures logic and defies common sense: The pimps, traffickers, and johns who abuse providers of commercial sex at alarming rates when police may be watching will somehow behave better when police turn their attention elsewhere.

A fact that most advocates of decriminalization and legalization ignore is that it does not reduce or eliminate illegal prostitution. Decades of decriminalization have not protected
Rhode Island from demonstrable harm from prostitution, nor has Nevada’s legalized and regulated prostitution eliminated illegal prostitution. Las Vegas has a large illegal prostitution market, resulting in well over 1,000 prostitution arrests per year, although legal options are available nearby. In Australian states with legalized prostitution, studies have found that the majority of the commercial sex market functions illegally (e.g., Schloenhardt, 2009). Why? Mostly, illegal prostitution thrives alongside its legal counterpart due to simple market forces. Brothels and residential prostitution require substantial overhead investment to manage and regulate, driving prices above those of unregulated prostitution. There is a robust market for more inexpensive sex, and that is available only from illicit sources. In addition, many providers of commercial sex cannot or will not work successfully within the confines of a regulated workplace, due to issues related to addiction, the control of pimps, temperament, or choice.

In addition to the risk to others, the evidence is irrefutable that sex for pay poses prevalent and grave risks to “sellers” (Campbell et al., 2003; Newman, 2006; Nixon et al., 2002; Walker, 2002), particularly teens who are acutely vulnerable. Most runaway and throwaway girls are approached for commercial sex within 48 hours of appearing on the streets. Numerous studies (e.g., Edwards, 2006; Estes and Weiner, 2002; Farley et al., 2003; Shared Hope International, 2009) find the average age at which girls are drawn into prostitution is about 14 to 16. Even when men do not intend to buy sex from minors (and often, they do), it happens. Looks can be deceiving, and police have processed as adults, based upon their appearance, girls they have arrested who are 13 years of age and younger.

Keep in mind that ages 14 or 16 are averages, meaning that roughly half start even younger. That makes statutory rape or sex trafficking the typical beginning of a “career” in commercial sex. One cannot emphasize enough that, as opposed to what decriminalization advocates would have us believe, childhood sexual abuse is the typical start of life in the sex trade, and is the most common rather than the extreme scenario.

The list of personal risks goes on (Campbell et al., 2003; Newman, 2006; Nixon et al., 2002; Walker, 2002), and most of the negative personal consequences can then result in harming others. A U.S. study of nearly 2000 prostituted women followed over a 30-year period found prostitutes to have mortality rates almost 200 times greater than those found among other women with similar demographic profiles (Potterat et al., 2004). In that study, the most common causes of death were, in order: homicide, suicide, drug- and alcohol-related problems, HIV infection and accidents. The homicide rate among active prostituted women and girls was seventeen times greater than the rate for age-matched females in the general population (Potterat et al., 2004; see also Dudek, 2001; Salfati et al., 2009). After conducting a literature review and an analysis of nine different data sets, Brewer and colleagues (2006) concluded that, “Prostitute women have the highest homicide victimization rate of any set of women ever studied.”

The majority of women (and all of the girls) are raped while “working,” and over three-quarters are assaulted or robbed by customers, traffickers, and/or pimps (Baldwin, 2003; Miller and Schwartz, 1995; Potterat et al., 2004; Urban Justice Center, 2003; Zimmerman et al., 2008). Somewhat better conditions may exist in elite legal brothels or escort services, but research finds that crime and exploitation abound there as well. Even the most highly regulated, exclusive legal brothels in Nevada are armed with panic buttons (Brents &
Hausbeck, 2005; Malarek, 2009), due to the commonplace occurrence of rape, assault, and robbery. Most of the women in Nevada’s legal brothels still have pimps, in addition to the “house” taking half of their earnings. Circumstances are worse in unregulated brothels, such as those in Rhode Island.

Those arguing that selling sex is simply another form of work would be hard pressed to explain the profound differences. For example, unlike typical employment, people engaged in prostitution typically lose their market value as they age and grow more experienced, as opposed to real work. In fact, the market’s peak value for most providers of commercial sex occurs when they are minors who cannot even legally work, and declines throughout their late 20s and beyond. Prostituted persons retain only a small portion of their earnings after supporting drug addictions and “third party extortions of net residual earnings” (DeRiviere, 2006). They typically leave the sex trade suffering from debilitating health conditions, addictions, and mental health disorders arising from their work. After spending late childhood and early adulthood providing commercial sex or being sexually enslaved, attempts to enter the legitimate workforce are challenged by various emotional and physical debilitations, a criminal record, underdeveloped job skills, and a dearth of support services to help individuals transition from commercial sex to work (e.g., Choi et al., 2009; Dalla, 2006; DeRiviere, 2006; McIntyre, 1999; Monroe, 2005). At the end of a “career” of selling sex, most women at a relatively young age (before age 40) are considered by that labor market to have little or no value, and they leave financially broke, as well as physically and psychologically scarred.10 While these facts point to the tragic personal toll, and are rightly the primary concern, libertarians who believe these are simply unfortunate consequences of bad personal choices should also be concerned that these individual costs result in shared social and economic harm due to lost productivity, burden on public systems, etc.

While people on both sides of the debate generally agree that more should be done to protect providers of commercial sex, neither decriminalization nor legalization is the answer. The demonstrated outcome of the former is that it allows pimps and traffickers to operate unabated, makes police bystanders to the chaos and blight of prostitution that they witness daily, and offers nothing in the way of compensating outreach or programming for prostituted women and girls. Decriminalization removes the criminal justice intervention that is sometimes helpful in finding services for survivors, and removes much of the criminal justice capacity to pursue cases of sexual slavery, since most present themselves initially as prostitution cases. And legalization provides marginal benefits to those working within regulated brothels, but only a small portion of prostituted persons work within them.

**Arguments against the “oldest profession” justification**

Some argue that prostitution is inevitable, so rather than fight a hopeless fight it is better to legalize, tax, and regulate “the sex trade” (e.g., Brents et al., 2010). This argument can be

---

10 Citing the numerous ways in which women and girls engaged in commercial sex or sexual slavery are harmed is not meant to suggest that the damage is universal, nor that those experiencing substantial trauma are incapable of building productive lives after being involved in commercial sex. It is simply to acknowledge the overwhelming evidence that the typical experience of selling sex is traumatic and negatively affects participants.
summarized as follows: (a) prostitution is the “oldest profession,” has been around virtually forever and has been fought by societies throughout, yet remains; (b) ergo, prostitution must be a biological imperative brought about by evolution, is now irrevocably hardwired into the male body and psyche, and is impervious to opposition; (c) ergo, the most productive response must be to accept commercial sex as an inevitable, and pursue a harm reduction, normalization, and regulatory model—mainstreaming commercial sex as a form of work.

This argument does not hold up well under empirical scrutiny. A list of its largest flaws begins with “the oldest profession” premise. Historians find prostitution to be neither universal cross-culturally nor over time (e.g., Ringdal, 2004). The oft-cited phrase about prostitution being the oldest profession is logically unlikely (better cases could be made for spear-making or food gathering, commercialized through barter systems), and definitely unknowable. However, one can argue effectively against legalization even conceding this point that it has been around throughout history.

A more serious discussion can be had about the assertion of prostitution being beyond the reach of intervention. One problem with this argument is that it presumes that throughout history, attempts to minimize or eliminate prostitution have been sensible. Does it really matter how long one has attempted to intervene, if the methods of intervention are off target, misguided, under-resourced, and/or administered inconsistently and with “dosages” too small to stand a chance of producing results? To illustrate the problem, one can consider the history of attempting to cure physical maladies. One could argue that particular diseases have been present among humans throughout history, and that throughout history, societies have tried to prevent or effectively treat them—yet the diseases remain. The lack of success is understandable when considering the methods of treating disease throughout history, including exorcism, laying engraved amulets on the afflicted, and bloodletting. The point is that if interventions are demonstrably hopeless because they completely miss the mark in targeting the real causes of problems, or are applied too inconsistently or with insufficient “dosage” to stand a chance, then they are irrelevant in establishing the history of intervention.

An important empirical question in discussions about efforts to combat commercial sex throughout history is: How hard people have tried, and what methods were used? The “beyond intervention” argument would be credible if it could be demonstrated that serious attempts have been made and failed to impact the problem. We can find little evidence that there have been widespread and consistently used approaches to curtail or eradicate prostitution. People have wished, hoped, commented, and passed laws banning prostitution, but few have addressed the main causal force (demand). It is not surprising to find little historical success in combating prostitution if the interventions largely ignore its causes, and intermittently address its symptoms.
Chapter 3. Maintaining Coalitions for Combating Demand

“No one wants advice, only collaboration.”

John Steinbeck, novelist (1902-1968)

Key Points:

1. Coalitions often form organically around compelling issues, effective leaders, and the pursuit of clear and important objectives. However, maintaining over time large coalitions whose members are of very diverse opinions and are widely distributed physically requires processes for management and sustainment.

2. This chapter presents a robust system for forming, sustaining, and using the collective strength of coalitions. It focuses on processes and procedures that can be useful for managing long-term collaboration, not on the factors inspiring people to become involved in issues.

3. We do not focus on more narrowly targeted coalitions that form around one specific activity or event, and then disband. Such coalitions can be effective, particularly in pushing toward single achievements such as passage of a law, but they are not well-suited for long-term stability and are not good candidates to around which to build the Campaign’s core coalition.

4. Management systems are critical for coalitions intended to be sustained and effective long-term.

5. Effective coalitions that have been successfully sustained over many years often use rule-based and evidence-based systems, where people with common goals but divergent opinions and interests can arrive at consensus and move forward.

6. We propose creating a fluid, collaborative learning system where new evidence is continually introduced, vetted by the coalition’s members, and then assimilated into the “industry standard” best practices when there is sufficient consent.

7. In a collaborative learning system, dissent is resolved by making an empirical case focusing on results, rather than by “winning” divisive battles between individuals, organizations, or ideologies.

No single person, initiative, or organization alone can end sexual exploitation in the United States. The problem is too large and too complex, and requires more ideas, effort, and resources than any single entity can produce. Ending sexual exploitation necessitates the coordinated actions of many individuals and organizations. Coalitions can provide infrastructures that bring groups together and multiply their power to fight today’s human rights abuses. Local coalitions usually form organically and operate successfully without the need for formal rules and processes, since they often coalesce around a local problem, the members operate in a common environment, and their scale and proximity allow personal relationships to develop readily. When coalitions have many members, are distributed widely, and bring together organizations built to address a diverse array of issues in widely varying environments, formal rules and processes can help form and sustain effective
collaboration. A coalition can develop a consensus-based process for formulating a national strategy for moving forward political action, evaluating and promoting best practices in the fight against sexual exploitation, sharing information across all partners, and creating a united front that unleashes the power and potential of the members in this movement.

Simply stated, the challenge today is that while many promising practices and noble efforts are underway across this country and the world, human trafficking remains an overwhelming problem. Despite decades of progress and sustained effort by disparate groups, U.S. and state laws are either nonexistent, inadequate, or not effectively enforced; organizations compete for a relatively shrinking pool of money; successful programs known to work are not broadly adopted; and many new promising ideas remain unexamined.

The most important step advocates for the abolition of sexual exploitation can take is to band together, and for that to happen, it is essential to have effective leadership and to establish processes for managing and maintaining collaboration. Sexual exploitation is a multi-faceted phenomenon of vast size; abolishing it will mean mobilizing an equally large response made up of multiple coordinated efforts. Luckily, we have individuals and organizations with the skill and passion to succeed in this struggle. Joining together will create the political will and intellectual capital to win this fight.

**Institutionalizing the Campaign: Forming and Maintaining Coalitions**

Uniting is difficult, even with a noble cause that should inspire banding together. Individuals and organizations have their own missions, their own understanding of the issues, and their own methods for fighting exploitation. Passionate individuals will often disagree about the best way forward. However, coalitions can be formed and move forward in strength. The most important first step is acknowledging that people are stronger together and that the mission, ending sexual exploitation, is more important than anything that divides individuals or organizations.

Small-scale, local organizing can emerge nearly spontaneously, often rallying around a single individual taking decisive action or a compelling event or opportunity. They do not require much advance planning or sophisticated processes to maintain themselves; in fact, over-investing in infrastructure can interfere with smaller coalitions, adding an unnecessary layer of bureaucracy and becoming so burdensome that it detracts from their work. However, when coalitions expand, they need more infrastructure to manage the greater number and diversity of members, who are often collaborating while geographically separate and who sometimes do not have prior relationships.

If coalitions intend to be inclusive, diverse, and sustained long-term, and to accumulate knowledge and collective strength over time, they need a structure and processes with which common cause can be turned into common action. We present one strategy for creating that structure. It would be a system of maintaining coalitions governed by mutually agreed-on procedures and processes; fair and open processes open to all willing participants; and processes focused on mutual respect, consensus building and, most importantly, *producing results*. While it is premature to determine the exact nature of this organization, other successful coalitions provide us examples.
Illustration of a Successful Model

The American Psychiatric Association (APA) is a professional association—or coalition—that represents the profession’s consensus about mental health diagnostics, codified in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM). The current edition of this consensus document is DSM-IV. The DSM-V is scheduled for release in 2013. The APA has established an effective system with a variety of structural elements and procedures that establish the consensus on diagnostic procedures and categorization of mental health disorders.

There are important parallels in the challenges faced by the APA in developing diagnostic procedures and those that are faced by coalitions intent on combating sexual exploitation.

- The mental health field is marked by a wide range of opinion about what does and does not constitute mental illness in general and specific ailments or pathologies in particular.

- There is constant movement in what constitutes state-of-the-art knowledge, diagnostic technologies (such as brain imaging, subjective testing procedures, blood tests), drug therapies, and public and political acceptance of what constitutes deviance or mental illness.

At one time, homosexuality was diagnosable as a mental disorder, while Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder was not. The evolution of social values and accumulation of evidence changed the coalition’s consensus opinion over time. There is never universal agreement over what should be included. However, there are rules and procedures that have been established that make consensus possible and manageable. The key element is that evidence drives the system, and there are agreed-upon rules governing the nature and use of evidence. If convincing evidence can be marshaled to support the argument that something should be added, removed, or changed, there are rules about the kinds of evidence that is admissible and compelling, and procedures for presenting and using that evidence. This provides a “safety valve” that alleviates pressure and prevents dissent from critically fracturing the consensus. If someone disagrees about the established consensus, they can commit themselves to producing the evidence necessary to change the consensus and support the changes they want in the DSM.

To manage the processes of developing consensus, the APA established DSM task forces, a board of trustees, work groups, and study groups. They have schedules and produce interim reports that present evidence that is constantly accumulating about diagnostic methods and diagnostic categories. The various bodies, following established procedures within transparent processes, continually review and process the flow of evidence to determine whether consensus forms around whether to confirm current diagnostics or to make changes.

Similarly, the field of those opposing sexual exploitation disagrees on a number of things, such as where to draw the line distinguishing prostitution from sex trafficking or sexual slavery, and whether to prioritize punitive or therapeutic approaches to prevent men from exploiting others. However, without rules and processes to guide us, there have been few examples of successful consensus building. Differences of opinion are often unresolved because there are no agreed-upon standards about what criteria to apply to determine whether one side of an argument is more persuasive than the other. Discussions often degrade into personal attacks, rather than being seen as opportunities to make the best evidence-based arguments they can.
Example of a Structure and Processes

As a thought exercise for consideration by the National Campaign, we can propose a structure for establishing and maintaining a coalition. This does not mean that any decision has been made about whether to implement any system, nor this particular illustration. This is presented here simply as something to consider in discussions at the conference if there is interest in establishing a system or systems for managing a coalition or multiple coalitions.

The coalition will be open to all participants with a commitment to end sexual exploitation. Participants from all organizations will be represented as individuals, each having a voice and vote. The coalition will be entirely open to all individuals with a demonstrated commitment to ending sexual exploitation. However, members will abide by the terms and spirit of the coalition. Here are some components of a possible coalition structure:

- **Charter.** The first official act of the coalition will be to create a charter defining the mission of the movement, the principles underlying participation, and the rights and responsibilities of membership.

- **Procedures.** The coalition will coordinate efforts by establishing common strategies and cooperating on fulfilling strategic goals. Procedures will govern consensus-building on goals, strategic plans, common endorsements, and coalition assignments. Procedure statements will define the makeup of steering committees, review panels, voting participation, and voting methods.

- **Task Forces.** Given the varied strategies and tactics required in a successful abolition effort, the coalition will create task forces focused on particular products required by the group’s strategic plan. These task groups will represent the best thinking in the movement and included nominated individuals who can best advance these assignments. As we outlined in the preceding chapter, we envision three task forces (education, law enforcement, social marketing), and other candidates may include research and evaluation, and survivor leadership. Team charters can be a useful tool for teams or task forces to use in clarifying their purpose, articulating goals, objectives, activities, benchmarks, final products, and timelines.

- **Project Management.** Evidence suggests that successful coalitions use defined project management supports to ensure progress toward goals. The anti-demand team would provide task forces with the project management supports to bring order to meetings and efforts while giving content experts the freedom to think and act. Trained project managers would facilitate meetings, develop timelines and work plans based on task force direction, and provide logistical and communication support to these groups.

- **A Learning Collaborative.** The Learning Collaborative model provides a set of procedures by which action-oriented individuals can share their thoughts, plans, findings, and questions. Learning Collaboratives are characterized by frequent, structured meetings around a focused topic or activity in which members work together to create action plans.

- **A Balloting Process.** The coalition would be consensus-driven with a defined set of steps for determining critical directions in the movement. Some items would require a consensus across the entire community. For example, the charter would require ratification by the entire
group. Other items, for example, task force recommendations, would require only the consensus of that group.

- **Oversight.** Even the most successful coalition will eventually engender disagreements that are not easily resolved. In these cases, the coalition would turn to a standing review board, assembled according to the group’s processes. This review board would hear and decide disputes that cannot be resolved by consensus. Just as the Supreme Court rules on difficult questions in our overall society, the society of like-minded reformers could submit to a ruling of this mutually selected authority.

- **Information Systems.** Modern technologies provide unprecedented opportunities for improving communication and knowledge sharing. The coalition would use the latest communication methods to ensure all voices are heard and all ideas are vetted in an open way. A website could provide the coalition with a common voice for blasting our common cause, a single point of contact for new members seeking a way to engage, and a user-friendly repository for all best practices, research, and toolkits where practitioners in the fight against sexual exploitation can arm themselves. The coalition would provide an online forum where members can discuss relevant topics, distribute new products, and vet new ideas. The forum would include an area for proposing new studies and nominate efforts for promotion by the coalition. Finally, the system would provide a vetting and balloting site, modeled after those used in mental health and healthcare consensus communities, where mutually agreed-on democratic processes can determine the coalition’s united messages and actions.

- **Evidence-Based Practice Model.** The coalition would be guided by the evidence-based practice model: a model, like the scientific model, that requires testing methods against results. Of course, in a field where action is necessary and information always incomplete, the coalition will move without complete information where necessary, always striving toward the more defensible and proven effective methods. Consensus will develop around best practices and what constitutes the state of the art.

**Promoting Successful Programs for Adoption**

Existing registry efforts, including a coalition Model Programs Guide, would demonstrate sound practices for disseminating information about model programs. However, there would be several limitations to promotion efforts. (1) Typical registry databases do not provide a sufficient volume of programs to match the target populations and specific needs addressed by local program efforts. For example, the coalition Model Program Guide might start with 50 documented programs; this represents a great deal of work by the centralized research team. However, a user searching this database using three or more search criteria is very likely to find no program that fits the variables. (2) Centralized efforts using second-generation Internet technologies (documents and database content prepared and posted by web teams) funnel materials through limited staff resources causing delays in publication. It is expensive and time-consuming to create this array of replication materials. Agencies or organizations that endorse a large number of model programs may not be able to afford to create detailed replication materials. Agencies or organizations that develop thorough and detailed replication materials may have to endorse many fewer model programs. (3) The first step in
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11 For example, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention’s Model Programs Guide (MPG). Available at: http://www2.dsgonline.com/ mpg/
promoting programs is to get people to the site. The relatively static and slowly changing nature of most registries means that users will visit one time and not return to the site.

Successfully Replicating Models

As discussed above there are several impediments to providing aspiring program developers with the widest selection of model programs. There are two remaining broad categories of shortcomings in the present registry paradigm.

First, the models do not provide the kind of detail required for implementation and, second, the models are not always timely enough for replication. While models are informative, they are rarely tailored to the specific conditions encountered by the practitioner. These sites provide little information addressing the needs of lower-level officials who must plan, implement, and operate replicated programs. Instead, the websites identify persons in agencies whose programs were endorsed as models, who may be contacted for more information. For example, a model program web page (and home site) may have excellent documentation explaining the program’s evaluation history and theoretical underpinning. However, the documentation does not include the organizational information such as programming plans, procedures and policies, staff configurations, and budgets required for successful implementation.

Given the time required to identify, assess, document, and promote a program, it may take a decade or more for an initial innovation to be launched, imitated, evaluated, endorsed as a model program, and replicated. This lag creates inherent tension—the context that gave rise to and shaped the innovation will surely differ (perhaps radically) from the context in which replications are planned and implemented. This time lag increases the tension between concepts of maintaining fidelity to core elements of the innovation, and adapting the innovation to the reality of the current context. Contextual changes (particularly those involving technology) may be so profound over a decade that core elements of a model program may need to be reconsidered and modified.

Potential Solution

Online collaboration sites have been developed that bring service providers together and allow them to create timely, relevant, and high quality knowledge resources. Web platforms, developed over the years through government funding, provide registered users with the ability to create their own web pages, share online documents, run discussion boards, create online forms, surveys, and polls, and manage who sees what on their secure servers. The coalition might support expanding upon existing model programs information systems to create a Model Programs collaboration center that allows for peer-to-peer sharing of information and materials relevant to the host of programs targeting anti-demand initiatives. This approach will solve the resource limitations described above by 1) increasing the speed and ease with which project staff members, collaborators, and model program promoters develop publishable content and 2) creating a peer-to-peer sharing system that captures profiles on a broad base of programs and provides a larger volume of better targeted materials that address implementation issues.
As evidenced by online technology and knowledge communities, such as Wikipedia, current collaboration strategies have demonstrated a previously unparalleled ability to promote peer-to-peer information exchange and collaboration. A vibrant community of volunteers made up of researchers, practice leaders, ground staff, and other stakeholders can provide perspectives and insights that exceed any team’s abilities. A thoughtful, well-managed system that emphasizes evidence-based discussion and promotes a culture of excellence can harness the collective knowledge of many fields and bring about new ideas. A potential site could be organized into separate tiers each with its own distinct but related look, activities, and project oversight (see Figure 3.1). The model and initial materials for the first tier might already exist in a current Model Programs Guide. The creators of this guide have done an excellent job of using second-generation web tools to present prepared information that is user-friendly and serves the purpose of documenting the high-level requirements of each model program. A proposed plan would use third generation web tools (e.g., document sharing, page creation, and online communication) to make two major changes to the first tier: 1) the content of the model programs pages would be expanded by project staff, model program developers, and volunteer experts to include “how-to” materials that go beyond the useful but limited logic models and project profiles, and 2) the pages will more effectively communicate that emergent programs can not only apply for consideration but also use the lower tiers to actively work toward membership in this elite group.

The second tier will be devoted to promising programs and practices and contain program evaluations, designs, and ideas that are works in progress. This tier would be organized into fields and topics of interest (already identified in the current guide navigation and database structure) and feature running discussions and updates on promising and emerging programs and practices. The tier will function in a manner similar to Wikipedia, allowing invited participants to create their own project profile pages, edit pages on emerging ideas and concepts, and upload relevant implementation documents. (The major differences here would be that (1) unlike Wikipedia, a coalition program would have volunteer moderators and project leaders who would more actively solicit materials, offer advice to implementers, promote discussions, and monitor and referee materials; (2) the Wiki pages created on site will also provide automated data forms for capturing structured data such as program profile information and logic models; and (3) topics will have related discussion boards, mailing lists, and syndication features.)

The third tier would be open to all programs interested in developing evidence-based, data-driven practices. Beginning with the existing projects network of professional associates, partner organizations, and experts, an anti-demand coalition team would disseminate invitations to program leaders to register their programs on the site. (They would fill out a Wiki page that contains a profile form within it.) Registered programs would appear in an interactive map and search database allowing other program staff and the public to find them by service categories and location. After signing up and creating a user profile, registered users would be able to participate in peer-to-peer information exchange, online discussions, and the development of shared information pages. The key
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12 Wikipedia is an online encyclopedia developed entirely by volunteer collaborators. Started in 2001, it has over 1.8 million articles, making it the largest and most referenced information source in the world. [www.wikipedia.com](http://www.wikipedia.com)

13 “What We Learned From the Wikipedia Experience.” Tom Austin, Jeffrey Mann. Gartner Inc February 14, 2006.
content of this area would be the sharing of practical tools and templates for implementing change (e.g., budgets, work break-downs, staffing charts, program models, user guides). The format would be self-administered exchange of content with question and answers fielded by other practitioners, moderators, and project staff members. (Of course, implementation content from promising and model program will also be available in this exchange.)
The Cycle

Although the coalition’s project team would need to work strategically to “prime the pump” through initial content development and aggressive outreach to field leaders, the goal is to create a vibrant online community made up of innovators promoting their proven models and aspirant program developers seeking timely input from experts and peers. The system will offer content for people at each stage of project development. These stages might be described as:

- **Researching.** The program developer is actively looking for an effective model.
- **Planning.** The program developer needs practical planning tools such as budgets, performance measurement plans, and task lists.
- **Implementing.** The developer requires expert advice from field monitors or her peers.
- **Networking.** The programmer seeks recognition for a successful program, ongoing improvement tips, and the next model activity.

A key incentive for programs to participate in the online knowledge sharing is to document their own processes for consideration as a model program. In this plan, the online presentation of the program’s approach, implementation tools, measurement processes, curriculum, and training materials and response to moderator and project questions would constitute the application for model program status. Programs would move through tiers based on increasingly more challenging criteria from registered program (any program) to peer-endorsed performance management-driven and positive program, to promising as identified by moderators and project staff, finally to an effective or exemplary model program as supported by hard evidence.
Conclusions About Coalitions

1. **Coalitions are critical to success.** No single initiative, organization, or movement in the United States can end sexual exploitation alone. The problem is too large, too complex, and requires more ideas, effort, and resources than any single entity can produce. Ending sexual exploitation requires the coordinated actions of many individuals and organizations. Coalitions can provide infrastructure that brings groups together and multiplies their power to fight today’s human rights abuses. A coalition can develop a consensus-based process for formulating a national strategy for mobilizing political action, evaluating and promoting best practices in the fight against sexual exploitation, sharing information across all partners in the fight, and creating a united front that unleashes the power and potential of the members in this movement.

2. **Multiple coalitions are probably necessary.** Broad coalitions made possible the passage of the TVPA and its reauthorizations. Some national-level initiatives are likely to require similarly broad coalitions. Other initiatives are more divisive in nature and more localized in scope, and it may not be desirable or possible to attempt to have everyone aboard a single coalition. A solution is not to expect a single coalition, but instead a network model with multiple coalitions all aimed at ending sexual exploitation, but focusing on separate pieces that together constitute a comprehensive effort. For example, there is broad support for educating boys so they do not become men who exploit, and a very broad coalition to develop and implement programs is possible. There is less consensus on john schools, or shaming men arrested for buying sex, or pushing for particular law reforms such as requiring johns to register as sex offenders. Those who support john schools or shaming may coalesce around those initiatives; other who have collaborated to supported a particular law reform or education programs may recuse themselves from other efforts if they are conflicted about participation.

3. **Systems from other fields have been established to support and facilitate effective coalitions, and build and maintain consensus.** The current field of experts, leaders, and practitioners have worked together before and accomplished much. But there are also conflicts that have, by nearly everyone’s account, slowed progress or produced less than optimal results. If a comprehensive effort is to progress and create a critical mass of energy that can push public opinion and policy over tipping points of change, those interested in the National Action Plan and the National Campaign should consider establishing rules and processes to manage the divergent opinions and interests of actual and potential coalition members.
Chapter 4. Research and Development

“Give me six hours to chop down a tree and I will spend the first four sharpening the axe.”

-Attributed to Abraham Lincoln

Key Points:

- Whenever possible, it is preferable to have a solid empirical foundation to inform the development of new interventions, and to assess the performance of existing efforts.

- The key tasks of all the National Campaigns efforts will be whether they produce results, and performance measurement systems and evaluations produce the most credible evidence.

- Research and development is an important support for action and accountability, and includes the gathering of new descriptive information about the range of the current practice and policy, performance monitoring of current and new demonstration interventions, evaluations of programs and practices, basic research on the causes and consequences of sexual exploitation, and disseminating research findings to benefit practice, policy, and effective interventions.

- It is critically important to have state-of-the-art evidence of effectiveness for programs and practices that are very costly, have high opportunity costs, or expose the public to risk.

- The appropriate method for conducting any study is determined by weighing many factors, including time, resources available for the study, willingness of subjects (programs, individuals) to be studied, existence of time-series data for certain designs and ability to gather new data for prospective designs, and whether it is critical to have state-of-the-art information, the collection of which can sometimes exceed investment in the programs being studied.

- New programs developed by the National Campaign, or existing ones chosen as demonstration programs, should have performance measurement and evaluation components built into the programs to ensure collection of data that will support inferences about the programs’ implementation and effectiveness.

While conducting research for this project, we encountered the widespread perception that more and better research is needed on the causes and consequences of commercial sex and sex slavery, and the need to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of interventions. A tangible manifestation of this perceived value is found in the Wilberforce Act of 2008, in which a dozen distinct studies and data collection efforts are mandated. These mandates include a broad study of the size and characteristics of the commercial sex market in the United States. They also require implementing a new data collection effort in which the Uniform Crime Reports (one of the two main sources of official crime data in the U.S.) are required to report separately on arrests of buyers and sellers of commercial sex, whereas currently, arrests are combined. In addition, the majority of those we interviewed for this project placed research near the top of the list of critical issues to be pursued by the National Campaign.
The key objective of all of the efforts will be whether they produce results, and performance measurement systems and evaluations produce the most credible evidence. Research and development is an important support for action and accountability, and includes the gathering of new descriptive information about the range of the current practice and policy, performance monitoring of current and new demonstration interventions, evaluations of programs and practices, basic research on the causes and consequences of sexual exploitation, and disseminating research findings to benefit practice, policy, and effective interventions—including educational and social marketing efforts.

Information is a key to making good decisions, and the essence of research is gathering valid and reliable empirical evidence. The National Campaign will launch new programs, practices, and policies, and promote evidence-based interventions. Solid empirical research on evidence-based practices can be invaluable in making sound decisions about which approaches are most worthy of investment. The ultimate objective of all of the Campaign’s combined efforts producing results, and performance measurement systems and formal evaluations are the most rigorous methods of producing credible evidence about how programs operate and whether they are producing their intended effects.

Social science research is an important form of decision support for public policy and programmatic interventions, guiding action and promoting accountability. Studies can gather new descriptive information about the range of the current practice and policy, monitor the performance of current and new demonstration programs, evaluate the impact of programs and practices, and pursue basic research on the causes and consequences of sexual exploitation. Research findings can be disseminated to benefit practice, policy, and effective interventions, and can form the foundation for target identification and the formulation of messages for use in education, social marketing, law reform, and political advocacy efforts. For example, practitioners who could potentially mobilize to educate or arrest buyers of commercial sex may be persuaded to do so by research showing the prevalence and severity of sexual slavery, and the damage caused by commercial sex even when not compelled by third parties.

For practitioners already convinced of the need to address sexual exploitation, the next questions are usually regarding how to intervene effectively. These are empirical questions with empirical answers, and while not the only way to gather and convey information, dispassionate and objective research is a demonstrably valuable tool. It is particularly useful in persuading those who are not already on board, or those who are but are pragmatists and functionaries who need data and evidence to support their decisions within bureaucracies. Policymakers can be persuaded by similar information, if packaged properly and conveyed through credible channels.

This chapter includes our recommendations for using research to advance the Campaign towards its goal of ending sex trafficking. We also intend for this it to serve as a resource for the National Campaign’s staff for making decisions about research and performance measurement. To that end, we provide general guidance on program evaluation performance measurement, aimed for practice oriented audiences who are not research specialists.
Need to Study, Monitor, and Evaluate

Historically, evaluating anti-crime and social service programs was more the exception than the rule, but that era is ending. Competition for funding of these and other social programs has intensified and governments are demanding evidence that such programs accomplish what they promise. At the federal level, the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (GPRA) puts the burden of proof on programs, which has been reinforced by the White House’s issuance of Program Assessment Rating Tools (PART). Similarly, private foundations and corporations that sponsor programs such as anti-trafficking and anti-slavery initiatives are increasingly concerned with return on investment—not in the sense of monetary or other personal gains, but in terms of producing results commensurate with the investment of money, labor, political capital, and other resources. This chapter discusses some of the issues that the National Campaign’s leaders and the program managers of local initiatives should address when considering the role to be played by—and the investment to be made in—research, specifically regarding:

1. **Development**: Identifying the causes of sex trafficking and promising points of intervention, and using this knowledge to develop new programs, practices, and policies. The first can be thought of as research and development (R&D) in business, and analogous to formative evaluation among social scientists.

2. **Performance Measurement**: measuring and monitoring how well programs, practices, and policies are being implemented.

3. **Evaluation**: Isolating and assessing the role of programs, practices, and policies in producing their intended effects.

“Evaluation” should not be thought of as something that is thrust upon the National Campaign’s task force leaders or program managers by outsiders. Instead, it can be seen as an extension of what effective managers of organizations and their staff already do. Managers in private and public organizations obtain feedback of all sorts to monitor how these organizations are working and how well they are achieving their goals. In private sector firms that sell goods and services, managers can measure their success in meeting goals by monitoring their spending and tracking their sales. The success of anti-trafficking and exploitation initiatives in meeting their goals cannot usually be measured so readily, so it will be necessary to define appropriate measures of performance and to undertake special data collection. Drawing conclusions about performance from these measures and data can be challenging because anti-crime programs often seek impacts that are affected by a variety of forces other than the program.

Sorting out the program’s effects from the influences of other forces usually requires scientific analysis and evidence-based inference. Evaluators provide the expertise needed to develop this feedback about the program’s operation and performance, but the information they provide is what managers of all organizations need to improve effectiveness, efficiency, and to sustain or grow their programs and organizations in difficult environments.

Because the technical aspects of measurement and analysis are often difficult for non-scientists to understand or execute (or, they simply do not have the time), managers often engage evaluators and then back out of the work, leaving the decisions to the specialist. But many of the fundamental
decisions that need to be made for evaluation are ones that program managers often address in the course of strategic planning, such as:

- What are the program’s goals and how should success be measured?
- What are thought to be the critical resources for achieving these goals?
- What are the critical activities?
- How are these resources and activities to be combined to produce immediate outcomes, that, in turn, produce the desired impact?
- What is the “theory” of the program, or its “logic”?

To organize and distill what are thought to be the essential elements of programs and their operating assumptions, it is usually productive for the evaluator and the manager to conceive of the program as an “input/output system.” The evaluator will seek to develop appropriate measures for these various elements, will identify (and sometimes collect) the needed information, and will devise methods of testing the assumptions. The manager remains the expert in defining what the program aims to be, how it aims to accomplish its mission, and how its successes (or failures) should be gauged.

Process evaluations typically focus on program processes and procedures, whereas outcome and impact evaluations focus primarily upon what the program does or does not accomplishes with respect to its goals. Process evaluations examine design assumptions (e.g., Are the goals clearly identified in measurable ways? Is there a clear and logical relationship between how activities are designed and executed and the expected results?), and they document all critical aspects of program implementation. For example: What program resources are consumed and at what cost? Is the program reaching its target population with appropriate services, at the planned rate or “dosage”? Are program activities producing the results/outputs as planned? Ideally, managers will have implemented monitoring systems for routinely collecting much of the data needed for evaluation, but evaluators may also undertake specialized data collection where monitoring data are not sufficient.

Program impacts—and whether the program achieves its ultimate goals—are often more difficult to measure and assess unambiguously. This is partly an information problem: for example, the effects of successful anti-crime or criminal justice programs may be difficult to observe fully in the short run. But there is also a logical challenge: if changes are seen in these conditions, is it justified to attribute these changes entirely or partly to what the program did? In most cases, researchers cannot simply trace a direct line from what happens in a program to an effect. Instead, they develop comparisons among different groups, measure differences in outcomes, and draw conclusions about the causes of those differences. This is more than just accurate description. Conclusions about cause-and-effect relationships require developing logically defensible inferences about what causes the observed outcomes. The strength of these conclusions depends partly upon accurate measurement but also on the research design used to structure the evaluation. It also depends upon the design of the program. Many programs have been implemented in ways that foreclose the possibility of a strong evaluation.

The strongest evaluation designs are structured like experiments, wherein the manager and the evaluator work together to devise a test of the program, creating both the “experimental” conditions—the program as it is intended to operate—while also creating conditions for comparison, which represent what happens in the absence of the program. When such experimentation is feasible and ethical, it can yield powerful and compelling findings. When evaluators are called in after programs
have been implemented, they will most often rely upon non-experimental ("quasi-experimental") designs. These involve identifying populations or conditions that represent what would have happened if the program did not exist. These include comparisons with other jurisdictions where programs were not implemented, or comparisons in the same jurisdiction before, during, and after the program was implemented. Other options include combining these two approaches into a single research design. The risk posed by such after-the-fact designs is that any observed differences in outcomes may have resulted not from the program’s operation, but from unmeasured and perhaps unrecognized differences in the compared populations. Evaluators have developed a number of statistical methods to minimize these risks—threats to one’s ability to draw valid conclusions from the data—but these are not always successful in providing convincing findings. The best solution is to engage evaluators early in the design and implementation of programs so that the conditions that support strong evaluations can be created.

The findings of impact evaluations can be used to develop estimates of the program’s cost-effectiveness, as well as estimates of the returns on investing in the program (cost/benefit analyses). In general, cost-benefit analyses shed more light on whether the programs being investigated are worthwhile, compared to alternative investments of funds. Cost-effectiveness analyses tacitly assume that the treatment objective is worth meeting. What matters is identifying the programmatic alternative that either achieves the stated objective at the lowest cost or achieves the greater benefit at a fixed level of cost.

While we discuss development, we focus primarily on performance measurement and evaluation, since the key emphasis of the National Campaign is results. This chapter is written for persons who will manage anti-demand initiatives associated with the Campaign, to help them monitor and evaluate the programs or tactics used. It is also meant to inform the current leaders of the formative stages of the National Campaign, to provide them with information and ideas to consider as they design the Campaign. This is not a manual on performance monitoring and evaluation, however. We assume that the National Campaign leaders and individual program managers will not attempt complex evaluations on their own but will engage trained social scientific researchers. Our focus throughout is on what leaders and managers, rather than evaluators, can and need to do to develop information about their programs’ effectiveness.

Gathering and Using Evidence of Program Performance

Feedback on organizational performance is necessary for the successful management of organizations, whether public or private. Consider, for example, the feedback that managers get in for-profit businesses that sell products or services. They learn from their sales figures if they are on the right track. If a redesigned automobile doesn’t sell, managers and their design teams are told by the marketplace that they failed to perform. Information about the processes for producing these goods and services is collected by cost accounting systems, inventory control systems, production monitoring, and various other means. Prospering in a competitive marketplace requires that managers track what their organizations do, at what cost, and how their collective efforts perform. They survive as long as their revenues at least match their costs or, failing that, as long as they can raise or borrow money. Those that fail to perform cost-efficiently over time usually run out of money, stop being able to raise money from banks or investors, and go out of business.
Program managers in public agencies and in not-for-profit organizations often lack these built-in information channels that for-profit businesses have. Their performance goals are often broader than selling goods or services to customers—for example, reducing recidivism of men arrested for soliciting, deterring others from buying sex, increasing public awareness of the role of commercial sex in driving modern day slavery, increasing the political will to combat sexual exploitation, or the size of commercial sex markets. Moreover, the extent to which public organizations accomplish these goals is often difficult to measure. For example,

- **Delayed Impact.** There may be National Campaign programs that engage educators to intervene with middle-school boys to prevent them from growing to become men who buy sex, but their effects may not be fully apparent for years to come, and their failures (criminal acts) will usually be hidden from public view.

- **Preventing Behaviors.** Increasing sanctions for buying sex succeeds if undesirable behavior (soliciting prostitution) doesn’t occur, and non-events are harder to measure or estimate than easily are failures.

- **Measuring Exposure.** Shaming offenders by publicizing their identities is intended to send a signal to would-be lawbreakers that they will be punished and that the community will find out if they are caught buying sex. Whether prospective johns get this message and are deterred from crime is difficult to observe directly.

- **Multiple Independent Factors.** Program activities are only one of the many possible influences on the behavior or the target group. Attributing an effect to the program’s influences requires that all other influences be excluded as possible causes of the outcome.

Measuring successes or failures in achieving these goals often requires initiating special data collection and analyses efforts—including *program evaluations*.

The difficulty of assessing goal achievement poses a critical problem for program managers. Because publicly-supported programs typically rely on grants or contracts rather than revenues from sales to fund their operations, sustaining their operations depends in part upon convincing funding agencies that they are achieving their goals or, at least, that they are on track to achieving them. If goal attainment is difficult to measure, programs may continue to win funding for a time in the absence of demonstrated results. But doing this is becoming harder in the absence of demonstrated effectiveness. In the words of the White House’s Office of Management and Budget, “No program, however worthy its goal and high-minded its name, is entitled to continue perpetually unless it can demonstrate it is actually effective in solving problems.” Moreover, “In a results-oriented government, the burden of proof rests on each federal program and its advocates to prove that the program is getting results.”

This focus by the federal government on results stems from the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (P.L. 103-62). GPRA aimed to improve the operations of federal government programs by changing management emphasis from *inputs* and *processes* to *performance* and *results*—or

---

outcomes rather than outputs. Outcomes refer to “the actual results, effects, or impact of a program activity compared to its intended purpose,” whereas outputs refer to actual levels of activity or effort that are realized.  For example, a police department may implement an enforcement strategy whereby computer-aided mapping software is used to indicate prostitution “hot spots” and police officers are concentrated in these areas. Measures of inputs and processes would include numbers of police assigned to these areas, and outputs could include numbers of arrests made. But did this activity reduce the total number of crimes—the main outcome of interest? While recognizing that outcome measurement is often difficult, and is infeasible for some program activities,” noted the authors of the Senate report accompanying GPRA, “outcome measures [are] the most important and desirable measures, because they gauge the ultimate success of government activities.”

While the National Campaign will be primarily a private venture, the same concepts apply and can serve as useful guidelines for monitoring any program.

Difficulties of assessing program impacts are compounded by the fact that it is often challenging to attribute observed changes to the program’s activities. For example, did a reduction in reported crime in a particular city result from the use of computer-aided identification of hot spots and the concentrated deployment of officers, or were other factors responsible for this? Answering such questions often requires systematic evaluation—which is why evaluation now occupies an important role in assessing the performance of public programs.

The Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

This tool requires that program administrators answer approximately 30 questions and thereby document many different aspects that affect program performance, including:

- **Program purpose and design:** Are the program’s purpose, goals and design clear and grounded in legitimate need?
- **Strategic Planning:** Does the program have valid long term and short-term targets for reaching those goals?
- **Program Management:** Is the program managed well; that is, is there clear and effective financial and operational supervision?
- **Program Results/Accountability:** Does the program “work;” that is it effective?

Evidence for these aspects are then reviewed and given ratings of “effective,” “moderately effective,” “adequate,” “ineffective,” or “results not demonstrated.”

The White House’s Office of Management and Budget has issued the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART), which is designed to assess federal programs, to inform management actions, requests

---


16 Ibid.
for budgets, and legislative proposals, and to increase reliance upon programs that have been shown to work. OMB aimed to evaluate all federal programs using this tool by the time that the FY 2008 budget was submitted. Programs that cannot demonstrate effectiveness risk elimination.

Distinguishing Among Program Evaluation, Monitoring, Assessment

Understanding the range of research, evaluation, and assessment options available to practitioners is complicated by the use of many different terms for similar or overlapping ideas. These include “program evaluation,” “impact evaluation,” “process evaluation,” “formative evaluation,” “performance measurement,” “performance monitoring,” “program assessment,” and “implementation research,” among others. Providing full definitions for all these terms is not necessary here, except to indicate that they generally differ from one another in a few key dimensions: the focus of the investigation (on program implementation vs. impacts or outcomes) and whether the data collection and assessment is ongoing or is undertaken for a limited period to support the evaluation.

Program Evaluation

Program evaluations often span both implementation and impact, although evaluations limited to program implementation are sometimes called “process analyses” or “process evaluations,” whereas studies that assess programs’ outcomes are often called “impact evaluations.” A defining feature of program evaluations generally is that they involve the systematic and evidence-based assessment of whether and to what extent projects or programs are implemented as intended and/or whether they achieve their intended objectives. Because evaluations seek to provide valid and empirically-grounded information, they generally employ social scientific methods of data collection and analysis. They are also “evaluative” rather than just descriptive, meaning that analysts aim to draw valid inferences about cause and effect relationships. For example, crimes rates in a particular community may have declined following establishment of a mentoring program for at-risk teenage boys. Is it valid to attribute these changes in crime rates to what the program does? Or are the changes actually the result of other factors? Determining this is not a matter of simple description.

Scientific program evaluations—especially evaluations of program impacts—are often demanding of resources, may require collection of data not ordinarily kept, and may impose substantial burdens on programs. Consequently, they tend to be performed as one-shot or infrequent events rather than as part of a continuous assessment of program performance.

Table 4.1: Differentiating Commonly Used Terms to Describe Data-Based Assessment and Monitoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus of Investigation</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Implementation</strong></td>
<td>• Program monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Process monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Performance monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Process control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cost monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program's Impacts</strong></td>
<td>• Outcomes monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Performance monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Program Monitoring**

Program evaluations in their various forms can be distinguished from other measurement activities that are typically more ongoing in nature, and usually undertaken for monitoring purposes. Ideas about “performance measurement” and “performance monitoring” began to be circulated widely in business circles during the 1980s before migrating into discussions of government programs and were typically focused on the control of manufacturing and service processes to improve results. Monitoring generally involves obtaining information that is easily available and focuses on events that can be observed readily. Therefore, it is typically focused on program processes and the more immediate results of these processes—for example, numbers of arrests made, numbers of human traffickers identified, or numbers of prostitution “clients” completing treatment or education program. This information may be used to track the extent to which program operations are congruent with plans, or if program activities comply with legal and regulatory requirements, among other purposes. Performance monitoring systems most often do not capture information about programs’ ultimate outcomes or impacts (unlike impact evaluations), although it is possible that they can if these outcomes can be tracked and measured relatively easily on an ongoing basis.

**Program Assessment**

“Program assessment,” as defined by the White House’s Office of Management and Budget, is not limited to monitoring program processes and their immediate results. Monitoring information is but the first tier of information to be collected as part of documenting program performance. Accurate monitoring and description alone do not provide strong evidence of program effectiveness. Agencies
and programs are therefore encouraged to conduct well-designed program evaluations, and especially impact evaluations.\(^{18}\)

**Using Information to Improve Performance**

Apart from its usefulness in demonstrating accountability to funding agencies, measuring performance also supports ongoing improvement in organizational performance. A fundamental principle of learning theory is that accurate feedback is necessary for efficient and effective performance of individuals and—by extension—the organizations they work for. For example, students learn faster when they get accurate and immediate feedback on their performance. Creating performance scorecards and other accurate feedback has been effective in reducing medical error in hospitals.\(^{19}\) As the director of a foundation that developed performance scorecards for New York City’s administration put it, “In large institutions, public and private, things are counted, and whatever *is* counted, counts.”\(^{20}\)

Conversely, managers and staff are less likely to perform effectively if they do not get accurate feedback about the results of their actions. “I asked an executive at an energy company once what he rewarded, and he said R.O.E.—return on equity,” a former CEO of Continental Airlines told a reporter. “I told him that if you asked someone on the second shift what roe was, he’d probably say fish eggs. When I came to Continental, we defined success as getting the planes to their destination on time. You should tell people how to keep score, and reward them for it. But you better make sure you’re using the right score card.”\(^{21}\)

**Linking Program Development, Performance Measurement, and Evaluation into Evidence-Based System**

One of the assumptions in pursuing evidence based practices is that there is solid evidence available to be gathered and assessed in guiding decisions about what interventions to invest in, how to design and implement them, and how well they perform. For all programs worthy of sustainment, performance indicators can help to feed a continuous feedback process in which information is used to refine, improve, and expand programs. If we take a business perspective on what it means to be proven or promising, we assume that the priority program are those found to have the greatest impact and to be the most cost effective. However, the information required to make such determinations does not exist for the majority of options.

---


Abt Associates has spent the past three years conducting assessments of demand-reduction practices in the United States, and has conducted the only rigorous impact evaluation of a demand reduction intervention. There are roughly a dozen distinct kinds of interventions available to combat demand (one can conclude there are more or fewer, depending on how they are grouped together or divided into subcategories). Evidence to date shows two approaches to work (arresting and educating known johns). Others may work if properly targeted and executed (e.g., public education campaigns, shaming), but are unreviewed and we do not yet know enough to determine when and why they are more versus less successful. Other approaches are either promising but untried (e.g., proactive, preventive education aimed at boys), or are of indeterminate potential and are unreviewed (e.g., community service, auto seizure).

![Figure 4.2: Program Implementation and Refinement Feedback Cycle](image)

We recommend that the National Campaign pursue an “evidence-based roll-out” approach to strategies and practices. Some interventions have evidence of impact and cost-effectiveness, and could be recommended at the start of the Campaign: for example, arresting buyers of commercial sex and education programs for arrestees are effective and inexpensive, and social marketing—if properly targeted and executed - can be a useful tool for helping to mobilize support for all of the other interventions. The effectiveness and efficiency of other options remains to be demonstrated, so we would recommend designing and implementing demonstration projects, coupled with feedback mechanisms to monitor performance and measure impact. As interventions are found to produce results, they can be adopted as core strategies of the Campaign. Demonstrations that do not fare well under scrutiny will either be refined and further monitored, or abandoned by the Campaign if it becomes clear that they are not promising. This approach is summarized in simplified form in Figure 4.2, and illustrated in more detail in Figure 4.3.

While developing recommended approaches remains a task of the Campaign leadership, at this point we would expect that it would include: (1) mobilizing early in the Campaign to initiate, expand, improve, and sustain intervention models with demonstrated effectiveness, while (2) starting an iterative, “evidence based roll-out” process, where unproven but promising interventions are developed, initiated, monitored, and evaluated. Evidence regarding the impact and cost effectiveness of the demonstration projects would be fed back continuously, and conclusions about new demonstrations would come in waves, beginning two or three years into the National Campaign.
Only then will the Campaign’s leaders and the coalition be in a position to determine which of the full range of approaches does and does not work, and then prioritize them for National Campaign support.

**Figure 4.3: Illustration of Evidence Based Rollout, Monitoring, and Refinement of Interventions**

**Challenges to Drawing Conclusions about Program Effects**

The general strategy for identifying program effects is to compare outcomes of populations that differ according to whether they have or have not been exposed to the intervention. If populations are otherwise identical and were subject to the same conditions other than the program, if the measured outcomes occur after the onset of the program, and the outcomes are different for the two populations, one can reasonably conclude that the program *caused* these differences. The main difficulty is that one rarely finds a situation where those who are exposed to a program are similar in all other ways to those not so exposed.

Several common sources of non-comparability among potential comparisons include the following.
**Selection and Self-Selection into Programs**

One pervasive source of differences among potential comparison groups stems from the fact that participation in programs or exposure to some intervention usually occurs because somebody selected persons for one type of treatment or processing, while not selecting others, all for a reason. This is especially true for criminal justice programs because the entire criminal justice system operates as a series of filters, whereby persons are selected for different amounts and types of treatments. For example, investigation and arrest procedures comprise one set of filters, and program eligibility criteria is another. In the case of programs in which participation is voluntary, self selection differentiates those who do and do not participate. Those not selected for the program may differ in significant ways that affect their observed outcomes, regardless of what the program did or did not do.

**Selection Out Of Programs**

A tempting solution to the problem of selection into programs is to compare those exposed to the program to those who were similar enough to be admitted but who subsequently dropped out. But are these persons really comparable? Could their motivation to stay in the program also affect whatever performance is being considered the outcome? If program completers have better outcomes than drop outs, it is possible that their success had nothing to do with the program’s services except that people who were less motivated to succeed were filtered out.

**Lack of Uniformity in Programming or Environments**

Lack of uniformity in implementation of multi-site programs may threaten the evaluator’s ability to isolate program effects from effects of differences in types of subjects/clients processed at each site. Environmental differences at sites may also contribute to differences in observed outcomes. The challenge is to develop defensible evidence that the program was responsible for or contributed to the observed effects, and to rule out alternative explanations.
Part II. Landscape Assessment
Chapter 5: The Case for Focusing on Demand

The case for focusing the National Campaign on combating demand for commercial sex is simple and evidence-based. We present the research providing the foundation for our recommendation below, but as an overview the case can be summarized as follows:

1. The primary cause of sex trafficking and sexual slavery is consumer-level demand for commercial sex.22

2. To combat demand, it is not necessary (or practical) to separate prostitution from sex trafficking.
   a. The distinction between people selling sex who are compelled by a third party and those who are not is generally invisible to buyers. Market incentives and fear of reprisals from pimps and traffickers motivate sex slaves to present themselves as if they participate voluntarily, and most johns cannot or choose not to see otherwise.
   b. It is not feasible to develop separate interventions for men buying compelled sex and for those buying sex from people who are not compelled by a third party.23 The only practical approach is to combat all purchasing of sex.
   c. Prostitution is the “front door” to sexual slavery and trafficking for law enforcement and other responders, since cases usually first present as prostitution, then some are reclassified as slavery or trafficking when evidence emerges attesting to the participation in commercial sex being compelled by third-party force, fraud, or coercion (or by finding the survivor to be a minor).

3. The only practices for combating prostitution and sex trafficking that are demonstrated to be effective are those that include combating demand.
   a. There is evidence that anti-demand interventions can be effective in reducing sexual exploitation; there is no firm evidence that interventions focusing on “supply” and “distribution” reduce the prevalence or incidence of sex trafficking.

4. There are two primary ways to directly affect actual and potential buyers of commercial sex:
   a. **education** of actual and potential buyers of commercial sex, and
   b. **law enforcement** interventions aimed at deterring men who might buy sex, and punishing those that do.

As we repeatedly assert in Part I of this report, arguing for combating demand does not imply that rescuing and supporting survivors or prosecuting pimps and traffickers are less important. It also does not imply that resources should be shifted away from efforts to address “supply” and “distribution.” These efforts need more support, as the “service gap” is tremendous and the needs are acute. What we mean is that an effective approach must be comprehensive and address all

---

22 The term “prostitution” is used when involving adults when no third-party force, fraud, or coercion is present, and “commercial sexual exploitation” and “sex trafficking” is used to refer to acts involving children and then commercial sex is compelled by a third party using force, fraud, or coercion.

23 An exception to this rule is that it is possible to form separate laws that provide penalty enhancements for men who buy sex from trafficked persons. It is also important to clarify that there are already separate laws for commercial sex with children, which is always trafficking.
three components of the market. Historically, the emphasis has been on supply and distribution, and little attention has been given to demand. The national campaign’s focus on demand is intended to bring balance to the overall effort to combat sexual exploitation (prostitution as well as sexual slavery) by providing a new infusion of resources and commitment to the market component that has been underserved.

The Need to Combat Commercial Sex

There are long-running debates about the level of harm resulting from commercial sex, and its proper legal status. At one end of the spectrum is the position that prostitution is inherently harmful and should be treated as a crime (Audet, 2002; Coulter, 2007; Davis, 2000; Farley, 2004; Raymond, 2003, 2005). At the opposite end are arguments that prostitution involving adults is victimless and should be legal and regulated like other businesses, and that commercial sex workers choose to exchange their time and services for money, as in any legitimate employment arrangement (see The Economist, 2004; Kempadoo, 2005, 2007; Klinger, 2003; Kuo, 2002; Liberator, 2004; Sanders, 2005; Sex Workers’ Outreach Project, 2005).

Evidence can be marshaled in support of either position, and sometimes the same evidence is used to support opposing conclusions. For example, prostitution opponents point to the drug abuse, community deterioration, and ancillary crime that invariably accompany street prostitution as evidence supporting criminalization. Those supporting legalization argue that these same dysfunctions are driven not by prostitution itself, but by the criminal status of the enterprise, much like alcohol prohibition fosters black markets, organized crime, and street crime. Legalization proponents generally assume that prostitution cannot be stopped, and argue that legalized prostitution would allow commercial sex to be taxed and regulated, and the conditions for prostitutes improved by the same kinds of oversight and legal protections provided in other workplaces.

However, the weight of the empirical evidence clearly finds sex trafficking and prostitution to be damaging, and that deregulation and legalization do not ameliorate those harms for more than a small portion of providers of commercial sex. The negative consequences of prostitution and sex trafficking for all parties directly and indirectly involved are well documented. Those working in the illicit sex trade, their “customers,” and residents and businesses in areas in which prostitution occurs all suffer tangible harm (Campbell et al., 2003; Newman, 2006; Nixon et al., 2002; Walker, 2002). Sexually exploited persons typically enter the illicit sex trade as minors (Edwards, 2006; Estes and Weiner, 2002; Farley et al., 2003; Shared Hope International, 2009), are frequently coerced or forced to engage in prostitution by pimps or traffickers (e.g., Chapkis, 2003; Farley et al., 2003), and are frequent victims of violent crime committed by pimps, traffickers, and sex buyers (e.g., Baldwin, 2003; Miller & Schwartz, 1995; Potterat et al., 2004; Urban Justice Center, 2003; Zimmerman et al., 2008). Although they are often the perpetrators of violence, the customers of commercial sex (“johns”) are also vulnerable to being victimized (e.g., Flowers, 1987; Miller, 1993; Sterk & Elifson, 1990) and are at elevated risk of contracting sexually transmitted diseases (e.g., Fernandez et al., 2005; Gil, 1996; Remple et al., 2007; Simonsen, 1988). Businesses are harmed when prostitution is visible nearby, and residents suffer from the vast array of felonies and community blight that invariably co-occur with prostitution. The market forces of prostitution also drive demand for victims of human trafficking (e.g., Hughes, 2001; Mameli, 2002).
Stratification of the Commercial Sex Industry

Understanding that the commercial sex “business” is highly stratified and segmented is a key to resolving the conflicting portrayals conveyed by proponents and opponents (e.g., Chapkis, 2000; Lowman and Fraser, 1996; Porter and Bonilla, 2000). By all accounts, street prostitutes occupy the lowest rung on the commercial sex ladder (e.g., Sanders, 2005; Scott and Dedel, 2006). They make the least money, are more likely to be drug addicted, subjected to violence, and otherwise distressed, and those who are pimped have the least control over their workload, choice of “clients,” and the money earned. Somewhat better conditions are generally (but not always) available to those working indoors in brothels, massage parlors, and clubs (e.g., Albert, 2001; Church et al., 2001; Sanders & Campbell, 2007; Whittaker & Hart, 1996). Operating at the highest levels of the commercial sex business are elite escort services, which some have referred to as serving the “luxury prostitution” market (e.g., Ringdal, 2004). The images of commercial sex portrayed by proponents of legalization best fit the conditions of women working as self-employed escorts or in the higher-end, more professionally run brothels and clubs (e.g., Elkind, 2010). In those market segments, women are less vulnerable to violence, drug addiction, and sexually transmitted diseases, and are more likely to have greater control over their “careers,” to be more selective about clients, and to make (and keep) more money (e.g., Albert, 2001; Brents & Hausbeck, 2005; Jeal & Salisbury, 2007; Sanders & Campbell, 2007). Many anti-prostitution initiatives target street prostitution, and are not structured to address prostitution occurring at various indoor venues, arranged online, or provided by escorts.24

Human Trafficking and Prostitution

The links between street prostitution and both domestic and international trafficking have been empirically confirmed by dozens of studies (see reviews by Farr, 2005; Leidholt, 2003; O’Connor & Healy, 2006), with the market forces of prostitution driving the demand for most human trafficking of women and girls (e.g., Farley, 2003; Hughes, 2001; International Human Rights Law Institute, 2003; Joe-Cannon, 2006; Mameli, 2002; United Nations, 2006). Estimates of the overall magnitude of human trafficking into and within the United States are the subject of debate and are derived from data and methods with substantial limitations (e.g., Clawson et al., 2006), but most researchers have concluded that the majority of trafficking is for the purpose of commercial sex (Ugarte et al., 2003; Wilson & Dalton, 2007). For example, the United Nations (2006) estimates that 87% of trafficked persons are sexually exploited, primarily through prostitution.25

24 The arrests of virtually all john school participants result from “reverse stings” in which female police officers pose as street prostitutes. Nothing else about the program would preclude it from serving male customers of escorts or brothels, or commercial sex arranged online, but police operations limit the program to serving men seeking street prostitutes. Similarly, none of the john schools accept men arrested for soliciting sex from children, since such men would be ineligible, but also because the pool from which john school participants are drawn is men soliciting sex from adults in reverse stings.

25 Critics argue this point, contending that there are far more people engaged in labor than in illicit commercial sex, and therefore the number of people in forced labor should exceed the number in forced sex. One can debate this point, but for the purpose of developing strategies for combating sexual exploitation - including sexual slavery – it is immaterial whether sexual exploitation more or less frequently than labor exploitation. It is indisputable that both are reprehensible and people must mobilize to combat both criminal affronts to human rights.
One of the objectives pursued by advocates has been educating law enforcement, social service providers, and policymakers to view prostitution as part of a much larger system of commercial sexual exploitation (Bales, 1999; Farr, 2005; McGill, 2003; United Nations, 2006) rather than merely a local, low-level street crime.

There is currently no firm answer to the question of what proportions of prostituted persons in any given area in the U.S. have been trafficked internationally, trafficked domestically, pimped locally, or are engaging in prostitution independently. While these distinctions are crucial for those involved in prosecuting offenders (i.e., pimps and traffickers) or serving the providers of commercial sex, the distinctions are relatively unimportant for attacking demand for street prostitution. Pimped, trafficked, and independent prostitutes serve the same market, and if that market is weakened by attacking demand, it will impact trafficking as well as local prostitution.

**Vulnerable Women and Girls Drawn Into Prostitution**

Most studies find the average age of entry into prostitution to be between 12 and 16 (Boyer et al., 1993; Estes and Weiner, 2002; Farley et al., 2003; Shannon et al., 2009; Silbert and Pines, 1982), and the vulnerabilities leading girls and young women into commercial sex often conspire to keep them there. Women and girls drawn or forced into prostitution typically are economically and emotionally vulnerable, with most having been scarred by childhood sexual and physical abuse and other forms of dysfunction in the home (Earls & David, 1989; Earls & David, 1990; Janus et al., 1987; Nandon et al., 1998; Michaud, 1988; McCarthy, 1995; McClanahan et al., 1999; Seng, 1989; Simons & Whitbeck, 1991; Sullivan, 1986; Tremble, 1993; Webber, 1991; Walker, 2002; Weisberg, 1985). For example, Farley et al. (2003) found that 63% of the prostituted women they interviewed in nine countries had been sexually abused as children, and 57% of the U.S. respondents also reported childhood physical abuse. Similarly, McIntyre (1999) found the majority of prostituted persons have a history of sexual and physical abuse (82% and 75%, respectively).

Traumatic childhood experiences contribute to prostitution via homelessness and a lack of economic self-sufficiency. Sexually and physically abused children are at an increased risk of running away (e.g., McCarthy, 1995; McClanahan et al., 1999; Michaud, 1988; Webber, 1991; Widom & Ames, 1994), and women and girls who are unable to sustain themselves financially are highly vulnerable to sexual exploitation. Providers of commercial sex are found to have high levels of childhood truancy, poor education, poor employment skills, and high levels of debt (e.g., Crime and Misconduct Commission, 2004; Walker, 2002a; Weisberg, 1985). Studies repeatedly find that among the most important predictors of prostitution are running away from home and homelessness (Bittle, 2002; Crime and Misconduct Commission, 2004; Farley et al., 2003; Greene et al., 1999; McClanahan et al., 1999; Nandon et al., 1998; Stark & Hodgson, 2003; Walker, 2002; Sullivan, 1986; Weisberg, 1985). The Minnesota Attorney General’s Office (1999) found that many youths are approached for sex within 48 hours of becoming homeless. Many runaway and homeless youth are too inexperienced, unskilled, drug involved, traumatized, and/or young to maintain legitimate employment, and turn to prostitution to survive.
Negative Impact of Commercial Sex

Impact on “Providers”

Once drawn into commercial sex, prostituted persons are at high risk for many kinds of additional trauma (Brewer et al., 2006; Campbell et al., 2003; Farley et al., 2003; Newman, 2006; Nixon et al., 2002; Romero-Daza et al., 2003; Scott and Dedel, 2006; Shannon et al., 2009; Walker, 2002). A recent study found that the vast majority of women and girls trafficked internationally are physically (95%) and sexually (59%) abused while being trafficked (Zimmerman et al., 2008). A U.S. study of nearly 2000 prostituted persons followed over a 30-year period found them to have mortality rates almost 200 times greater than those found among other women with similar demographic profiles (Potterat et al., 2004; see also Spittal et al., 2006). In that study, the most common causes of death were, in order: homicide, suicide, drug- and alcohol-related problems, HIV infection and accidents. The homicide rate among women actively engaged in prostitution was seventeen times greater than the rate for age-matched females in the general population (Potterat et al., 2004). After conducting a literature review and an analysis of nine different data sets, Brewer and colleagues (2006) concluded that prostituted women “…have the highest homicide victimization rate of any set of women ever studied.”

The vast majority of prostituted persons become victims of violent crime committed by customers, pimps, and/or traffickers (Baldwin, 2003; Hunter, 1994; Miller, 1995; Miller & Schwartz, 1995; Nixon et al., 2002; Raphael & Shapiro, 2004; Schissel & Fedec, 1999; Urban Justice Center, 2003; Valera, 2000; Walker, 2002). For example, surveys in the United States have found 73% to 92% of prostituted women to have been raped while providing commercial sex, and 59% of victims had been raped more than five times (Farley, 2003; Parriot, 1994; Williamson & Folaron, 2001).

Involvement in prostitution is also linked to a variety of health problems, including tuberculosis, HIV, STDs, anemia, and hepatitis (e.g., Campbell et al., 2003; Farley et al., 2003; McDonnell et al., 1998; Nixon et al., 2002; Walker, 2002a; Wood et al., 2007). Rates of infectious disease are from five to 60 times higher among providers of commercial sex than in general populations (Jeal and Salisbury, 2004). In a national survey of U.S. school children, twenty percent of the girls who were prostituted reported that they had had a sexually transmitted infection, compared with four percent of girls in the group who had never exchanged sex for money or drugs (Edwards et al, 2006).

The various physical traumas resulting from commercial sex often lead to psychological distress, including Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (e.g., Campbell et al., 2003; Farley et al., 2003; Roxburgh et al., 2006; Valera, 2000; Walker, 2002a). Non-assaultive commercial sex can also be traumatic, especially for underage girls newly involved in prostitution. For example, one study found that 90% of a sample of prostituted women and girls had lost their virginity in an act of commercial sex (Silbert, 1984).

Although some work independently, studies find that up to 80% of samples of women and girls serving as prostitutes had been coerced or forced to engage in prostitution by pimps or traffickers (Chapkis, 2003; Farley et al., 2003; Raphael & Shapiro, 2002; Raymond et al., 2001). In a comparison of female prostitutes with pimps to those without, Norton-Hawk (2004) found that pimp-controlled survivors of sexual exploitation were more likely to have an inadequate education, to be chronically unemployed, and to have been younger when they first had
intercourse, tried drugs, and engaged in prostitution. Women with pimps usually have financial quotas to meet, and are subjected to many forms of manipulation and abuse designed to keep them under control and generating money (Albert, 2001; Hoigard & Finstad, 1994; Kennedy et al., 2007; Maher, 1996; Miller and Schwartz, 1995; Royal, 1998; Schwartz et al., 2007; Sterks, 2000; Williams, 2007; Williamson & Cluse-Tolar, 2002). Prostituted persons often keep little of the money they generate: Scott (2002) reports that pimps take an estimated 60% to 70% of the money earned, and substance-involved persons often spend much of the remainder toward satisfying addictions. Prostituted women in Nevada’s legal brothels keep less than half of their earnings after paying half to the brothel, paying various fees and charges for food and supplies, tipping support staff, and paying pimps (Albert, 2001).

Studies have found that most women engaged in prostitution want to exit “the life,” but the emotional and physical harm resulting from commercial sex, compounding pre-existing vulnerabilities, can make it difficult to leave. Farley & Barkan (1998) found 88% of a sample of female providers of commercial sex in San Francisco to report a desire to leave prostitution. Compromised health, addiction, PTSD, and a lack of employment skills can narrow options for developing financial self-sufficiency, and this creates dependency upon prostitution as a means of support and, in many cases, perpetuates dependency upon pimps. After years of manipulation and exploitation, women who have been controlled by pimps and traffickers can have difficulty separating (e.g., Kramer, 2003). Pimps and traffickers will use combinations of force, manipulation, fraud, and intimidation to maintain control of what, for them, is a financial asset (e.g., Kennedy et al., 2007; Maher, 1996; O’Connor, 2004; Royal, 1998; Williamson & Cluse-Tolar, 2002). Raymond and colleagues (2001) found more than half of the women who tried to leave prostitution were threatened, stalked, abused, and/or forcibly returned.

Pre-existing conditions, subsequent traumas, and market forces converge to keep women and girls involved in commercial sex. Those who were not initially addicted to drugs often become so soon after becoming involved in prostitution (Chapkis, 2000; Kramer, 2003). Drug addiction and poverty serve to keep prostituted women and girls destabilized and dependent. Substance abuse is a factor in both the initiation and persistence of prostitution (Hwang & Bedford, 2004; Farley et al., 2003; Campbell et al., 2003; Kramer, 2003; Maher and Daly, 1996; McClanahan et al., 1999; Potterat et al., 1998; Romero-Daza, Weeks, & Singer, 2003; Silbert, Pines, & Linch, 1982; The Urban Justice Center, 2003; Walker, 2002a). The trauma experienced by prostituted persons can result in greater dependence on drugs (Romero-Daza et al., 2003; Silbert et al., 1982), both as a means of self-medicating (Hwang & Bedford, 2004; Kramer, 2003) and to support a drug habit (Nixon et al., 2002), sometimes through exchanging sex for drugs (O’Leary & Howard, 2001). Interactions among prostitution, abuse (physical, sexual, and emotional), addiction, compromised health, diminished self-sufficiency skills, and other dysfunctions can send the lives of survivors in a downward spiral from which exit becomes progressively more difficult.

**Impact on “Consumers”**

While the providers of commercial sex suffer the most serious consequences, the consumers are also negatively affected. Although they are more often the perpetrators of violence, johns are also vulnerable to being victimized. Their involvement in a criminal act makes it unlikely that they will report victimization that occurs while they are with prostitutes. Prostituted persons and pimps are fully aware of this and some take advantage of the opportunity by “setting up” johns for robbery and assault (e.g., Flowers, 1987; Miller, 1993). For example, Sterk & Elifson (1990)
found two-thirds of prostitutes in Atlanta and New York to admit to having robbed johns, and Arnold and colleagues (2001) found 56% of the prostituted persons they studied to report having assaulted clients for reasons other than self-defense.

In addition to criminal victimization, johns are at elevated risk of contracting sexually transmitted diseases (e.g., Fernandez et al., 2005; Gil, 1996; Remple et al., 2007; Rolfs et al., 1990; Simonsen, 1988; Ward et al., 2005). Johns frequently seek and pay a premium for unprotected intercourse and oral sex (e.g., Jeal and Salisbury, 2004; Strathdee et al., 2008), which greatly increases the risks of contracting and spreading STIs, HIV, hepatitis, tuberculosis and more (e.g., Decker et al., 2008; Fernandez et al., 2005; Gil, 1996; Remple et al., 2007; Simonsen, 1988). Surveys of prostituted women find that those insisting on always using condoms face income losses of up to 79%, because most “customers” prefer sex without condoms (Rao et al., 2003). Between 35% and 55% of samples of prostituted women said they had engaged in unprotected commercial sex, and 10 to 35% never use condoms while engaging in commercial sex (e.g., Hong-Jing, 2004; Jeal and Salisbury, 2004; Peralta et al., 1992; Rhode Island Family Life Center, 2009; Strathdee et al., 2008). Disturbingly, surveys have found that just 47% of prostituted women know whether or not they are HIV-positive, less than half had health screenings in the prior year despite having sex with an average of 17 different men per week, and 45% were infected with hepatitis C (Jeal and Salisbury, 2004; Rhode Island Family Life Center, 2009). Other research has found clients of brothels to have unprotected sex with both the women in brothels and their wives and other sex partners, providing an infectious disease “bridge” between commercial sex markets and the general population (e.g., Decker et al., 2008; Gomes do Espirito Santo & Etheridge, 2005).

**Impact on Communities**

Prostitution is associated with higher crime rates and other forms of community degradation. Among the immediate safety problems are used condoms, syringes, and other hazards left in public areas where prostitution occurs (see review by Scott & Dedel, 2006). A survey in Hudson County, New Jersey found that 23% of respondents to say that they live in an area in which prostitution is a problem (NJ.com, 2008). Surveys of business owners and community organizations find that street prostitution negatively affects local businesses and lowers the quality of life within communities (e.g., Russell, 2006). Collaborative problem-solving efforts over the past 20 years have repeatedly determined prostitution to be among the higher-priority problems plaguing communities throughout the nation (Sampson & Scott, 1999). For example, Web searches and literature reviews conducted by our evaluation team have identified more than 30 communities that have targeted prostitution as a focus of their “Weed and Seed” initiatives. A study by the Justice Research and Statistics Association found that 32% of the 19 Weed and Seed sites targeted prostitution as a focus of their local initiatives (O’Connell et al., 2004). More than a dozen nominees and winners of Goldstein Awards from the Center for Problem-Oriented Policing have named prostitution as a high priority issue, sought grant support, and have developed collaborative responses. In addition, research on adult-oriented businesses such as

---

26 Weed and Seed is a community-based strategy sponsored by the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ), featuring proactive problem-solving and comprehensive multiagency approaches to law enforcement, crime prevention, and community revitalization. [http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/ccdo/ws/welcome.html](http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/ccdo/ws/welcome.html)

27 See [http://www.popcenter.org/library-goldstein-application-07.htm](http://www.popcenter.org/library-goldstein-application-07.htm) for a list of Goldstein Award nominees and winners.
strip clubs or adult books and video stores find crime rates to increase when such businesses open, and to decrease when they close (e.g., McCleary, 2008).

**Burden on Law Enforcement and Other Public Services**

Most crime statutes in U.S. states as well as abroad categorize common street prostitution involving adults as a low-level misdemeanor, public nuisance crime. Advocates of legalization of prostitution view it as a victimless crime, while others see the community where soliciting occurs as the “victim” because prostitution negatively affects neighborhoods and attracts other criminal activity. These perspectives have led many cities to enforcement policies oriented to accomplishing short-terms goals of cleaning up particular street corners and business districts; cities often tolerate prostitution activity confined to restricted locations. Frequently, enforcement activities involve arresting prostitutes followed by short-term punishment and no provision of services. Thus, police departments and district attorneys’ offices process a large number of recidivist prostitutes with unaddressed service needs, but prosecute few johns.

Prostitution places a large burden on the criminal justice system and on providers of public health and social services. One study conducted in the 1980s found that 16 U.S. cities each spent an average of $15.3 million in one year for prostitution control (Pearl, 1987), adjusting expressed in 2010 dollars. More recently, Allard and Herbon (2003) estimated that prostitution arrests in 2001 cost the city of Chicago over $10.6 million (in 2007 dollars).

Those involved in prostitution are typically in need of other public services. As we’ve discussed, prostituted persons are often sexually assaulted, and victims of sexual assault present an array of service needs ranging from the need for employment; refuge from abusers; child care; and legal advocacy to addressing psychological problems resulting from sexual violence (Baskin & Sommers 1998; Brownstein et al. 1995; Parriott, 1994; Ritchie 2000; Spunt et al. 1994). They also are at high risk for a host of physical and mental health problems, including drug addiction, STD infection, PTSD, and injuries from violent crimes (e.g., Crime and Misconduct Commission, 2004; Council for Prostitution Alternatives, 1991; Dunlap et al., 2003; Lowman, 1991; Schissel & Fedec, 1999; Mansson & Hedin, 1999; Nandon et al., 1998; Nixon et al., 2002; Stark & Hodgson, 2003; Widom & Kuhns, 1996; Walker, 2002). Obviously, those supporting themselves exclusively through commercial sex are usually uninsured, and seek costly, reactive health care services at emergency rooms and public health care providers. Since many prostituted women and girls have children, they also are high-end users of the foster care system and child protective services.

**Commercial Sex Markets**

Like the market for any commodity or service, the illicit commercial sex market is a function of supply and demand. Ensuring that there is a supply to meet the demand (and to profit from the exchange) are distributors. Like the market for any good or service (illicit or otherwise), demand is the driving force, and the other components follow. When there is demand, supply will be found or produced, and distributors will ensure that the two shall meet. Figure 5.1 presents a simple illustration of the economic model of commercial sex markets.

The model in Figure 5.1 is limited in that it does not convey a flow or sequence of events, but instead, is a static image in which supply, demand, and distribution are depicted as coequal. An
alternative model is presented in Figure 5.2, which better illustrates the origination of the market in demand, which drives distribution to procure a sufficient supply. The stronger the demand, the greater is the economic motivation to obtain and deliver a sufficient supply.

**Figure 5.1: Triad Model of Commercial Sex Markets**

Figure 5.2 depicts also how distributors (pimps or traffickers) can be bypassed where demand can make direct connection with supply. In commercial sex markets, it is not always true that there are third parties brokering (or forcing) exchanges between those providing commercial sex and the consumers of commercial sex. For people engaged in providing commercial sex who do not have pimps or traffickers compelling them, one can consider distribution to be bypassed, or can consider providers as their own distributors.

There are a few individuals in the current working coalition who have argued that it is more accurate to model commercial sex markets as having two levels of demand. First, there is consumer-level demand, which is illustrated in both Figures 5.1 and 5.2. Second, they argue that there is a “wholesale” level of demand, or the demand on the part of pimps and traffickers to procure a supply of people to exploit. This feature of the market is best depicted in Figure 5.2 (and is not illustrated in 5.1).

While it is undoubtedly true that there is both consumer-level and wholesale-level demand, framing the distributive role of pimps and traffickers as a type of demand is problematic when it comes to taking pragmatic action, and confuses the concept of demand in a way that can be counterproductive for the campaign. For example, it is clear that without consumer level demand, there would be no economic gain and hence no purpose for pimps to serve, and therefore no economic reason to attempt to sell sex - under compelled conditions or otherwise. Pimps and traffickers therefore exert no independent demand on the market - they are simply a conduit, whose activity and influence is merely reflective, as they benefit from satisfying retail-level or consumer-level demand.
Through the mid 1990s, criminal justice systems attempts to suppress street prostitution focused largely on interrupting supply by arresting and sanctioning the providers, but largely ignored the individuals creating demand. While arresting street prostitutes may temporarily clear an area of visible activity, driving it to other neighborhoods or indoors, experience shows that this strategy alone produces few lasting benefits. Prostitutes cycle through the criminal justice system often and rapidly, typically returning to the streets within hours of being arrested. Moreover, women and girls arrested for prostitution are rarely provided with services to help them address the issues that make them vulnerable to further sexual exploitation.

The development of “john school” programs generally proceeds from the assumption that some portion of the population of men who solicit prostitutes are amenable to “treatment” in the form of education, and will change their behavior in response to new information. Another subset of men may be unresponsive to an educational intervention. The proportion falling into the “amenable” and “intractable” groups is unknown, but it is not crucial to know: As long as there is a group of men drawn into the program that is amenable to change, the programs have a chance to make a difference as long as they are executed properly.

It is also assumed that a one-day educational program is likely to do no harm to those in the “intractable” group. The programs are often designed as an option for diverting people from normal adjudication, but in doing so expose the public to no additional risk since traditional sanctions for misdemeanor prostitution offenses require offenders to spend little—if any—time
segregated from the public. In addition, there is very little opportunity cost for investing in the programs, since the modest program expenses are covered by fees paid by participants.

**Markets for Prostitution and Sex Trafficking Driven by Demand**

Like the market for any commodity or service, the illicit commercial sex market is driven by demand (Hughes, 2004; Lederer, 2006; Malarek, 2009; Sanders, 2008). Both prostitution and sex trafficking (commercial sex provided by those compelled through force, fraud, or coercion) arise from a common source: men’s decisions to buy sex.

Studies have found that purchasing commercial sex is relatively common and that the profiles of consumers of commercial sex are fairly mainstream and unlike those of other offender groups, although the population of “johns” also contains some dangerous criminals and sociopaths (e.g., Holzman and Pines, 1982; Reichert, 2004; Sawyer et al., 2001). A substantial portion of men in the U.S. admits to having purchased sex at some point in their lives, with most surveys finding between 10% and 20% to admit to this crime (e.g., Michael et al., 1994; Monto, 1999; Sullivan and Simon, 1998). The rates found in the U.S. are similar to those found in Australia and Europe (see reviews by Sanders, 2008; Weitzer, 2007). With one out of every five or six men admitting to purchasing sex, it is clear that patronizing commercial sex is not primarily the result of deviance or pathology. It is equally apparent that since most men do not purchase sex, the behavior is not normative and cannot be considered an intractable problem beyond the reach of intervention.

Studies of male consumers of commercial sex find them to be similar to the general population in most regards, and quite unlike most populations of criminal offenders (see, e.g., Kennedy, 2004; Lever and Dolnick, 2000; Monto, 1999). In a comparison of men who had been arrested for purchasing sex to nationally representative samples of men (i.e., male respondents of large-scale national surveys; Monto, 1999; Monto & McRee, 2005) found that those who had purchased sex were more likely to have attended college, and were just 15% less likely to be married (41% for arrested johns versus 56% in the national survey; Monto, 1999). Similarly, Shively et al., (2008) found that a large proportion of the men in San Francisco’s “john school” program were well educated, employed, and married, and few had extensive criminal histories. Similar results have been found in other studies (e.g., Kennedy, 2004; Lever and Dolnick, 2000).

Many studies have examined men’s motivation for buying sex, and the aggregate finding is that there is a wide range of reasons for procuring sex from prostitutes (see review by Sanders, 2008). The distinct motivations identified in these surveys can be categorized into a few main types: (1) seeking intimacy (i.e., a way to approximate intimate relationships they are unable or unwilling to develop); (2) seeking sex without intimacy (a way to get sex without the investment and compromises needed for intimate relationships); (3) seeking variety (fulfilling a desire for sex with women of various “types,” based on ethnicity, size, age, hair color, etc.), (4) thrill-seeking (being drawn by the “thrill of the hunt” and the illicit nature of prostitution); and (5) pathology.

---

While the population of male consumers of commercial sex undoubtedly contains its share of serious criminals and sociopaths (e.g., Holzman and Pines, 1982; Reichert, 2004; Sawyer et al., 2001), studies have found that purchasing commercial sex is relatively common and that the profiles of johns are fairly mainstream and unlike those of other offender groups. A substantial portion of men in the U.S. admits to having purchased sex at some point in their lives. While earlier studies with methodological limitations have found 69% (Kinsey et al., 1948) to 80% (Benjamin and Masters, 1964) of American men to have engaged in commercial sex, more recent studies with representative sampling have found much lower - but still substantial - rates in the range of 15% to 20% (e.g., Michael et al., 1994; Monto, 1999; Sullivan and Simon, 1998). These more recent U.S. rates are similar to those found in Australia and Europe (see reviews by Sanders, 2008; Weitzer, 2007). With one out of every five or six men admitting to purchasing sex, it is clear that patronizing commercial sex is not the behavior of just a small minority of deviants.

Studies of male consumers of commercial sex find them to be similar to the general population in most regards, and quite unlike most populations of criminal offenders (see, e.g., Kennedy, 2004; Lever and Dolnick, 2000; Monto, 1999). In a comparison of men who had been arrested for purchasing sex to nationally representative samples of men (i.e., male respondents of large-scale national surveys; Monto, 1999; Monto & McRee, 2005) found that those who had purchased sex were actually more likely to have attended college, and were just 15% less likely to be married (41% for arrested johns versus 56% in the national survey; Monto, 1999).

While men who solicit prostitution are not atypical demographically or in terms of criminal history, they are unsurprisingly and measurably different in terms of a range of attitudes toward women, relationships, and commercial sex. For example, Monto & McRee (2005) found that consumers were less likely to be happily married than men in national samples, to have sexually liberal attitudes (e.g., to view premarital sex, sex among minors, and homosexuality as acceptable), and to think about sex more often. Commercial sex participants were also less likely to have been sexually molested as children, or to report having forced women into sexual acts. The differences between samples were not large, but were statistically significant.

Many studies have examined men’s motivation for buying sex (e.g., Bernstein, 2001; Farley, 2007; Hoigard & Finstad, 1992; Holzman & Pines, 1982; Lau et al., 2004; Lever & Dolnick, 2000; Mansson, 2006; McKeganey & Barnard, 1994; Monto, 2000; Stein, 1974; Winick, 1962; Xantidis & McCabe, 2000), and the aggregate finding is that there is a wide range of reasons and the relationships between prostitutes and their “customers” can become quite complex (see review by Sanders, 2008). Research has found that the reasons men hire prostituted persons include:

- To engage in sex acts that few other women are willing to engage in.
- To experience sex with women with a variety of physical traits.
- To satisfy the desire for sex and/or intimacy that they are unable to meet in other ways.
- To satisfy a need for emotional support that they are not receiving from others.
- Because it provides them with sex but requires little or no emotional involvement.
• Because they are attracted to the excitement of the illicit nature of prostitution.
• Because they have difficulty meeting women conventionally (e.g., feeling shy or awkward approaching women).
• Because they feel that most women find them unattractive.
• Because they do not have the time nor desire the responsibility of a conventional relationship.
• Because it provides a less risky means of mimicking extreme or illegal fantasies, such as incest or rape.
• Because they desire being “in control” or dominating women when having sex.

Many people who have studied the problems of sexual slavery and prostitution, including practitioners who have worked in the field to assist survivors and prosecute traffickers, have independently concluded that mitigating or eliminating sexual exploitation requires attacking it at its source: consumer-level demand. Without the demand for commercial sex, there would be no market forces producing and sustaining the roles of pimps and traffickers as “distributors,” nor would there be a force driving the production of a “supply” of people to be sexually exploited. Supply and distribution are symptoms; demand is the cause. (See Figure 1.1 for an illustration of a tri-partite economic model of commercial sex markets).

A paradigm shift regarding buying sex is needed in order to produce substantial and lasting change. Currently, the majority of men in the United States do not buy sex—but it is not universally condemned, and a least one out of six or seven men in the nation by sex from a prostituted person (e.g., Michael et al., 1994; Monto, 1999; Sullivan and Simon, 1998; see reviews by Sanders, 2008; Weitzer, 2007). A national survey of over 13,000 U.S. children in grades seven through 12 found nearly four percent to have exchanged sex for drugs or money, which extrapolates to 650,000 teenagers who have engaged in commercial sex (Edwards, 2006; see also estimates by Estes and Weiner, 2001; Shared Hope International, 2009). A substantial plurality of the U.S. population believes that prostitution is a harmless vice and should be decriminalized or legalized (e.g., Cotton et al., 2000; General Social Survey, 1996; Gallup Poll, 1991). This indifference, tolerance, or outright support for commercial sex is a major impediment to combating demand, and should be one of the primary targets of the campaign.

**Tactics for Combating Demand**

Given the need to address prostitution and sex trafficking, the demonstrated ineffectiveness of sanctioning “providers” (e.g., DeMuth & Steffensmeier 2004; San Bernardino County Sheriff’s Department, 1993), and the difficulty of successfully prosecuting “distributors” (pimps and traffickers), many communities have attempted to curb commercial sex by combating demand (e.g., Hughes, 2004; Shively et al., 2008). Among demand reduction tactics are police operations targeting sex buyers using female officers posing as prostitutes (e.g., Allard & Herbon, 2003; Nolan, 2001; Scott & Dedel, 2006), public education campaigns, vehicle seizures, geographic restraining orders or civil injunctions, community service program, “shaming” offenders by publicizing their identities, and “john school” education programs (Shively et al., 2008).
In exploratory research conducted in 2006-2008, Abt Associates found little descriptive information to be available about the vast majority of demand reduction strategies, and no systematic effort had been undertaken to develop a typology and identify jurisdictions implementing them. To inform those operating or planning demand reduction effort, we launched a systematic description and process/formative assessment of practices employed throughout the U.S. In the National Assessment we developed a typology and have compiled lists of sites in which demand reduction efforts have occurred. A summary of findings is presented in Table C.1. ( Appendix C), and a complete list of sites is presented in Table C.2. As can be seen here, the most widespread demand reduction strategy is the police decoy operation, or reverse sting, occurring in 650 cities and counties. Nearly 60% of sites (n = 379) that conduct reverse stings also publicize identities of arrestees.

For men who cannot be (or have not yet been) educated or deterred, the campaign should support practices and policies that ensure their behavior is dealt with in such a way that (a) justice is served, (b) punishments are commensurate with the crime’s severity, (c) responses to sex buyers serve to accomplish both specific and general deterrence,29 (d) captured sex buyers are educated and make restitution by funding survivor programs; and (e) arrested sex buyers are provided incentives or mandates to assist in investigating and prosecuting pimps and traffickers.

To reach the long term goal of true and widespread prevention, a number of intermediate objectives should be pursued, such as supporting effective and promising practices at the local grassroots level, multifaceted efforts geared at changing common normative perceptions about commercial sex, law reform, formulation of (and adherence to) policies prohibiting buying sex, training practitioners, and conducting education and social marketing campaigns. We discuss the possibilities in more detail throughout the remainder of this report, but as an overview, some of the key objectives that should be considered are:

- Eradicate sexual slavery by working to eradicate all illicit sexual exploitation.
- Contribute to a comprehensive effort by focusing on eliminating demand for commercial sex.
- Establish permanent system change to ensure sustaining the campaign’s successes.
- Produce a paradigm shift involving elimination of general public tolerance of, or support for, sexual exploitation.
- Educate boys so that they do not become men who sexually exploit.
- Promote law reform:
  - Reform state laws so that buying sex is a felony, with increased penalties, mandatory education programs, and restorative justice components.
  - Provide penalties and/or incentives for johns to assist police in investigating and prosecuting sex traffickers.
- Support law enforcement:
  - Advocate for rigorous enforcement of prostitution and trafficking laws.
  - Provide support for gender equity in enforcement of prostitution law.

---

29 Deterrence refers to discouraging people from committing crime (or other acts) due to the threat or application of sanctions. Specific deterrence refers to preventing repeating subsequent crimes of people already sanctioned, and general deterrence refers to discouraging offending of people other than those who have been punished.
- Support investigations, enforcement, prosecution, and meting out penalties.
- Shift focus from providers to consumers of commercial sex.
- Link buyer penalties to survivor services.
- Route buyers to education and treatment programs in addition to penalties.
- Leverage buyers to make cases against pimps and traffickers.

- Mobilize federal action
  - TVPA/Wilberforce Act—appropriations for the End Demand provisions in particular, and Department of Justice research and collection of data on buyers of sex.
  - TVPA/Wilberforce Act—compliance with other programming and reporting requirements.
  - Congressional oversight to ensure that agencies are meeting their obligations and complying with federal laws on human trafficking.

**Tactics Directly Addressing Johns**

While they can be combined and categorized as *education* programs and *law enforcement* interventions, there is a wide array of specific tactics that have been developed, and many of these tactics overlap categories in our strategic framework. There is vast expertise at the practice level that should be fostered and brought to bear on the collective efforts supported by the coalition and the campaign. An effort has been underway for the past three years to inventory the range of extant demand reduction efforts operating at the local in the United States. There are roughly a dozen distinct types of interventions that have been developed and implemented to combat demand, and many variations within each type. Specific approaches include:

- **Public education & awareness programs**
  - broad messaging—general public
  - targeting specific groups, e.g.
    - state and local policy leaders, such as mayors, agency heads
    - professionals—law enforcement, public health, activists, education
    - men who sexually exploit others
    - boys
    - community organizations
    - military—leadership and armed forces
    - business—leadership and the workforce
    - teachers—school administrators, classroom teachers, school psychologists
    - parents
    - legislators—federal and state

- **Police decoy operations (“reverse stings”) aimed at johns**
  - street-level
    - women officers posing as prostituted persons
  - web-based
    - police respond to real ads, replace prostituted persons with police decoys, continue taking calls from johns
    - police post decoy ads, set up reverse sting
    - police decoys respond to ads placed by johns seeking prostituted persons
  - brothel-based
- police investigate brothels, make arrests, replace brothel staff with decoys, continue fielding calls and “walk-ins” from johns
- police use “black books” or other call lists to investigate “customers”

- **Shaming**
  - publicizing identities of arrested johns, via news outlets, police websites, or billboards
- **Seizing or forfeiting autos**
- **Suspending driver’s licenses**
- **Geographic restraining orders (e.g., Stay Out of Areas with Prostitution, or SOAP orders)**
  - johns prohibited from visiting areas with known prostitution activity
- **Neighborhood action**
  - tips to police
  - citizen patrols
  - community initiated events
- **Community impact panels**
  - Residents and business representatives speak to arrestees about harm of prostitution to residents and businesses
- **“John School” education or treatment programs for arrestees**
  - as sentencing options, coupled with other criminal sanctions
  - as diversion programs
  - one-day classes versus multiple-session counseling models
- **Community service programs for arrestees**

**Evidence of Deterrence**

There have been few sound evaluations of demand initiatives, but there is evidence that men can be deterred and commercial sex markets can be reduced. Our evaluation of the FOPP found a 40% reduction in recidivism to be attributable to San Francisco’s john school program (Shively et al., 2008). Weisburd et al. (2006) examined the impact of a comprehensive “crackdown” on prostitution in Jersey City, NJ finding a substantial reduction in prostitution and concluding that the effects were not the result of displacement. While this is encouraging, the intervention involved tactics that targeted supply as well as demand, so it is unclear what portion of the effect is attributable to the anti-demand interventions. Similarly, Poland et al. (2008) found a dramatic reduction in street prostitution in Ipswich, England resulting from an intensive and multifaceted intervention. The program featured intense enforcement aimed at demand (arresting “kerb crawlers”), and a therapeutic (rather than punitive) approach for providers of prostitution.

**Anecdotal evidence: Domestic Sex Trafficking in Pennsylvania and New York**

In our National Assessment (Shively et al., 2010), we found anecdotal evidence that a combination of arresting and shaming johns produced a dramatic impact on demand in Wilkes-Barre, PA. The respondent in our interview described what he called a “pimp circuit” that operated in upstate New York (Buffalo, Rochester, Syracuse, Binghamton) and down Route 81 into Central Pennsylvania (Harrisburg, Reading, Scranton, Wilkes-Barre). Typical interventions had been tried and proven ineffective: arresting prostituted women accomplished little. Women who were trafficked on the circuit would simply pay their fines and serve a few hours in lockup
and move on. They also tried focusing on the pimps, but putting together a good case for prosecution was very labor intensive and rarely successful. The respondent said they had built a good case against one pimp, which meant that they “finally” had someone willing to testify against him. But shortly before the case went to trial, the witness (one of the women he prostituted) died, “and so did the prosecution.” In 1986, Wilkes-Barre police tried something new: they conducted several large-scale john stings or reverse stings, using female police decoys posing as prostitutes and arresting men attempting to buy sex. In each of the first few reverse stings, they arrested over 100 men. The men were issued citations and ordered to pay fines, and their identities were included in press releases which ran in the local Sunday paper.

The respondent from the police department said that their efforts quickly showed results. The women they were arresting for prostitution started talking about business being bad. Police departments in other cities on the pimp circuit (including Scranton and Syracuse) reported hearing that “business” was poor in Wilkes-Barre. Within two years or so of periodic reverse stings and publicizing identities of buyers, it became evident that Wilkes-Barre was taken off the circuit. Prior to the demand focused efforts, there was an average of 20 “street prostitutes” operating in the city at a given time - five would be local, and “usually hard-core drug addicts.” The remaining 15 were trafficked on the interstate circuit. After several intensive large-scale reverse stings, Wilkes-Barre was taken off the circuit, leaving only a handful of local women who would sometimes serve as prostitutes in a very small market for street prostitution.

Social Science Studies on Combating Demand

Two studies have attempted to isolate and estimate the effects of demand reduction tactics, but were challenged by data limitations. Monto and Garcia (2001) studied the impact of a john school program that operated in Portland, Oregon from 1995 to 1997. They found no significant difference in the recidivism rates of a treatment and a comparison groups, but could not make conclusions about the program's impact since there were only three recidivists in the treatment and comparison group combined, and a total sample size of 190, providing insufficient statistical power to detect an effect. Brewer et al. (2007) attempted to determine the deterrent effect of arresting men who solicited prostitution, and concluded that arrest reduced recidivism by 70%. However, the study design does not adequately support that conclusion. The “arrested” group was comprised of men whose point of initial identification as a sex buyer was at arrest for prostitution. The comparison group was comprised of men identified as commercial sex buyers through health records. There is significant potential for selection biases and thus nonequivalence between the arrest “treatment” group and the health care “comparison” group, resulting in group differences at baseline affecting probabilities of subsequent arrest. In addition to that concern, the study had insufficient statistical power to make a determination about group differences or treatment effects: their sample had a total of two recidivists in the "arrest" group and four recidivists in the “non-arrest” comparison group identified through health centers. In addition, it is unclear whether the recidivism follow-up period was equivalent across the two groups. For arrestees, arrest records provided a clear starting point for the follow-up period to track recidivism, but for the health clinic sample, it is unclear when the most recent purchase of commercial sex occurred and thus when the “clock” started for the follow-up period.

Surveys of men who have purchased sex have attempted to address the potential impact of various interventions by asking men hypothetically what would deter them (e.g., Durschlag & Goswami, 2008; Farley et al., 2009). Topping the list of most frequently cited consequences was
having one's photo or name publicized in local papers, billboards, or on the internet, mentioned more often than traditional criminal justice sanctions such as jail, drivers license suspension, automobile impounds, and fines. These survey findings are consistent with what we have found anecdotally in our survey of law enforcement personnel for our national assessment: e.g., one of the police chiefs interviewed said that the first question most johns ask is not whether they will go to jail or pay a fine, but whether their wife, girlfriend, or boss will find out. While encouraging, the survey findings about hypothetical penalties and the anecdotal evidence of the penalties feared most by johns do not demonstrate that shaming is an effective deterrent.

The aforementioned similarities of sex purchasers to the “general population” and dissimilarities to criminal offender populations provides clues to understanding the potential to deter men from buying sex. The fact that the men tend to be married and employed, with little criminal history, suggests that they would be affected by relatively minor sanctions – such as arrest, minor penalties, or extralegal sanctions such as shaming - that have little effect on typical offenders populations.
Overview

This chapter of the report provides overviews of efforts three sites in the United States that have been pioneers in efforts to combat demand for exploited commercial sex. There are a number of reasons for providing what we may loosely call case studies, and for choosing these three sites to feature. We believe that valuable lessons can be drawn from examining specific cases of communities working out methods of addressing prostitution and sex trafficking, and that these lessons will be useful to the national campaign in two individual communities seeking to launch new programs or improve existing ones. Among the key lessons evident when reviewing these three cases are:

- The value of forming and sustaining coalitions and informal collaborations.
- The value of pursuing multiple approaches and seeking to have a comprehensive effort to combat demand.
- The necessity of tailoring interventions to fit local needs, constraints, and opportunities, and to leverage the strengths and capacity of local partners.
- The sequential and interactive nature of the development of innovative and effective interventions.

All three of the sites highlighted in this chapter are nationally and internationally recognized as leaders in the development of initiatives to eradicate sexual exploitation, and particularly in pursuing this objective by focusing on ending demand. Cook County, Illinois has developed arguably the most comprehensive effort to combat demand in the United States. San Francisco is known globally as leading the development of the “john school” model. Atlanta developed and fielded an award-winning social marketing and public awareness campaign focusing on the buyers of prostituted youth. While these three sites are unquestionably innovators and leaders in developing and implementing tactics to combat sexual exploitation, we must qualify their presentation as “best practices” with the caveat that – with the exception of San Francisco’s john school program – the practices described have not been evaluated and therefore cannot be assumed to be effective. However, while the impact on sex trafficking and exploitation cannot be assured, it is clear that these sites have – at minimum - been successful in creating coalitions, developing responses, and implementing innovative and comprehensive programs and practices focused on combating demand.

This chapter begins with a narrative of collaborative work to combat sex trafficking and prostitution in the greater Chicago area. While their approach was comprehensive, many of the initiatives focused on combating demand for commercial sex. One of the central themes apparent in the evolution of their efforts was the indispensable value of coalitions and partnerships in reforming law and implementing programs and practice, a message repeatedly reinforced as we conducted research for this project. This chapter provides an overview of a wide range of specific programs, practices, and strategies that can be employed to combat demand and the resources and steps taken to mobilize them.
We also provide a description of efforts to combat sexual exploitation in Atlanta, with a focus on the role of coalitions and collaboration in developing and implementing a range of specific initiatives designed to combat sexual exploitation, including several anti-demand initiatives. As was seen in Cook County, a core group of collaborators expanded and linked to form partnerships with other coalitions in order to assemble and deploy resources they needed to take action.

In addition, we present another illustration in which the role of coalitions and collaboration was critical in developing and implementing initiatives designed to combat sexual exploitation, including a model “john school” anti-demand initiative. In San Francisco, a core group of collaborators formed a partnership in the mid 1990s that has remained intact to the present, and has developed and sustained a program that has served as a model for over 70 subsequent programs in the U.S., Canada, the United Kingdom, and South Korea.

When reading the description of efforts in these three sites, please keep in mind that we do not present them as representing all of the efforts ongoing in Atlanta, Cook County, or San Francisco. Nor do the descriptions necessarily capture completely the partnerships involved or the programs and practices described. True case studies of three sites engaged in innovative, comprehensive, and multifaceted programs are far beyond the scope of this project. While limited, due to the inability to represent a wider range of voices to describe these efforts to combat sexual exploitation, we believe there is value in providing overviews that were possible to produce within current time and resource limitations. Readers interested in learning more about these efforts can contact the Abt Associates project staff and we will provide contact information for people involved in implementing these programs and practices.

I. Combating Demand in Cook County and Chicago, Illinois

This section describes a multi-faceted effort to combat sexual exploitation in the greater Chicago area by focusing on demand. Much of the draft was provided by Rachel Durchslag, the executive director of the Chicago Alliance Against Sexual Exploitation (CAASE), with the assistance of her staff. We also received, and have integrated, material provided by End Demand Illinois, a collaboration of five main partners, including the Cook County Sheriff’s Office (who provided material to us for this chapter). Special thanks for assistance in drafting this timeline and report goes to all of our End Demand, Illinois partners with significant contributions from DePaul- Jody Raphael, Samir Goswami, Kaethe Morris Hoffer and Lynne Johnson, ICASA-Polly Poskin, Marian Hatcher, Terrie McDermott, Bradley Miles, and Karen Stauss. For the purposes of assembling this report, the material provided to Abt Associates has been edited slightly by our project team.

Overview of the Collaborators

Of interest to the creation of other campaigns designed to curb demand that are collaborations between many organizations is the structure of End Demand Illinois (EDI’s). EDI has numerous collaborators and five main grantee partners: CAASE, the Voices and Faces Project, DePaul University, the Women of Power Alumni Association, and the Polaris Project. The campaign itself has a fiscal agent, the Illinois Coalition Against Sexual Assault. Funding for EDI from the NoVo Foundation goes to the fiscal agent and is then distributed to these partners. Funding
amounts and activities are determined through a committee of these partners and undergo a six month and annual review.

On the various task forces and steering committees actively working to end sexual exploitation in Cook County are representatives from the following government agencies: The Circuit Court of Cook County- Juvenile Justice Division, The Circuit Court of Cook County- Child Protection Division, U.S. Department of Justice/Federal Bureau of Investigation, Cook County Sheriff’s Police Department, Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, State’s Attorney of Cook County, Illinois Department of Human Services, Illinois Department of Children and Family Services, Chicago Police Department, Law Office of the Cook County Public Defender, Office of the Illinois Attorney General, City of Chicago, Mayor’s Office on Domestic Violence, Cook County Sheriff’s Office - Department of Women’s Justice Services, Cook County Adult Probation Department, Cook County Commission on Women’s Issues, Cook County Sheriff’s Police, Office of Emergency Management and Communication, City of Chicago Corporation Council, Chicago Police Department Vice Control Section, Chicago Alternative Policing Strategy, and the Public Defenders Office.

CAASE is a nonprofit organization based in Chicago that is committed to building a global community free from sexual exploitation. CAASE was founded in June of 2006 by Rachel Durschlag, and works to eliminate sexual exploitation through litigation and advocacy, organizing and policy reform, and prevention and resource development. CAASE proceeds from the assumption that it is possible to stop sexual exploitation by directly addressing the culture, institutions, and individuals that perpetrate, profit from, or tacitly support sexually exploitive acts against people. To accomplish their mission, CAASE: seeks legal remedies on behalf of survivors and penalties for perpetrators of sexual harm; advocates for policies and legislation that hold sexual exploiters accountable; creates and implements prevention initiatives, including the provision of safe spaces for survivors to give testimony about their experiences; and develops resources that empower individuals and communities to stand with victims of sexual harm and take powerful actions against sexual exploiters.

**A History of Efforts to Combat Demand in Cook County and Chicago**

Cook County’s focus on “demand abolition” evolved through a collaboration of survivors, advocacy organizations, law enforcement and the unique leadership of key elected officials.

In the spring of 2002, through the Prostitution Alternatives Round Table a group of survivors began confronting the Chicago Police Department (CPD) about their practice of arresting far more women for prostitution than men who buy sex in Chicago Police District 14 (a gentrifying neighborhood in the northwest side of Chicago). This organizing led to much local and national media attention and significantly contributed towards the beginning of a cultural shift within the CPD about the role that demand plays in prostitution, as well as funding from the City of Chicago for a housing program for women arrested for prostitution in that district. It was these organizing efforts that laid the foundation for much survivor organizing towards the eventual passage of the Predator Accountability Act (the Act was introduced in Illinois’ General Assembly in 2003 and adopted in 2006).

In 2003, these survivors also organized a boycott of a Chicago tavern that was allegedly organizing sex-tours for its patrons to Costa Rica. As a result of these successful efforts, and the
ensuing media attention, it was these survivors who created the anti-demand posters that were displayed throughout the city by the Chicago Coalition for the Homeless in 2008. It was also this organizing campaign that inspired the Chicago Coalition for the Homeless to assess the extent of “demand” in Chicago and it thus conducted and released the landmark study, “Buying Sex: A Survey of Men in Chicago” in 2004.

Also in 2003 the process of studying law enforcement’s response (or lack there-of) to tackling demand began as a key focus of the Mayor’s Office on Domestic Violence’s report, “The Intersystem Assessment of Prostitution in Chicago” that was eventually released in 2006. The collaborative approach of this study prioritized involving law enforcement officials and greatly contributed to the cultural shifts within the Chicago Police Department that are on the verge of bearing fruit today. This report has already resulted in a steady increase in the arrest of johns in Chicago since 2004.

This historical progression towards focusing on eliminating demand as a method to combat sex trafficking and prostitution contributed to the creation of CAASE and served as the foundation that allowed the Justice Project Against Sexual Harm to collaborate in creating the End Demand, Illinois Campaign. These efforts were codified when Cook County Sheriff’s Office worked with Cook County Commissioners to pass significant legislation in 2008 and when he made “demand suppression” a key element of his “Human Trafficking Response Team” in 2009, thereby serving as a living model to law enforcement to adopt this strategy.

CAASE was founded by Rachel Durchslag in June of 2006. She had spent the summer of 2003 on a small island near Bangkok working with young girls who had been kidnapped or sold into sexual slavery. Her experiences highlighted the need for work to be done on ending the demand for sexually exploited individuals, not only abroad but in her own community as well. CAASE emerged from this experience. Although anti-sexual exploitation organizations in Chicago were actively working to address sexual exploitation and sex trafficking, CAASE was the first local organization to focus specifically on eliminating demand as its core mission.

The following overview and timeline was provided by Terrie McDermott of the Cook County Sheriff’s Office and her collaborators:

It is the commitment of key elected officials, the bravery of survivors and the tireless advocacy and service provision of public and private organizations that has created a climate in Illinois where we can realistically envision the significant curbing of demand as a policy and practice embedded in the state’s laws.

Our history is not the story of one organization; it is the story of many public and private agencies working and advocating individually and collectively towards a common goal. It is the story of key elected officials using the authority of their office, in partnership with not for profit organizations to lead initiatives against demand and treat prostituted women as victims of sex trafficking. What most informs the formation of any national or local campaigns and coalitions around demand is Cook County’s model of collaboration, and the events that brought us to where we are. Disseminating this history will rightfully honor those who have worked tirelessly to curb sex trafficking and demand in Cook
County, will ensure that our local coalitions remain strong, and better inform the development of campaigns in other areas.

Below is a timeline that reflects key developments in Cook County that have contributed to our many successes and led to a collaboration formalized as the End Demand, Illinois Campaign. This timeline is an overview, and does not reflect the many public events, community organizing initiatives, workshops, and training sessions that have occurred over the past decade in Cook County that have contributed to a political climate where the desired change is possible.

2001:
- With a grant from then State Representative Tom Dart, the Chicago Coalition for the Homeless (CCH) hosts the conference, “Prostitution: A Violent Reality of Homelessness” and establishes the Prostitution Alternatives Round Table (PART) that for the first time brings together key allies to the same table to begin collaborative work. Initial goals are public education, technical assistance to service providers and legislative advocacy to create alternatives to incarceration for women arrested for prostitution. A key focus was organizing survivors towards legislative change. Key partners included the Center for Impact Research, the Cook County Public Defender’s Office, Cook County State’s Attorney’s Office, the Mayor’s Office on Domestic Violence, Chicago Legal Advocacy for Incarcerated Mothers, service providers, faith based organizations and area rape crisis centers. Major political support was provided by the Department of Women’s Justice Services of the Cook County Sheriff’s Office.
- Advocates for Prostituted Women and Girls is established as Chicago’s first survivor led organization for prostituted girls and leads numerous public education initiatives (later becomes the Young Women’s Empowerment Project).

2002:
- State Representative Tom Dart holds a public hearing on prostitution in the Illinois House Judiciary Committee of which he is the chairperson.
- The Illinois General Assembly passes the “Residential Treatment and Transition Center for Mothers”, creating an alternative to Incarceration program for mothers convicted of felony crimes, including prostitution. This is an initiative of the Cook County Sheriff’s Office supported by the Chicago Legal Advocacy for Incarcerated Mothers and the Chicago Coalition for the Homeless.
- The City of Chicago Mayor’s Office on Domestic Violence (MODV) begins a three-year process of studying the region’s response to prostitution. A major focus is analyzing law enforcement’s response and engaging them in this project.
- CCH releases, “Unlocking Options for Women: A Survey of Women in Cook County Jail”.

Women of Power Alumni Association is established with support of the Cook County Sheriff’s Office. WOPAA is Chicago’s second survivor-led organization offering supports to formerly detained women.

2003:

2004:
- PART culminates two years of organizing survivors around demand and successfully pressures the Chicago Police Department to start increasing arrests of men who buy sex and simultaneously reduce the criminalization of prostituted women.

2005:
- The Salvation Army launches the PROMISE model in Chicago, bringing together all levels of local, state and federal law enforcement, as well as service providers to combat the sex trafficking of children.
- The Illinois Coalition Against Sexual Assault adopts a strong statement on prostitution as a violence against women issue and begins providing technical assistance to rape crisis centers throughout Illinois to serve prostituted women.
- CCH advocacy results in City of Chicago funding for Heartland Alliance’s Families Building Community program that offers housing and social supports to women arrested for prostitution.

2006:
- MODV issues their report, “The Intersystem Assessment of Prostitution in Chicago”. Key recommendations are to focus limited police resources on arresting and deterring men who buy sex, increasing the prosecution of traffickers, while offering services in lieu of incarceration to prostituted individuals.
- The Salvation Army’s STOP-IT program receives funding to offer direct services to victims of sex trafficking in Chicago and begins to assist victims of sex trafficking who are engaged by the Chicago Police Department.
- The Illinois General Assembly passes the Predator Accountability Act, result of a three-year advocacy, organizing and lobbying initiative led by the Chicago Coalition for the Homeless with many community partners.
- The Chicago Alliance Against Sexual Exploitation is established and begins to interview men who buy sex, utilizing the survey instrument developed by Prostitution Research and Education.
- BeyondMedia Education produces “Turning a Corner” an award winning documentary about survivor organizing on the Predator Accountability Act through CCH’s Prostitution Alternatives Round Table.

2007:
- The Illinois General Assembly passes the First Offender Probation Act, an initiative led by the Chicago Coalition for the Homeless in partnership with the Cook County State’s Attorney’s Office, granting prostituted individuals an alternative to prison for felony prostitution offenses.
- The Cook County Commission on Women’s Issues releases, “The Realities of
Human Trafficking in Cook County: Strategies for Ending the Exploitation of Women and Girls”, which also recommends focusing on deterring the demand for commercial sex.

- Dream Catcher Foundation is established, Chicago’s third survivor-led organization that assists young women at risk of prostitution on the south side of Chicago.

**2008:**

- Cook County Sheriff’s Office works with Cook County Commissioners to pass an ordinance that increases penalties on those who buy sex. This effort is supported by many Chicago based advocacy organizations.
- The Justice Project Against Sexual Harm (JusticePASH) is established and organizes support from the Illinois Senate, the Cook County Board of Commissioners, the Cook County Sheriff’s Office and local advocacy organizations for the passage of the William Wilberforce Act. JusticePASH brings together key allies to create the End Demand, Illinois Campaign.
- CAASE releases its report, “Deconstructing the Demand for Sex”, co-authored by JusticePASH’s policy director.
- DePaul University releases its report, “The Domestic Sex Trafficking of Chicago Women and Girls”, co-authored by a researcher from the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority.
- Cook County Sheriff Office creates the “Human Trafficking Response Team (HTRT)” and hires survivors of prostitution to intervene in every prostitution arrest his officers make. The HTRT is led by the Department of Women’s Justice Services who invite various advocacy and social service organizations to be part of the initiative and relies on community partners to offer services.

**2009:**

- Cook County’s Presiding Judge Criminal Courts, under the Auspices of the Chief Judges Office, begins a process to create the “Prostitution Court”, a specialized court that treats prostituted individuals as victims and explores diversion programs. This process is assisted by the Department of Women’s Justice Services and advocates from area not for profit organizations.
- Illinois Department of Human Services receives a grant to create Illinois Rescue and Restore.
- Cook County State’s Attorney’s Office begins partnering with the Chicago Police Department on reforming its practices by focusing on prostitution as sex trafficking and relies upon Salvation Army’s STOP-IT program to provide services to prostituted women.
- CAASE acquires JusticePASH and thus the End Demand, Illinois Campaign (a project created by JusticePASH in the summer of 2008). The NoVo Foundation awards EDI a multi-year grant.
- DePaul University releases “Interviews with Five Ex-Pimps in Chicago”.-20 additional interviews took place in 2009-2010 and will be combined with the original 5 interviewed in the pilot study, with a report forthcoming in September 2010 and unveiled at a public meeting.
- Illinois Attorney General Lisa Madigan’s staff compiles data on Craigslist postings that is used extensively to highlight the abuses facilitated by the website.
- Cook County Sheriff Tom Dart sues Craigslist and gains national attention on his
office’s work to combat sex trafficking by focusing on demand and internet based exploitation. Sheriff Dart’s efforts are also highlighted in a multi-city video conference organized by CAASE, DePaul University and the Hunt Alternatives Fund.

• Cook County Sheriff Tom Dart successfully begins to implement the Cook County Ordinance to deter demand.
• Polaris Project, Polaris Project deepened its engagement with End Demand Illinois partners on legislative policy and on law enforcement training. In addition, Polaris Project participated in public outreach activities and assisted in gaining national exposure of EDI and its goals.
• Polaris chaired or co-chaired with CAASE three meetings of a newly formed legislative policy committee during this period (7/30, 9/18, and 10/27).
• In the area of law enforcement interaction and training, Polaris and other EDI members initially met with representatives of the Cook County Sheriff’s Office, Chicago Police Department, and the Cook County State’s Attorney’s Office to discuss issues and challenges in addressing prostitution and human trafficking.

2010:
• Cook County State’s Attorney successfully lobbies the Illinois General Assembly to create the Safe Child Act, legislation that codifies in Illinois law that minors arrested for prostitution are always victims and never criminals. The Act also expands law enforcement’s authority to investigate sex trafficking cases. EDI supports this legislation and assists in drafting and passage.
• CAASE pilots its curriculum aimed at deterring boys from buying sex.
• Cook County Sheriff Tom Dart launches a concentrated initiative in Leyden Township to deter men from buying sex.
• Trafficking Workgroup have drafted standards for rape crisis centers to use in developing services for victims of prostitution and trafficking in their local communities. The standards “Rape Crisis Center Response to Victims of Prostitution and Trafficking in their Local Communities,” will be reviewed and recommended for adoption by the ICASA Governing Body at a special meeting on June 16, 2010. The standards specifically address Rape Crisis Center Response and Community Collaboration.
• Polaris Project focused on legislative advocacy, and drafted a bill proposal for consideration by EDI a year earlier than planned. The CCSAO introduced the legislation (HB 6462), incorporating virtually EDI’s entire draft bill. Polaris drafted supporting advocacy documents and testified in support of the legislation at its House committee hearing. Polaris also commented and testified in support of other legislation (HB 6195) that would increase penalties for pimps and johns, including increasing vehicle impoundment fees, a portion of which would be directed to victim services. Both bills passed the House, were merged in the Senate, and passed the Senate judiciary committee on April 22, 2010.

The Involvement of Local Government in Combating Demand in Chicago

The subject of “demand” was beginning to gain traction in Chicago in 2006, and it was an advantageous time for the creation of a demand-focused organization. At this time survivors and
advocates were working with a community collaboration led by the Chicago Mayor’s Office on Domestic Violence, which over a period of three years conducted an assessment of prostitution and the systems with which prostituted people came into contact. Government agencies and departments, nonprofit organizations, and survivors of prostitution worked together, and in 2006, the “Intersystem Assessment on Prostitution in Chicago” was published. The Intersystem Assessment gathered data and presented findings about the scope and nature of prostitution in Chicago, and more critically, made policy recommendations. Chief among these recommendations was that the demand side of the problem of prostitution must be more effectively targeted.

At the same time that the group collaborating with the Mayor’s Office on Domestic Violence was paying increased attention to eradicating demand for prostitution, a growing recognition of the overlap between prostitution and “human trafficking,” often referred to as “sex trafficking,” was developing. This problem was widely regarded as an obvious human rights violation, but also was frequently assumed to involve the crossing of international boundaries.

The next year, following the release of the Intersystem Assessment by the Mayor’s Office, the Cook County Commission on Women’s Issues issued its own report entitled “The Realities of Human Trafficking in Cook County: Strategies for Ending the Exploitation of Women and Girls.” Like the Mayor’s Intersystem Assessment Report, the Cook County Report concluded that “there is a clear overlap between sex trafficking and prostitution” and that demand is the root cause of the sex trade and sex trafficking, to the extent that “unless police and law enforcement officials target pimps, traffickers, and the establishments that profit financially from the exploitation of trafficked human beings, the problem will not go away.”

While many of the specific policy recommendations published in the mayor’s report and the county report have yet to be implemented, the development and publication of both reports helped create and strengthen local alliances between survivor activists, government actors, and nonprofits, as well as enhance the political climate in Chicago, where supporting specific legislation or legal action against pimps and customers of prostitution is now regarded as legitimate, and much less controversial, than it might otherwise have been.

**Task Forces and Government Involvement**

Evidence of this is seen in the number and type of government agencies that joined existing coalitions in Chicago focusing on sexual exploitation. These coalitions are:

- **Partnership to Rescue Our Minors from Sexual Exploitation (PROMISE):** The mission of PROMISE is to address, in a holistic manner, the problem of commercial sexual exploitation of all those under the age of 18 in the Chicago area by focusing on (a) prevention, (b) intervention, (c) outreach, and (d) service provision. The task force is comprised of over 24 governmental and non-governmental organizations that work together to eliminate the commercial sexual exploitation of children. PROMISE works in close partnership with the FBI initiative “Innocence Lost” that targets pimps and traffickers of sexually exploited youth.

- **Chicago Mayor’s Office on Domestic Violence Demand Deterrence Committee (MODV):** MODV was charged with overseeing an intensive effort to build Chicago’s
capacity to more effectively respond and intervene in cases of domestic violence. For two years MODV coordinated a “Demand Deterrence” committee focusing on eliminating the demand for prostituted individuals in Chicago. Unfortunately, due to personnel changes within the department, this task force is no longer in existence.

- **Prostitution Alternative Round Table (PART):** PART is a network of city, state, county, private nonprofit organizations, and survivors of prostitution dedicated to addressing the many issues related to prostitution and homelessness in Chicago. PART is a project of the Chicago Coalition for the Homeless. PART has an active steering committee and a committee of survivors of prostitution who lead and organize its initiatives. PART has expertise in creating and passing legislation, such as the Predator Accountability Bill, that focuses on the demand side of the sex trade. PART also hosts community forums and implements publicity campaigns to raise awareness about the realities of the sex trade.

- **Illinois Department of Human Services-Illinois Rescue and Restore Campaign:** The State of Illinois has partnered with the federal government to combat labor and sex trafficking in Illinois. Consequently, Illinois has joined the Department of Health and Human Services and other law enforcement, social service, healthcare, and advocacy organizations across the state to fight modern-day slavery. To help deter demand for sexually exploited individuals, Rescue and Restore hangs posters all across Illinois to raise awareness about human trafficking and is beginning to coordinate a response protocol when victims are identified.

**Legislation Targeting Demand**

In Illinois, 2006 brought the establishment of a new civil rights focus on action for survivors of prostitution. The Predator Accountability Act, 740 ILCS 128, was designed to allow survivors of prostitution in Illinois to seek civil damages from individuals and entities that recruited, harmed, profited from, or maintained them in the sex trade. Under the legislation predators can be held liable for economic loss, damages for personal injury and disease, and mental and emotional harm. Those who will most likely be held accountable under this law are individuals and entities that recruit, traffic, maintain, and profit from persons in the sex trade, including pimps, abusive family members, or agencies whose false advertising tricks persons into illegal sex trade activities. The law stipulates that the offense must have occurred after July of 2006, so as of yet no cases have been prosecuted.

In addition to establishing that Illinois survivors of prostitution can hold pimps, johns, and profiteers accountable for recruiting, maintaining, or harming them in prostitution, the process through which the law was introduced and established had certain other critical effects. Specifically, substantial numbers of policymakers, legislators, and thought leaders statewide were educated about the realities of prostitution in Illinois, frequently through discussions with actual survivors of prostitution. Furthermore, the passage of Predator Accountability Act helped shift the perception of women in prostitution from perpetrators of crime to victims of violence. Because survivors were full participants in lobbying legislators to support the Predator Accountability Act, elected officials were able to meet survivors, learn about their lived experiences, and gain respect for their perspectives. It also reinforced the conviction that this violence should be prevented and perpetrators held accountable.
• **Massage Establishments and Massage Services (Chapter 4-92):** This municipal ordinance strives to make it more difficult for pimps and traffickers to use legal venues, such as massage parlors, for illegal commercial sexual activity. Main tenets of the legislation are that it outlaws tinted windows for parlors, requires a waiting room for patrons that is visible from the outside, and creates stricter licensing criteria.

• **Illinois State Senate Resolution 590:** This legislation passed the Illinois State Senate in May 2008 and a similar resolution was passed by the Cook County Board of Commissioners in June 2008. The resolution urged US senators from Illinois to support HR 3887, the federal reauthorization of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act. This act introduces a cohesive legal framework to fight both domestic and international trafficking, constitutionally targets the demand for international trafficking by directly addressing the network that buys and sells women and children for commercial sexual exploitation, removes a barrier to effective prosecutions against traffickers by making “force, fraud, and coercion” part of aggravated trafficking rather than a requirement for all convictions, and makes sex tourism a more significant crime.

• **Offenses Involving Public Morals Nuisance Violations Ordinance:** In spring 2008, CAASE successfully lobbied for the new Cook County Public Morals Nuisance Violation Ordinance that allows the Sheriff’s Police to impose a civil penalty on pimps and johns and to direct revenues from fines to the Department of Women’s Justice Services. CAASE has been advising the department on implementation. During the summer and fall of 2009, they held several meetings with Vice Unit Detectives and the Unit’s Commander to create a protocol of implementation.

• **Potential Consequences:** Legal penalties for purchasing sex can include as much as $1,500 in fines, having one’s vehicle impounded if the vehicle is used during the solicitation for sex, and a misdemeanor conviction. Felony convictions can be incurred for purchasing sex but rarely transpire.

**CAASE’S First Three Years: Awareness Raising and Research**

During its first two-and-a-half years, CAASE focused on three initiatives: **prevention,** **community education,** and **intervention.** Understanding the importance of preventing sexual exploitation from occurring, their preliminary prevention work investigated existing curricula aimed at high-school aged boys that addressed violence imposed by men against women. Simultaneously, the majority of the organization’s focus centered on raising awareness about issues of sexual exploitation, demand, and human trafficking throughout Chicago. They proactively engaged media to cover stories on the issue, launched city-wide protests against events that normalized the sex trade (such as Pimp N’ Ho parties and strip tease classes called ‘Turning Tricks’), created a book club centered around these issues, utilized the arts as a means of awareness-raising, hosted a three day “Art for Awareness” festival, screened films in the community on the issue, coordinated the Midwest launch of the groundbreaking film *Price of Pleasure* that investigates the pornography industry, and produced the plays *Becoming Natasha* and *Body and Sold.*

In 2007, limited research existed in the United States that offered insight into the behavioral and cognitive patterns and belief systems that drove the demand side of the sex trade. Without this
empirical understanding, CAASE would have struggled to have created successful initiatives to curb demand. To address this problem, CAASE led the Chicago project of an international research study on men who patronize the sex trade. The study was developed and overseen by Dr. Melissa Farley, an internationally renowned psychologist who founded Prostitution Research and Education. A total of 113 men participated in and completed the research study, and preliminary findings from the interviews were released in May 2008. The findings are summarized below:

- Young men need to be exposed to the realities of prostitution and trafficking including the reasons women enter prostitution, the extent of violence in prostitution, and the physical and psychological harms suffered by prostituted individuals.

- Young men should be educated about the conflicted feelings of men who use women in prostitution and the potential adverse consequences that buying women for sex can have on their own sexuality and on their relationships with non-prostituted women.

- The link between pornography and prostitution should be further examined. Eliminating demand for prostitution and trafficking, and deterring young men from buying sex, includes challenging men’s demand and need for pornography.

- Young men should explore, early on, their own definitions of what it means to be a man, and address cultural and peer pressures that might influence them, or their friends, to use women in prostitution.

- Community groups should design and implement awareness-raising campaigns that debunk prostitution myths by highlighting the realities of why women enter prostitution, the connections between trafficking and pornography, and the violence that women endure in the sex trade.

- Men should hold each other accountable for their patronage of the sex trade industry and cease perpetuating myths of “masculinity” that include domination and exploitation of women.

- Community residents should work with alternative policing groups to raise awareness about the existing criminal penalties for purchasing sex and to ensure that these criminal penalties are enforced.

- Community residents should work with their local police departments to target the indoor venues where men purchase sex.

- Community residents should work with their legislators to create and implement legislation that increases criminal penalties for those purchasing sex. Any measure taken that publicizes the identities of johns should only be implemented after conviction, not arrest.

- Existing “john schools” should be expanded to include individual sessions with clinical practitioners who should explore the varied psychological reasons that lead men to originally purchase, and continue to purchase, sex. Counseling should be available on a long-term basis.
• Service providers who already work with men to end violence against women, such as batterer intervention programs, should incorporate a discussion of prostitution into their work. They should explore to what degree clients’ propensity to tolerate violence against women might play a role in their decision to buy sex, as well as in their sexual and romantic relationships with non-prostituted women.

• Clinical practitioners working with regular users of the sex trade should assess for history of sexual abuse, development of healthy or unhealthy sexual behaviors, risk of unhealthy sexual behaviors, and history of mental health issues and substance use. Mental health practitioners should also assess if their client’s outlook on prostitution changes as he continues to understand his own sexual needs and behaviors.

**Acquisition of the Justice Project Against Sexual Harm**

On January 1, 2009, CAASE acquired the Justice Project Against Sexual harm (JusticePASH). JusticePASH was founded in February 2008 and was the only organization in the country assisting victims of sexual assault and exploitation through the use of civil law. JusticePASH also assisted survivors in navigating the criminal justice system to ensure appropriate prosecution of their perpetrators and engaged in policy reform to ensure that Illinois laws designed to counter sex trafficking and sexual exploitation were utilized appropriately. After the acquisition of JusticePASH, CAASE’s three focus areas became:

1. **Litigation and Advocacy**

   CAASE engages in civil litigation against perpetrators and facilitators of sexual harm, and advocates for appropriate and effective criminal prosecution of rapists, pimps, and people who buy sex. They also advocate for public policies that increase the efficacy of criminal and civil laws against sexual violence and exploitation.

2. **Organizing and Policy Reform**

   CAASE creates and advocates for legislative and policy reform that strives to: increase the legal and social accountability of sex traffickers, pimps, people who buy sex, and rapists; promote broad community support for victim services; and advocate that perpetrators pay for the sexual harm they cause. CAASE also advises law enforcement, policymakers, and other stakeholders on best practices relating to sex trafficking, prostitution, and rape.

3. **Prevention and Community Engagement**

   CAASE works to prevent sexual exploitation by increasing public understanding of the harms inherent in the sex trade through research and the arts. CAASE creates and implements educational curricula designed to encourage boys and men to work against sexual exploitation. Additionally, CAASE develops toolkits for nonprofits, faith-based groups, schools, businesses, feminist groups, and other communities and individuals to provide tangible methods people can use to prevent sexual harm.
CAASE’s Current Work

Litigation and Advocacy (The Justice Project Against Sexual Harm)

The Justice Project Against Sexual Harm (JusticePASH) provides low-income survivors of sexual assault and exploitation with low- or no-cost civil legal representation, policy and media advocacy. JusticePASH takes the view that the fight against sexual exploitation is a critical front in the battle for social justice and equality. JusticePASH also believes that a proven method for creating social change in the United States—civil rights litigation by disempowered groups—has thus far been a radically underused tool in the fight against rape and sexual exploitation.

How JusticePASH Assists Individual Survivors:

- They sue individual and organizational perpetrators of sexual abuse, seeking to make perpetrators pay for the damage they cause;
- They pursue litigation to prove that rape or sexual exploitation occurs, seeking to empower victims and hold perpetrators publicly accountable;
- They advocate for clients when the crimes against them are (or are not) investigated and prosecuted by police and prosecutors;
- They pressure the criminal system to better respond to rape;
- They provide free legal consultations and advice to survivors who are seeking to learn more about their rights.

Public Policy and Advocacy

There are three main public policy and advocacy campaigns surrounding demand. These are:

1. Collaborating with the Cook County Sheriff’s Office

Since the summer of 2009, CAASE has been working closely with the Cook County Sheriff’s Office on implementing innovative protocols for handling prostitution and sex trafficking cases. Out of necessity, in the fall of 2009 they began working closely with the Cook County State’s Attorney’s Office and the Chicago Police Department to create an effective region-wide protocol. In early 2009, the Cook County Sheriff’s Office implemented the Trafficking Response Team (TRT), run by the Department of Women’s Justice Services (DWJS). Through regular meetings, CAASE-facilitated workshops and trainings, and continual technical assistance, CAASE has advised DWJS staff in creating a protocol for response to women arrested for prostitution. The TRT investigates prostitution offenses, and when prostituted women or girls are encountered, survivors (who are TRT members) provide the first intervention for them. The survivors offer crisis intervention and service referrals as a voluntary alternative to detention while law enforcement focuses on arrests of pimps and customers. The TRT is gradually moving toward the recognition that women in prostitution are in need of services, and a purely criminal justice response is a waste of scarce resources.

A frustration that is routinely expressed by Sheriff’s police officers is the inability of the Cook County State’s Attorney’s Office (SAO) to charge offenders under Illinois’ anti-trafficking statute. This hinders the sheriff’s ability to appropriately investigate possible trafficking cases and the insurance of a successful prosecution. This frustration also underscores the need for an
effective region-wide, law enforcement-based strategy to address prostitution and sex trafficking cases. Therefore, since the summer of 2009, CAASE has been working with the SAO and the Chicago Police Department (CPD) to assess their capacity and implement proven protocols to ensure that trafficking cases can be successfully investigated and prosecuted.

In September 2009, CAASE facilitated a meeting between the CPD, the SAO, the Cook County Sheriff’s Office, the Salvation Army, and the Illinois’ Rescue and Restore Coalition to promote system-wide collaboration. In February 2010 they hosted a conference call between the Dallas Police Department and District Attorney’s office and the above Cook County law enforcement officials to learn about creating protocols that assist trafficked children and hold perpetrators accountable. Building upon these meetings, CAASE is currently working with these groups to create a protocol that (a) appropriately handles trafficking cases that involve youth, (b) implements best practices, and (c) conducts system-wide training to assure the appropriate management of these cases.

Currently, CAASE is contributing to the efforts of the Division of Women’s Justice Services toward the creation of a “prostitution court” in Cook County. Though the current vision for the court is to house cases hearings for prostituted individuals, they are advocating that pimps and johns are also sent to this court. If this happens, they can train the prostitution court’s judges on the available penalties to use against perpetrators and to help increase prosecution of these cases.

2. End Demand, IL

In January of 2009 CAASE’s began to consider whether or not Illinois would be able to pass legislation similar to the Swedish model. They brought together a key group of allies in Chicago to assess if people would be interested in pursuing such an initiative, and the response was unanimously positive. CAASE staff felt that Illinois would be a strategic place to launch the initiative because they had:

- strong coalitions;
- relevant research that specifically addressed the issue in Illinois;
- the support of government and city leaders such as Sheriff Tom Dart and the Chief of Chicago Police Department’s VICE unit;
- multiple pieces of progressive legislation; and
- received national support from advocates who felt that Illinois would be an ideal location to attempt to pass such a progressive piece of legislation.

CAASE then put together a steering committee of 20 organizations which met every two months to develop the goals, mission, timeline, and projected outcomes of the campaign. End Demand, Illinois (EDI) became a policy and legislative campaign directed at increasing the ability of the criminal system to focus their efforts on the demand for prostitution, while simultaneously increasing services for girls and women at risk for, suffering in, or attempting to escape from prostitution.

**Overview of the Campaign and Initial Activities and Successes:** The EDI initiative is a grassroots effort to transform the state’s response to prostitution and sex trafficking to reflect the philosophy that prostituted individuals are victims and should be treated as such and that law
enforcement efforts should be focused solely on deterring men from buying sex and arresting and prosecuting pimps, panderers, and traffickers. Activities in the first half of the year include:

1) Raising the public’s knowledge of the campaign and beginning to recruit supporters;

2) Beginning to collect necessary data and policy development ideas;

3) Drafting and introducing legislation to eliminate criminal liability for minors engaged in prostitution

4) Establishing and solidifying relationships with law enforcement and urging the adoption of model practices;

5) Recruiting and training survivors to assume leadership roles in the campaign;

6) Conducting national research on best practice models for services for prostituted people.

CAASE anticipates that they will begin outreach and education efforts outside of Chicago in the rest of the state in the fall of 2010. EDI is convened by CAASE, collaborating with the Women of Power Alumni Association (WoPAA), the Polaris Project, the Voices and Faces Project (Voices), and the Schiller DuCanto and Fleck Family Law Center of DePaul University College of Law (Schiller), and the Illinois Coalition Against Sexual Assault, as campaign partners. EDI was officially launched (along with a new website) on September 17, 2009 at an event attended by over 200 individuals.

Public Messaging

In August 2009, volunteer Katie Feifer (also affiliated with the Voices and Faces Project) of San Francisco-based research group KGF Insights, conducted 31 one-on-one interviews with a diverse group of Illinois residents to glean their feedback on statistics, beliefs and slogan statements, and the philosophy and messaging employed by the campaign’s public education efforts. The conclusions and recommendations from this report will serve as the basis of all campaign outreach materials.

Documentary Series

In August and September of 2009, Larissa Malarek, a volunteer documentarian, conducted 23 on-camera interviews with policymakers, law enforcement officials, service providers, and survivors throughout the state about prostitution, sex trafficking and demand in Illinois. These interviews will form the basis of the production and ongoing release of short documentary vignettes used for EDI public education initiatives. An initial clip was released at EDI’s launch event in September.

Survivor Focus Groups

EDI researchers have conducted six focus groups with a total of 35 participants (two with formerly incarcerated women, one with transgender women, one with men and two with
self-identified sex workers). Participants discussed current engagement with Illinois anti-
prostitution law and made recommendations for policy development.

**Interviews with Ex-Pimps**

During this time period, permission was received from the DePaul University
Institutional Research Board to conduct interviews with ex-pimps and madams in
Chicago to understand the financial organization of prostitution and sex trafficking rings,
as well as effectiveness of Illinois’ current legal system to address the industry. Eight in-
depth interviews (including three of women) were completed and one interview with an
ex-pimp who trafficked women internationally has been secured.

**Freedom of Information Act Requests**

With a goal of acquiring prostitution and trafficking arrest data from 21 select counties
throughout the state, and with the pro bono assistance of the Kirkland and Ellis law firm,
staff began sending Freedom of Information Act requests to police departments, state’s
attorney’s offices, and sheriff’s offices in these counties. This entails approximately 350
FOIA requests being sent out and then negotiated with the pertinent official. Thus far,
about one-third of the requests have been sent out and the responses negotiated. Data are
now being analyzed. The data will be used to determine prostitution activity throughout
the state from a law enforcement perspective, the makeup of arrests, the disposition of
cases, and the cost to law enforcement of arresting prostituted individuals.

**Policy Development**

EDI formed a public policy committee co-chaired by the Polaris Project and CAASE.
Polaris Project staff led committee members through a section-by-section analysis of the
Illinois and Cook County prostitution codes, with the goal of educating partners about the
current status of the law and pointing out areas for recommended “ideal” changes. The
committee has set priorities for statewide legislative change, deciding that the first major
priority should address removing criminal responsibility for minor victims of sex
trafficking. The committee determined necessary initial action items in the areas of
research and document generation, and began the process of short and long-term
committee action plans. Substantive legislation was introduced in 2010, one year ahead
of schedule.

**Direct Service Research**

EDI established a Direct Services Committee to create a proposed model for a statewide
comprehensive service delivery system for prostituted and trafficked people, with an
emphasis on the provision of a continuum of housing supports. It has developed a work
plan for its activities that includes research, data analysis, and policy formulation. In
September 2009, the committee completed research on best practice service standards for
providers in Chicago and Illinois. Of the 19 providers contacted, 13 provided
submissions. In August 2009, the committee expanded its research to include national
providers who specifically work with prostituted and trafficked people. As of April 2010,
the committee has collected submissions from over 30 agencies or individuals. The
committee expects to complete its research by June 2010. Throughout the summer of
2010, the committee will analyze the data and begin drafting their proposal for a statewide infrastructure of care for survivors of prostitution and trafficking.

**Law Enforcement Pilot**

EDI staff continues to work with the Cook County Sheriff’s Office on efforts to deter demand and assist prostituted individuals. CAASE serves as the advocacy partner on the sheriff’s office’s Human Trafficking Response Team (HTRT). The Team is enforcing a new county ordinance CAASE helped pass in 2008. The ordinance provides for the issuance of civil citations against pimps and johns, collection of fines, and the direction of those fines to support services provided by the Department of Women’s Justice Services. The team also goes out on stings to investigate prostitution-related crimes. The team includes survivors of prostitution who interact directly with the prostituted women and youth encountered on stings. The survivors offer them support and services, and at this point in the model’s development, if a prostituted person accepts services, the charges will not be pursued. In the summer of 2010, the HTRT will be developing protocols for improved response to victims.

EDI grant partner DePaul Law School will conduct a full evaluation of the Human Trafficking Response Team in the summer of 2010. The research will be led by Jody Raphael, senior fellow at the Schiller, DuCanto & Fleck Family Law Center and a community research intern from Duke University.

CAASE is the advocacy partner for the Cook County State’s Attorney’s Office and the Chicago Police Department’s Trafficking Initiative. In early 2010, CAASE submitted a policy reform proposal to this work group proposing reforms to their current enforcement of prostitution offenses. Proposals included the establishment of a law enforcement response consisting of survivor-led intervention with prostituted people and the collection of fines from pimps, traffickers, and johns to support services for prostituted/trafficked people.

Recently, CAASE learned that the McHenry County State’s Attorney’s Office filed charges under Illinois’ Anti-Trafficking laws—the first CAASE is aware of in the state. CAASE met with the prosecutor and victim witness advocates to share the work of End Demand Illinois and offer their assistance. Representatives from the office shared their belief that law enforcement and prosecutors around the state are unaware of the existence of their state trafficking code. As a result of this and similar feedback CAASE has received, their EDI campaign partner Polaris Project will begin a yearlong statewide training series for police and prosecutors to educate them about Illinois’ trafficking laws and offer guidance for its effective implementation.

**Organizing Survivors**

The Women of Power Alumni Association (WOPAA) leads the EDI campaign’s survivor organizing. WOPAA is a nonprofit leadership development organization of formerly incarcerated women that is associated with the Cook County Sheriff Department’s Women Justice Services. A diverse group of 31 women were initially recruited by EDI’s organizer of which a core group of nine have formed an Organizing Committee. Committee members have helped draft campaign messages, undergone three public
speaking training sessions, and serve on EDI’s Steering, Policy, and Direct Services Research committees. Committee members have also been interviewed and filmed for EDI’s documentary series. They are now speaking to community groups to raise support for the EDI initiative.

Assessment of the Impact of EDI to Date. The campaign has already helped make substantive policy changes within the Cook County Sheriff’s Office. Since implementing the ordinance in September 2009, the Office has issued 61 citations and collected $16,000. The fines are directed toward support for the Department of Women’s Justice Services, which intends to use the money to support new clinical positions within the department.

CAASE’s work within the Cook County State’s Attorney’s Office has had a powerful impact. In March, State’s Attorney Anita Alvarez agreed to support an EDI-drafted bill that would eliminate criminal liability for minors under the age of 18 engaged in prostitution. State’s Attorney Alvarez’s legislative team began working with the EDI Policy Committee to move the bill through the Illinois legislature, and on March 25, the bill was passed by the Illinois House. On April 28 CAASE will send two members of their Survivors Organizing Committee to their state capital to lobby the bill.

3. Community Engagement

CAASE believes that raising awareness about the actual lived experiences of individuals in the sex trade can deter men from purchasing sex. Research conducted by CAASE with men who purchase sex found that a substantial number of interviewees said that if they had known more about the harms of the sex trade, and about the common life experiences that lead women into entry, that they would not have purchased sex. Strategic messaging through creative means can shift the common conception of the sex trade from an inevitable and relatively harmless part of society to one that recognizes and widely accepts prostitution as harmful and avoidable.

This is achieved through:

- Lectures and presentations throughout the community
- Theatrical events such as the original play *The Johns*, being produced in May 2010
- Film screenings and festivals
- Poster campaigns that CAASE is currently designing with a local graphic design school
- A website filled with resources, research, action ideas, and film, book, and blog recommendations
- Research on other international demand initiatives

Developing Resources

Throughout its existence, CAASE has been strongly committed to creating tools and resources to help individuals, organizations, and communities conduct their own activism around issues of demand. Below is a list of both the research reports authored by CAASE staff as well as toolkits they have developed.
Research Reports

- “Deconstructing the Demand for Prostitution: Preliminary Insights Into Chicago Men Who Purchase Sex”
- “Demand Deterrence Strategies: International Initiatives to Eliminate Demand for the Sex Trade”
- “National and International Public Awareness Campaigns”
- “An Investigation into John Schools”
- “Engaging Young Men in Ending Commercial Sexual Exploitation: A Report, Curriculum, and Recommended Resources”
- A variety of fact sheets about the sex trade, human trafficking, demand, and civil legal options for survivors

Completed Toolkits

DEMAND CHANGE: 10 Actions X 10 Issues = 100 Steps Towards Ending Sexual Exploitation: This action guide identifies 10 different actions an individual can take to end the harms of the following 10 forms of sexual exploitation: the commercial sex trade industry, demand, international sex trafficking, the commercial sexual exploitation of children, sex tourism, internet exploitation, pornography, rape culture, child sexual abuse, sexual harm, and rape.

Media Response Toolkit: This kit provides talking points to respond to harmful media messages about the sex trade as well as several sample letters to the Editor

Communities of Faith Toolkit (Jewish, Protestant, Catholic, and Eastern Orthodox with a Buddhist one in development): This toolkit provides clergy from all different faiths with resources to connect issues of sexual exploitation to religious passages and rituals.

‘Pimp N’ Ho’ Protest Toolkit: This toolkit is geared towards college students and provides ideas and actions to protest “Pimp N’ Ho” parties held on campus.

Lesson Plans for High School Coaches: These are five lesson plans on human trafficking and sexual exploitation that coaches can use with their teams. It was developed in partnership with Coach for America.

Toolkits in Development

Community Engagement Toolkit: This toolkit empowers communities to take specific actions against the demand for the sex trade in their neighborhoods. The toolkit provides
both educational materials about why targeting demand is the most effective strategy to reduce prostitution, and offers a variety of concrete actions communities can implement.

**Engaging Parents and Guardians of High School-Aged Sons in Stopping Sexual Harm:**
This toolkit is designed to inform and empower parents to begin an open dialog with their sons about issues of sexually exploitive relationships. The toolkit includes insights into the role of demand in prostitution, identifies some of the social pressures boys face to have sex, ideas on how to cultivate equality in relationships, and resources such as recommended books and local counseling services.

**Accompanying Teacher Guide:** This toolkit is provided to schools that have implemented the curriculum and provides lesson plans and ideas for engaging youth in a mature, thoughtful, and proactive manner about issues such as human rights and gender expectations that may influence, support, and even encourage sexually exploitive relationships. Complete with activities, recommended books for students, and movies to facilitate an interactive learning experience, the Teacher Guide provides the components necessary for reaching today’s young people about frequently unexplored issues.

**Partnerships**

Part of CAASE’s operating philosophy is to always work in collaboration with allies to leverage the impact of their work. During CAASE's four years they have formed strategic partnerships with groups such as:

- **ILLINOIS COALITION AGAINST SEXUAL ASSAULT:** One of the five lead partners on EDI and the fiscal sponsor for the initiative.

- **PROTESTANTS FOR THE COMMON GOOD:** An EDI partner and active lobbying presence in Springfield on relevant legislation.

- **YWCA METROPOLITAN CHICAGO:** An EDI partner.

- **CHICAGO COALITION FOR THE HOMELESS:** Runs the Prostitution Alternative Round Table and helps lead lobbying initiatives in Springfield. PART is one of CAASE’s key partners and they work together on many projects, such as poster campaigns. Also an EDI partner.

- **PROJECT IRENE:** An EDI partner and active lobbying presence in Springfield on relevant legislation.

- **SALVATION ARMY - STOP IT:** The sole nonprofit organization working to identify victims of human trafficking. They work with STOP IT on identifying places to bring the curriculum and they are an EDI partner.

- **SALVATION ARMY - PROMISE TASK FORCE:** An EDI partner and supporter of all of CAASE’s work.

- **RAPE VICTIM ADVOCATES:** An EDI partner.
SCHILLER DUCANTO AND FLECK FAMILY LAW CENTER, DEPAUL UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF LAW: An EDI lead partner and the organization in charge of all research. Currently working on the interviews of the eight pimps.

POLARIS PROJECT: Their EDI national partner who advises all of the policy and legislative aspects of the campaign.

WOMEN OF POWER ALUMNI ASSOCIATION: Associated with the Cook County Sheriff’s Department of Women’s Justice Services. An EDI partner and in charge of survivor organizing.

COOK COUNTY SHERIFF’S OFFICE

PILLARS: An EDI Partner.

CLAIM: An EDI partner and active lobbying presence in Springfield on relevant legislation.

THE DREAMCATCHER FOUNDATION: An EDI partner.

THE VOICES AND FACES PROJECT: An EDI lead partner and in charge of most messaging work associated with the campaign.

COUNTERQUO.ORG: An EDI partner.

COMMUNITIES IN SCHOOLS CHICAGO: An organization in Chicago that works to connect public schools with social issue programming. This is the organization that is helping CAASE get their curriculum into schools.

FREDERICK DOUGLAS FOUNDATION: A national foundation working to bring curriculum and service learning projects to Chicago Public Schools. CAASE is developing the section of their curriculum that addresses demand.

TRAFFICK FREE: A local organization that works on awareness-raising initiatives.

SOROPTIMIST: An international women’s rights initiative that strives to raise awareness about human trafficking. They have awarded CAASE a few small grants and partnered with them on the development of their DEMAND CHANGE toolkit.

IDHS RESCUE AND RESTORE: An Illinois coalition that CAASE works with on awareness-raising efforts.

Other Anti-Demand Initiatives in Chicago

There are only a few nonprofit organizations that have incorporated demand deterrence and demand intervention efforts into their activist and social service work. The first is the Chicago Coalition for the Homeless Prostitution Alternatives Round Table (PART). In 2008, PART launched a city-wide poster campaign to deter demand. The poster was designed by PART’s
survivor group. The campaign ran for six months and was displayed on several Chicago Transit Authority (CTA) buses that traverse the city on a daily basis. For at least two months, a poster was also stationed directly over a CTA subway entrance at a major intersection and on the backs of buses in 15 different bus routes throughout Chicago. A website was listed at the bottom of the posters (www.stopsexualexploitation.com) to direct viewers to more information and resources.

The subway location and bus routes were chosen based on documented and anecdotal evidence of high levels of prostitution. Of particular influence was the report “Domestic sex trafficking of Chicago women and girls” by J. Raphael and J. Ashley, produced jointly by the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority and DePaul University College of Law. This report pinpointed two areas—Midway Airport and Rush Street in Chicago’s Gold Coast neighborhood. Preliminary findings from interviews with johns conducted by CAASE also reinforced that prostitution exists in these neighborhoods. Therefore, the poster was displayed on a panel over a subway station and on bus routes located in these two neighborhoods, among others. The posters were strategically placed on the CTA so that they would be visible not only by CTA riders, but by any other vehicle or pedestrian traffic in the area.

The campaign used two tools to measure the impact of the demand deterrence and awareness campaign: a newly developed website to track those who were drawn to learn more about the issue after seeing the poster and a brief survey of individuals passing near the CTA poster placements conducted by volunteers over two days in August.

**Website:**

The new website, www.stopsexualexploitation.com, was created in July 2008. The website contains information on the specific criminal consequences to buying sex, facts about prostitution in Chicago, why PART’s campaign is targeting the demand for the sex trade, why men buy sex (with specific data from CAASE’s research), a list with brief descriptions and links to relevant resources, information about PART and its campaigns and activities, contact information, and a link to an online survey through www.surveymonkey.com.

There were 737 unique visitors to the website, with a total of 910 visits (1.23 visits per visitor). Many only visited the website briefly—on average 143 seconds per visit—and viewed an average of 2.1 pages per visit. The Chicago Coalition for the Homeless (CCH) and a few partner organizations posted links to the website, and a couple of pro-prostitution groups negatively discussed the ad campaign on their websites (www.boinkology.com, www.wisdomofwhores.com) with links to the website.

Unfortunately, there were very few people who filled out the online survey or contacted CCH staff directly. One lesson learned would be to make the website more interactive to engage more visitors and get them connected to PART/CCH and other partner organizations.

**Survey:**

The survey consisted of 6 questions plus optional gender identification. Over two days (four hours total) in mid-August 2008, 7 teams of 18 volunteers surveyed 303 individuals
at 6 different locations. These locations were chosen based on where the poster advertisements were placed—on the panel above the subway platform in the Gold Coast neighborhood (Clark & Division) and at intersections and bus stops along routes where buses known to display the posters traveled. Armed with cold bottled water, volunteers approached individuals on the street, presented the poster to view, and asked the willing participants for responses to the six survey questions.

The survey took approximately five minutes to administer with the aim of understanding whether individuals were seeing the poster as they passed through the area, what they thought the message meant, whether it affected the way they thought about the sex trade, and whether viewing the poster might prevent a person from buying sex.

Lessons Learned from the Survey

CCH found that though the poster had been displayed on the CTA for at least two or three weeks, the overwhelming majority of those surveyed had not seen or noticed the poster (92%) before they were surveyed. This means that for a short-term campaign there would need to be greater saturation of the posters to even begin to engage one’s target audience. CCH does not know how the response to the survey might have changed after another one to six months of advertising.

Upon viewing the poster, most participants were able to quickly ascertain at least a basic understanding of the poster’s message. Sixty-three percent understood that the message was either to stop prostitution, stop the purchase of sex, and/or that many women and girls don’t enter the sex trade by choice (starting as minors, etc.). However, another 34 percent confused the message to be targeting either young girls/teenagers or their parents. These individuals thought the message was either for parents to watch their daughters more carefully, for girls to stay off the street and out of trouble, for parents to make sure their daughters were picked up in the more innocuous sense (e.g., from school or a date), or for individuals to be aware of missing, runaway, or kidnapped children. The responses to this question informed CCH that future posters need to be bolder, more direct, and clearer in order for the general public to quickly comprehend the intended message.

Those surveyed were nearly evenly split on whether the poster had any effect on what they thought about prostitution. Forty-nine percent stated that it did not affect them. Of these, most (26 percent) did not elaborate as to why but 16 percent said that they had already thought prostitution was harmful as a reason why the poster did not affect them. Forty-six percent said the poster caused them to think differently. These individuals gave various explanations, all of which were ideas that PART would want to confer to the general public. For instance, 12 percent said it got them to think about a prostituted individual as a person with a family. The responses to this question are largely positive since the majority either began to think or had always thought that prostitution was harmful. Because a quarter of the respondents did not give any reason as to why the poster had no effect, it is hard to glean what message may have had more impact. However, it does reinforce the idea that a stronger, more direct message might be helpful.
Only 20 percent of those surveyed felt that the poster would deter someone from buying sex, either because it would cause the person to think more about the person they are “picking up” or because they do not want to go to jail. About 19 percent thought that maybe a few token men might think twice, if they even read the whole poster, or just simply expressed hopefulness that the poster would deter someone. A much more resounding 62 percent said that no poster would stop someone from buying sex, with some suggesting other issues like addiction or misogyny that present a deeper challenge or other interventions that would provide a greater deterrent effect.

These responses lead to several possible conclusions. One could assume that perhaps it is pointless to engage in a poster campaign to deter demand. One might instead argue that a poster deterrence campaign is more likely to be effective if it is matched by other community and police prevention and intervention work. Another conclusion might be that the posters should continue to target johns with a bolder, clearer, and more highly saturated advertising campaign. However, advocates might also shift their expectations to focus more on engaging the general public, changing how they think about prostitution, and providing tools for communities to help eliminate the demand for the sex trade rather than on directly deterring a person who is about to purchase sex.

The results of the surveys and the website usage demonstrate that the general public is interested and willing to engage in discussion about the issue of prostitution. In addition, once they are properly informed about the realities of the sex trade, they may begin to be more sensitive and compassionate to the women and girls victimized by the sex trade and by johns in particular. This is crucial to bring about real change and to move in a direction toward holding customers of the sex trade responsible for their actions.
The second nonprofit that works on demand issues is Christian Community Health Center’s Footprints program, which runs the city’s “john school,” called the Amend Program. This is a one-day seminar for men who have been arrested for soliciting a woman in prostitution. It educates men about the far-reaching consequences of their actions and discusses the behavioral issues associated with solicitation. Women with a history of prostitution speak to the men about their experiences in the sex trade. Participation in the program is an alternative to conviction. Money made from the program goes back into services for women impacted by sexual exploitation.

Additionally, in the winter of 2008-2009 the DePaul College of Law’s Schiller DuCanto & Felck Family Law Center completed in-depth research with five ex-pimps in the Chicago metropolitan area. This research study presents important information about the role pimps and traffickers play in Chicago’s sex industry.

Both city and county government have launched anti-demand initiatives. The Chicago Police Department, in conjunction with the mayor’s office, has initiated a “shaming” intervention, making prostitution solicitors’ information available online. Additionally, in 2009, both the Illinois Attorney General and the Sheriff of Cook County sought to hold Craigslist, Inc. accountable for the ways in which the Craigslist website promotes and profits from prostitution locally. Although a lawsuit filed against Craigslist by the sheriff was dismissed from federal court in October, Craigslist did increase the cost of advertising for “adult services” on its site, and publicly promised to direct those funds to agencies providing services to survivors of sexual exploitation. Recently, Craigslist retracted its commitment to direct a portion of its profits to services.

CAASE’s Curriculum

Because of the lack of effort to educate young people about the harms of the sex trade, CAASE developed Empowering Young Men toward Ending Sexual Exploitation, the first curriculum in the country that directly addresses demand deterrence for commercial sexual exploitation and human trafficking with young men. The curriculum resulted from three years of research into various prevention education programming. It contains four sessions, and specifically targets young men in high school. The three educational goals of the curriculum are:

1. To inform men of the exploitative dynamics and sexual violence that occurs in the sex trade industry
2. To prevent young men’s potential involvement in this industry as consumers
3. To engage young men as allies in understanding constructs of masculinity and gender-based violence, and to empower them to take action in combating these, particularly with regards to commercial sexual exploitation

By teaching young men about harm of purchasing sex for both the prostituted individual and the buyer, as well as helping young men understanding the cultural messages they receive that glamorize prostitution and normalize purchasing sex, CAASE hopes to not only clarify societal misconceptions about prostitution but also to empower young men to take action against it. They feel that education about the violent and exploitative dynamics of this industry will positively influence young men’s decision to not patronize the sex trade and will further contribute to the movement to end sexual violence and sexual exploitation.

In March 2010, the project hired a part-time educator whose job duties include:

- conducting outreach with various schools and existing anti-violence training programs to forge collaborations and determine sites for pilot implementation;
- identifying ten schools in which to pilot the educational program and educate high school-aged young men;
- developing a formal, evidence-based evaluation system (in partnership with a research institution) to determine curriculum effectiveness; and
- analyzing the curriculum in light of evaluations from the pilot sites.

In March 2010, CAASE launched a pilot run of the curriculum with young men in the Juvenile Temporary Detention Center (JTDC) in Chicago. Five young men attended the multiple sessions. For a preliminary run-through, the facilitator, JTDC staff, and CAASE staff felt very positive about the results. The young men were engaged, reflective, and responded well to all of the activities. In April 2010, CAASE and the JTDC developed a partnership that will bring CAASE’s curriculum facilitator into the facility each month to implement the curriculum.

**Collaborative Partners**

CAASE is currently working with Communities in Schools of Chicago (CISC) to promote the curriculum. Although they do not yet know how many CPS students they are likely to reach this year, it is an honor to be chosen to partner with CISC, as they are a critical and established organization in Chicago that addresses the gap between students’ needs and schools’ ability to respond to these needs. They connect students with free social, emotional, health and enrichment programs, provide schools with strategic and tactical expertise in effective program coordination, and during the 2008-2009 school year, CISC partnered with 162 schools and served an additional 162 non-partner schools. During the 2009-2010 school year, their goal is to connect programs and services to more than 64,000 students. Together with a network of more than 125 service providers, CISC connected more than 1,170 programs and services to more than 61,000 students, at no cost to students or schools.

CAASE is also working with the Frederick Douglas Foundation to create a four session curriculum that incorporates a historical perspective on demand. This will be part of their broader curriculum on human trafficking that has both an educational and service-learning component.
**Evaluation**

Built into the curriculum are multiple evaluation tools. There are pre- and post-tests, a form to assess actions students might take in response to what they have learned in the curriculum, a feedback form for students, and a feedback form for the facilitator. Though they created some of the documents in-house, CAASE is working with a social psychologist from the University of Chicago to redo the evaluation tools. They will also have follow-up meetings with classroom teachers to obtain their feedback and to see if they utilized the material in the teacher toolkit.

**Needs**

When developing the curriculum, CAASE was fortunate to have had national educators, such as Jon McCain from DIGNITY and Lisa Gold from My Life, My Choice, who reviewed the curriculum material and provided recommendations. However, it would have helped them to create the curriculum if they had an actual educator to guide its development. Additionally, CAASE could use help establishing relationships with schools and developing an evaluation tool to assess both short-term and long-term impact.

**Key Individuals to Mobilize in Anti-Demand Efforts**

There are a variety of key individuals whose help and support would greatly enhance anti-demand efforts in Chicago. These include the following:

**Chicago Police Department:** Though they have created a preliminary partnership with the Chief of Organized Crime at the Chicago Police Department, CAASE would like to see greater collaboration from law enforcement with targeting demand. Ideally, they would hope for CPD to institutionalize trainings on the issue for all new recruits and to have performance measures based on addressing root causes of sexual exploitation and human trafficking. It would be extremely helpful for the CPD to have a zero tolerance policy prohibiting police officers from engaging in any sexual activity with the prostituted people they encounter.

**Legislators:** CAASE would like to see a greater number of champions in both the senate and house who support their legislation and who proactively meet with other legislators to gain their support as well.

**Cook County Commissioners:** It was progressive for the Cook County Board of Commissioners to pass the Offenses Involving Public Morals Nuisance Violations Ordinance, and CAASE would like to see greater collaboration with the commissioners on future anti-demand work. A positive development toward this goal is that CAASE’s deputy executive director has been officially appointed to the Cook County Women’s Commission by a member of the board.

**City Aldermen:** CAASE has yet to forge partnerships with local aldermen concerning their work, and they would like to begin developing relationships with aldermen to help with End Demand, IL’s goals.

**Judge Biebel and the Prostitution Court:** There is an initiative underway in Chicago to develop a prostitution court, modeled after mental health and drug courts in Chicago and other cities. While the primary purpose identified by the Court for this endeavor is to see women charged with
felony prostitution access social services in exchange for opportunities to avoid incarceration and
an increased criminal record, CAASE is actively working to expand the scope of the court to
aggressively prosecute pimps, johns, and traffickers. Ultimately, their goal is to see EDI succeed
in discouraging a criminal justice response to prostituted people and ensuring that this new court
would be in place and long experienced in the aggressive prosecution of the demand side.

Art Community: EDI has three social justice arts projects supporting the campaign’s work. These
are: an original play about men who purchase sex, a documentary film project, and art
installations at bus shelters. Though these collaborations indicate a strong preliminary partnership
with certain sectors of the arts community, CAASE would like to expand the number of artists
working to raise awareness about the harms of the sex trade and the need for radical change.

Schools: CAASE hopes that more schools throughout the city will allow them to implement their
curriculum.

Faith-based organizations: They have developed toolkits for communities of faith to use as both
an awareness-raising tool as well as an activist guide. They envision faith-based organizations
and religious communities playing a key role in their End Demand, IL efforts. They are working
collaboratively with the Illinois Department of Human Services’ Rescue and Restore Coalition to
develop more partnerships with faith communities.

For-profit companies: Their efforts would be greatly enhanced with more support from the for-
profit community. Specifically, they would benefit from the support of graphic design and PR
firms, the donation of advertising space, and other services that could help them raise awareness.

Universities: As students become increasingly more aware of issues of human trafficking, they
would like to utilize their momentum and interest in these issues to help them in their advocacy
efforts.

Lessons Learned

Keys to Current Successes

CAASE’s successes have frequently come out of their relationships with a variety of
organizations in Chicago. By working in strategic alliances on all of their projects, they have
increased their impact substantially. They have also helped re-frame issues of sexual exploitation,
helping the broader community understand the role of demand and the importance of addressing
demand in efforts to end sexual exploitation. As they strive to reach out to organizations to
involve them in their work, CAASE continues to increase their advocacy base for making change.

Another key to CAASE’s success is the work that preceded its formation. Specifically, the
Prostitution Alternatives Round Table has been doing anti-sexual exploitation and anti-demand
work for ten years, working diligently at educating elected officials, organizations, and the
broader community about these issues.

Additionally, CAASE has a unique model that attempts to address demand on multiple fronts:
from use of the civil court system to policy and advocacy work to prevention and awareness-
raising initiatives. Together, the staff of CAASE brings over two decades of work experience on
sexual violence issues. Utilizing their expertise, they are able to produce strong work partnerships to help further the goals of CAASE.

CAASE is also operating in a climate led by progressive political leadership in Chicago as well as a vibrant and well established women’s rights community. Both help support and further their work. Another key element in the success of their work is the strong lobbying presence that the anti-sexual exploitation movement has in Springfield, including especially their EDI partner the Illinois Coalition Against Sexual Assault, Protestants for the Common Good, Project IRENE, and their frequent collaborator the Chicago Coalition for the Homeless. Multiple nonprofit and government agencies who support their work are able to further their legislative aims.

CAASE has been fortunate in Illinois to have experienced a lack of organized opposition to the work that they are doing. Though there is a chapter of the Sex Worker Outreach Project in Chicago, they have presented CAASE with minimal challenges. CAASE has also made a concerted effort to meet with the chapter to identify issues that both organizations agree upon.

Another key to the success of their programs is the survivor leadership that guides all of CAASE’s initiatives. Survivor experience and expertise are essential in guiding the work of the organization. Chicago is unique in the number of strong survivor leaders who are actively involved in advocacy work. In many ways, their activism is a direct result of specific organizing methods and survivor trainings that were conducted in association with the campaign to pass the Predator Accountability Bill. Survivors involved in the passage of that legislation are now the leaders recruiting additional survivors to help with CAASE’s work and the EDI campaign.

**Keys to Program Sustainability**

Consistent outreach, networking, and collaborations help sustain CAASE’s work. By having multiple partners as stakeholders in all of their projects, CAASE expands the number of individuals who have an investment in seeing their projects succeed. Additionally, they regularly meet as a staff to identify ways to expand the scope of their work to include additional community partners and to ensure the sustainability of all projects.

CAASE has been fortunate to have the involvement of talented youth in their efforts. These include both high school students who work on messaging for the End Demand, IL campaign and the undergraduate and graduate students who make up their volunteer and intern base of over fifteen committed individuals who dedicate their time to the organization. These youth not only work diligently towards CAASE’s mission but they also engage their peers to help further CAASE’s work.

Their biggest challenge to sustainability remains financial backing of their work. Resources remain extremely hard to come by, and the need to constantly fundraise distracts them from being able to devote more time to their programmatic and advocacy work.

**Challenges That Inhibit Action, and Overcoming these Challenges**

One of CAASE’s most substantial challenges is helping people understand that prostitution as a human rights violation, not a choice that women and girls make. With mainstream culture constantly enveloping people in counter-productive and harmful messaging regarding the sex
trade, they find that merely establishing that this issue is something that one should care about is a challenge. And where people fail to understand that human trafficking, prostitution, and sexual exploitation are serious issues—including in their community—inspiring people to activism is almost impossible.

A second challenge is that foundations are hesitant to fund CAASE’s work. Particularly in the current economic climate, many foundations appear reluctant to move beyond narrow interpretations of their mission and frequently they do not recognize their work as constituting human rights work or even women’s equality work or civil rights work. For the foundations that are committed to anti-trafficking work, few provide funding for the broad range of legislative, legal services, and prevention work they engage in.

A roadblock CAASE frequently encounters is what they refer to as a “boys’ club” mentality within Illinois’ legislature and law enforcement. When the Predator Accountability Bill was before the Illinois Senate, a state senator asked, on the record, whether or not he would still be able to get a lap dance that evening if he voted for the bill. This is a clear demonstration of this damaging mentality. Research in Chicago has also found that trafficking of young girls to Springfield increases when the legislature is in session. And representatives are not the only people who use the sex trade in Chicago. Survivors constantly share stories of abuse by law enforcement officials who force them to provide sexual services. These two examples highlight how overcoming the patriarchal entitlement entrenched in many mainstream and governmental organizations acts as a barrier in CAASE’s work.

Another challenge to their work is competition, and sometimes enmity between local political leaders. While many of the most powerful politicians in Chicago and Illinois have progressive views on prostitution and are willing to work with them in ways that further their goals, they frequently have relationships with each other that pose roadblocks to the kinds of effective collaborations that they seek to produce and support.

**Current Opportunities**

Though they do face some collaboration challenges with governmental organizations, they simultaneously see opportunity in the work they are doing with the State’s Attorney’s Office, the Cook County Sheriff’s Department, the office of the Illinois Attorney General and the Chicago Police Department—although their relationships with the CPD are less developed than with the prosecutors, the Sheriff, and the AG. CAASE says that all of these agencies are aware of them and regard them as experts and key players on these issues in Chicago and Illinois, and they frequently look to CAASE for expertise and guidance as they increasingly work to deal with survivors as victims and hold perpetrators accountable. Even though these entities sometimes have their own territorial issues with each other, they have all been open to working with CAASE and to be guided by them in their efforts against sexual exploitation.

Another opportunity is CAASE’s three-year commitment from the NoVo Foundation to fund the End Demand, Illinois campaign. Though the funds supplied by NoVo only cover half of the campaign’s costs, they do provide a significant financial cushion. It also adds validity to both the EDI campaign and CAASE’s work to have the NoVo foundation associated with EDI.
CAASE staff has put significant effort into building national alliances. Key in this alliance-building has been the development of a close working relationship with the Polaris Project. Serving as EDI’s only national partner, Polaris has co-facilitated the EDI policy committee and has been instrumental in aiding them in their legislative work.

A partnership with the Juvenile Temporary Detention Center has also presented a great opportunity to pilot the curriculum and receive consistent feedback, which enables CAASE to update the curriculum so that it is as effective and impactful as possible. Another partnership that is helping to get the curriculum into schools and to further some of the other anti-demand initiatives is work with IDHS’s Rescue and Restore campaign. Rescue and Restore has chosen CAASE as a key partner in its anti-trafficking work in Illinois, and often reaches out to them for consultation, strategy building, collaborative opportunities, and other venues to help further its mission.

As issues of human trafficking and sexual exploitation continue to gain prominence in the national and local spotlight, they find that this increases the number of people interested in supporting their work both financially and through in-kind services and volunteering. Greater awareness also results in more people being arrested specifically for human trafficking. When perpetrators are arrested and funneled to the State’s Attorney’s Office, it can translate into more collaborative opportunities for CAASE.

A legal venue that serves as an untapped opportunity is use of the Predator Accountability Act. Though the act was passed in 2006, no cases have yet used the civil option. They hope that once they have the opportunity to use this piece of civil law against a perpetrator, more legal cases will be brought forward utilizing the provision.

**Moving Forward**

There are a variety of supports that would aid in the furthering of CAASE’s anti-demand work:

**Financial Support:** Financial support is greatly needed to fund both CAASE staff positions, such as a communications director, and direct programmatic work. CAASE would also benefit from more staff members who could dedicate the majority of their time to taking affirmative litigation against the organized parts of the industry (strip clubs, brothels, trafficking rings, etc.). Outside of CAASE, financial support on anti-demand work would allow for more reverse stings, monitoring of Craigslist and other prostitution websites, awareness campaigns, and the development of another john school in the city that takes more of a long term psychological focus.

**Trainings:** CAASE would like to see institutionalized trainings for all law enforcement that might interact with this issue and population. Additionally, CAASE would like to see media and communication trainings, as well as trainings for judges on civil options available to survivors. They would also like to continue providing trainings to survivors so that they can effectively lead community education about sexual exploitation throughout Illinois.

**Information:** CAASE would benefit from a mechanism that would allow them to access what other places are doing and how they evaluate their efforts. They would also benefit from the opportunity to meet with national leaders on the issue at conferences to build alliances and to learn from each other’s work.
Evaluation: A significant challenge that many nonprofits face is how to evaluate the multitude of efforts and advocacy work. It would be extremely beneficial to CAASE to have an external agency that could help organizations throughout Chicago develop and implement evaluation tools for their work.

Online Advocacy Software: CAASE’s work would be more effective if they could take advantage of software that would engage their community in advocacy. Software such as Cap Wiz is costly- but it allows for large numbers of people to reach their elected officials with targeted messages and measure the impact of an alert.

Best Practice Model for Coordinating and Mobilizing Community Activism: Applicability for a National Campaign

CAASE leadership believes that many elements of both their work and the greater work of the End Demand, IL coalition point to a “best practice” model when working to end demand. By combining policy work, community engagement, survivor leadership, and litigation efforts they feel that the Chicago abolitionist community is comprehensively working on multiple levels toward systemic change. By engaging numerous systems and gaining wide-spread community support, they have made significant progress in the way that Chicago, Cook County, and Illinois responds to issues of sexual exploitation and human trafficking.

An Overview of End Demand, IL

Source: http://www.enddemandillinois.org/about_end_demand_il.html

Goals

End Demand, IL (EDI) advocates for the creation of resources and tools for law enforcement to hold perpetrators accountable, deter further exploitation and increase options for prostituted and trafficked women and girls. EDI's extensive organizing and community education efforts will shift public perceptions of the sex trade industry and prostitution so that "pimping" is no longer glamorized and the stigma for the women involved in prostitution is reduced. EDI's work will result in the adoption of sound public policies and practices that focus law enforcement efforts on protecting victims of the sex industry and prosecuting traffickers, pimps and other enterprises that profit from the exploitation of women and girls in the sex trade. Furthermore, our work will create an infrastructure of care for those involved in prostitution, and will encourage Illinois residents to not tolerate the patronizing of sex trade venues and the buying of sex in their communities.

Philosophy and Background

In Chicago 16,000 - 24,000 women and girls are regularly involved in prostitution (i). Countless others, including men and boys, are also prostituted throughout the state. The public health risks associated with prostitution are well documented and acknowledged. Interviews of women in
prostitution conducted in Chicago reveal that high percentages experienced physical and sexual violence, regardless of the type of prostitution activity.

Customers were the most frequently identified perpetrators of this violence, followed by intimate partners and pimps. A quarter of these women stated that police officers were responsible for some of this violence. Furthermore, sixty two-percent of women first exchanged sex for money before the age of eighteen, and large percentages experienced homelessness. (ii) Reasons for entering and staying in the sex trade vary. For some it is pure economic necessity; others enter and stay in the sex trade through some form of coercion exercised by another person (iii). No matter the reason for entry, it is clear that those who enter prostitution and are trafficked are often some of society's most vulnerable, and their experiences once in the sex trade are violent and often psychologically devastating.

Sources


iii Ibid.
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II. Combating Demand in Atlanta

Overview

This chapter represents a brief description of work conducted by Stephanie Davis and various partners on behalf of Atlanta Mayor Shirley Franklin from September 2004 through December 2009. It describes a multi-faceted effort to combat sexual exploitation in Atlanta, particularly exploitation of children, by focusing on demand. It was drafted by Ms. Davis, the executive director of Georgia Women for a Change. We also received and integrated comments on the draft from Beth Schapiro (The Schapiro Group) and Alex Trouteaud (AT Insights). The section was also informed by an article by Nancy A. Boxhill and Deborah J. Richardson (2007) describing how a coalition of women in Atlanta created great shifts in responses to sexual exploitation of children in a 16-month period.

For the purposes of assembling briefing information in preparation for the National Action Planning meeting, the material has been edited and augmented slightly by Abt Associates. The original material provided by Ms. Davis will be made available on request.

Definition of Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children

*Sexual abuse of a child by an adult involving remuneration in cash or kind to the child or a third person; involving treatment of the child as a sexual and commercial object in activities such as prostitution, pornography, and other forms of transactional sex where a child engages in sexual activities.*

Background of Atlanta’s Efforts to Combat Sexual Exploitation of Children

In September 2005, the Atlanta Women’s Agenda presented the report, *Hidden in Plain View: The Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Girls in Atlanta*, to Mayor Shirley Franklin. The report documented the alarming rates of child prostitution and international and domestic sex trafficking into Atlanta and proposed several recommendations. Included in those recommendations were the expansion of services to victims, the launch of a major public education campaign, and the support of various law enforcement activities to assist in the prosecution of pimps and johns as well as establishing a victim-centered approach to the children who were being exploited.

The report and other sources found that victims are getting younger, more girls and women are involved in pimping them, and more boys are using the Internet to solicit for sex in order to make money to survive on the streets. However, a Department of Justice study in 2002 still found that 90 percent of children who were sexually molested were girls, while 97 percent of the abusers were men. It is very difficult to determine the numbers of children who are being commercially exploited in Atlanta and it is generally believed that the police department statistics are just the tip of the iceberg, as more minors are being pimped from hotel rooms, “spas,” and over the Internet, as opposed to the street, which is more visible. In the last half of 2006, 360 cases of child sexual abuse were being investigated by the Child Advocacy Center (however, this includes all sexual abuse within families). There are 90 known escort services in Atlanta and it is generally believed that there are more strip clubs per capita in Atlanta than there are in Las Vegas. It is common for underage girls to have fake ID and to be under the control of a pimp.
The Development of a Comprehensive Prevention Campaign

1. **The “Dear John” Campaign.** This campaign was (and is) part of the prevention strategy developed in Atlanta to raise consciousness within the community that the solution to commercial sexual exploitation of children (CSEC) must include community awareness. Atlanta is one of the few communities whose public service campaign has focused on the demand side of CSEC. Furthermore, Atlanta may be defined legitimately as a hub for CSEC, but it is one of the few cities where the mayor has taken a proactive position to end it. Edelman became our pro bono partner and they produced the print ads, 30-second PSA (which went on to win an Emmy), and consulted all along the way on how to enhance the position and spread the message. We raised about $100,000 in private funds to extend the reach of the “Dear John” campaign through paid advertising in targeted publications and on prime time network stations. We discuss the history and role played by the Dear John campaign below. The campaign’s PSAs can be viewed at [http://www.atlantaga.gov/mayor/dearjohn_111006.aspx](http://www.atlantaga.gov/mayor/dearjohn_111006.aspx).

2. **Faith-Based Coalition.** A group of ministers on the Peachtree Street corridor convened a summit to address the issue of child sexual exploitation and trafficking in Atlanta and discuss ways to inform their congregations and stand together as a faith community in support of the mayor. This event eventually led to the formation of Street Grace, a coalition of faith-based organizations and congregations committed to actively addressing the problem through volunteerism.

3. **Mayor Pressures Craigslist.** Mayor Franklin was the first public official in the US known to have written a letter to Craigslist requesting that they cease serving as the primary marketplace for the buying and selling of women and girls for sex. Craigslist is increasingly becoming a national site for the pimping of adolescents. Private attorneys in the technology practice at Alston & Bird researched options for approaching the owners of Craigslist with suggestions for changes to their operations. A front-page story in the *Atlanta Journal Constitution* exposed the issue and generated calls from around the country, including several attorney generals’ offices requesting information and inquiring whether there had been a response from Craigslist.

4. **Law Enforcement Training.** Additionally, service providers and law enforcement officials were trained to understand that if a majority of children who are eventually exploited are initially abused at home, then targeting those children will ultimately reduce their potential for commercial exploitation later.

5. **John School Development.** The development of a john school within Municipal Court was underway when Ms. Davis left the Mayor’s Office at the end of 2008. The program is intended for first offenders of adult women in the sex industry. A link between child and adult prostitution has been made, particularly for those situational johns who may not be seeking children per se. According to some estimates, the average age of entry into prostitution in the US is between 11 and 13 years old. John schools, which are in place in approximately 40 cities in the US, have been shown to reduce recidivism, thus reducing the demand for paid sex within the community. The Georgia Network to End Sexual Assault was the chosen provider of the educational programming for the john school.
6. **Local Ordinance Reform.** The coalition was able to pass an ordinance raising the minimum age of exotic dancers in the City of Atlanta from 18 to 21. For the two years that the ordinance was in effect, 2,400 girls between 18 and 21 had their licenses expire. Another 800 young women applied for licenses and were turned away. A major club in town, The Cheetah, brought a suit against the city which was later upheld by the GA Supreme Court and the ordinance was overturned.

7. **Safe Harbor.** SafeSPOTS (Safe Place off the Streets) was implemented in the final weeks of the mayor’s term. The Atlanta Fire and Rescue Department trained all firefighters to be first responders if a prostituted girl fled into a fire station for refuge. A protocol was developed with all service providers who would be referral sources in lieu of calling the police. The fire chief accepted an appointment by President Obama to serve as US Fire Administrator and planned to expand the program nationally.

**Prosecution**

The Fulton County District Attorney, together with the chief of police, met to generate strategies to increase the prosecution of johns and pimps. The child exploitation unit and the anti-trafficking unit of APD are both underfunded and thus understaffed, impeding the apprehension of perpetrators. Nationally in 2002, only 34 percent of prostitution arrests were of johns and the other 66 percent were of women and children.

**“Dear John:” Atlanta’s Social Marketing Campaign to End Demand Fueling Sexual Exploitation**

The “Dear John” campaign emanated from the Mayor’s Office of the City of Atlanta and provided a platform to raise public consciousness on the issue of commercial sexual exploitation of children, thereby creating the public will needed to advance social change. The difficulty of “moving the needle” on any social issue, especially those which are characterized as intractable, or about which there is widespread public support or tolerance, was anticipated and this campaign was the response.

After several years as the CEO of the Atlanta Women’s Foundation, where Ms. Davis first saw girls in shackles in the Juvenile Court, she approached the mayor so she could continue the work on CSEC as her policy advisor on women’s issues. At AWF, she was able to find a local law firm to draft legislation making the pimping and pandering of minors a felony, mount a legislative strategy to get it passed in just a few weeks, and raise the initial funding for Angela’s House, the first refuge for prostituted girls in the South.

The idea for the campaign was built into the recommendations of the study “Hidden in Plain View,” which was commissioned in early 2005 and presented to the mayor in September 2005 at a breakfast roundtable, a quarterly event Ms. Davis coordinated to explore women’s issues. The program was a panel that included the head of the Vice Unit, the District Attorney, and a young woman we called “Anna” who told her story of being prostituted as a young teen. The press was extremely cooperative in blurring her face in all moving and still photographs. She was extremely graphic in the telling of her story, and after the event the mayor came up to her and said she would send Anna to college. They had bought her a proper suit to wear in anticipation of the press, and she was compelling. The mayor accepted the report, held it aloft, and committed to take action on the data and review the
recommendations. An article appeared on page 1 of The Atlanta Journal Constitution’s metro section the next morning and there were at least two news segments on local television networks that evening. The campaign was launched.

Shortly thereafter, Ms. Davis reached out to Claudia Patton, the managing partner of Edelman, an international public relations firm, and asked her help on providing pro bono counsel for a public education campaign. She understood that Ms. Davis and the Mayor’s Office had no funding for media buys but was convinced this was needed and collectively could make it happen. There had previously been a series of articles in 2001 in the Atlanta Journal Constitution about CSEC, so it was not a brand new concept to the print media. Steve Behm, the consultant from Edelman on the Dear John project, was creative, strategic, and experienced; he was the vice president of the firm with a talented team of professionals behind him. It was later learned that Mr. Behm would “let” members of the team work on Dear John as a reward for corporate work well done.

In November 2006, Atlanta launched Dear John at a press conference attended by at least 75 people outside of the mayor’s office. Atlanta Women in Film produced three 30-second PSAs for free, and they used the one with the mayor which was shopped to the networks, who all ran it for free in slow media times. At the press conference, upon being introduced, the mayor proceeded to come out as a survivor and told her story of being molested at the age of nine by her best friend’s father and not telling her own mother until just a few years ago. She then asked all present, journalists included, to raise their hands if they ourselves or someone close to them was a survivor of child sexual abuse. The majority of hands went up, including those of a few cameramen, and not a few tears were shed. Mayor Shirley Franklin was at that time the first African American woman to lead a major city in the US, and she was the perfect leader and public official to launch Dear John.

The print Dear John ad was placed in a number of publications that donated the space including Business to Business magazine, The Sunday Paper, Skirt, and the Atlanta Business Chronicle. Ms. Davis was soon inundated with calls from people who wanted to know what they could do to help. Around that time, she also received a call from Rev. Scott Weimer, the head pastor at North Avenue Presbyterian Church, situated on the corner of North Avenue and Peachtree St. in the heart of Atlanta. That corner was mentioned in “Hidden in Plain View” as a hot spot for child prostitution. Rev. Weimer went on to become the chief organizer of Street Grace, the coalition of churches, temples and mosques who have coalesced around the issue and provided the foot soldiers for a lot of the legislative advocacy to follow as well as other volunteer efforts. His church donated the funding airfare to bring a consultant to Atlanta to consult pro bono on the john school, and to underwrite the curriculum design by our chosen provider, the Georgia Network to End Sexual Assault.

National press soon picked up on the campaign. The mayor was interviewed by Bob Herbert twice, and we benefited from an editorial in the New York Times on the day the ordinance passed raising the age of stripping in Atlanta from 18 to 21. Nicholas Kristof from the New York Times came down and did a column called “Girls in the Streets.” Numerous other publications around the country reported on the Atlanta story. In the meantime, they were able to secure $100,000 over two years from a private foundation to extend the reach of Dear John to paid advertising in the city’s major publications. In 2007, the Dear John public service announcement won the Emmy award for “Best PSA,” which allowed us to leverage another summer of free air time with public service directors at the three major networks in Atlanta. In December of 2007, Ms. Davis represented the city of Atlanta
in London at the World Leaders Forum and, along with Steve Behm from Edelman, competed and took the top prize in the Law and Order category for Dear John. All of this positive activity let the team know they were on the right track.

What is most unique and progressive about Dear John is that it focused on demand from the outset. Up to that time, most other public education campaigns sought to put a face on the victim and humanize these “bad girls” who are most often runaways after histories of sexual abuse in the home. Examples we found were “Isn’t She A Little Young?” sponsored by the Department of Public Health in Virginia and “She Has a Name” in Chicago.

The feminist movement has long known that in order to shine a light on an issue like rape and (soon thereafter) battering, organizers must first build services to victims. This gives organizers the stories we need to communicate women’s realities. All great social movements are first built on raising public consciousness and providing hopeful solutions that anyone can be a part of. An innovation of Dear John was that it appeared to be directed at the perpetrators, using a clever slogan with a double entendre. One problem with “Dear John” was that it is not cross-cultural. There is no slang for the letter that a Spanish-speaking woman might write to tell a man that their relationship is over. Also, the term “john” was not always part of the public vernacular. They encountered women, mostly upper or upper middle-class, who thought a john was in fact a pimp. The campaign made it clear that until people were willing to turn their eyes upstream to the person responsible for the exploitation, then more and more young women and girls would continue to be exploited. The need for shelters would be illimitable, and the need will persist and continue to outstrip resources.

**Keys to Success**

An axiom of any public education campaign is that it should not stand alone. It must be an intrinsic part of a social movement that is about challenging the status quo and promoting a change in public policy. Edelman was an effective partner and understood the contribution to be made by a marketing firm from the beginning of their collaboration.

*Leadership is critical.* Dear John was fueled by a powerful, female, urban mayor who was willing to expend political capital on this issue. Shirley Franklin’s leadership was indispensable to Atlanta’s success. The campaign ignited rage across religious, political, race, and gender lines. It catalyzed changes to Atlanta’s laws and inspired legislative change and organizing at the state level. “A Future. Not a Past,” the statewide organization arising from the Juvenile Justice Fund, a nonprofit of the Fulton County Juvenile Court, has been able to secure significant funding and resources to have a major impact.
The “hook” of concentrating only on children obviously brings many more people to the table, but one problem is that there is no prevalent desire locally to expand the group’s focus to include women. They avoid any discussion of all commercial sex and the controversy over women’s ability to choose to prostitute themselves. They have declined involvement on legislative initiatives regarding adult entertainment, since it deals with women who are at least 18 and not technically minors. During this current legislative session, the state considered competing bills to set a minimum age for prostitution, and although coalitions worked together, it was clear the legislature would not support the bill originating from Georgia Women for a Change that set “under 18” as the age, as opposed to their “under 16,” which is the age of sexual consent in Georgia. Likewise, other children’s advocates have been difficult to move to a larger discussion of men who buy sex. Prevention efforts focus on girls and promoting their self-esteem so they are not vulnerable to exploitation. They are aware that the crime of prostitution involving minors is usually opportunistic and most people overestimate the age of teen victims from their looks alone.
DEAR JOHN

The girls on my team stay in school and learn important life lessons: Sportsmanship. Leadership. Teamwork. They become strong women. Meanwhile, you use kids for your own sexual sport. You take away their hope and their lives. The game's over. No more —

NOT ON MY TEAM.

DEAR JOHN

My daughter is everything to me. I want her to have opportunities, like an education. a good family — a good life. You take advantage of kids who feel lost and alone and use them for sex. No more —

NOT IN MY NEIGHBORHOOD.
The media is mostly interested in putting a face on the victim, not the john, and that will be a challenge going forward. How do we move the reporter to ask us to produce a john for her/him to interview? How do we get the public to ask the question, “Who are these men?” If johns do indeed fear exposure, how do we build a campaign that shifts a culture of tolerance to one of intolerance that is more than a “Bible-thumping, anti-sex crusade?” As the public is outraged over the Boy Scouts of America scandal and the cover-up of the sexual abuse within the Catholic Church, the timing seems good for a paradigm shift toward greater intolerance of commercial sex.

**Recent Activity in Atlanta**

Ms. Davis recently received information from a principal of The Schapiro Group, the public opinion firm that developed and implemented the quarterly census of prostituted girls in Atlanta. The research was sponsored by “A Future. Not A Past” (AFNAP), an NGO devoted to stopping the prostitution of children in Georgia. Most of the work, including the first two years of census counts, was commissioned by AFNAP. In August, 2009, the counts were absorbed into the Governor's Office for Children and Families, which has oversight for the Georgia Care Connection. Ms. Schapiro is currently engaged in a study of johns in Georgia and recently led research on hotel employees.

**Johns Study**

The Schapiro Group, in research supported by AFNAP, set up a decoy phone number for an escort service, which they operated through Craigslist Atlanta and other sites known for soliciting for prostitution. They trained a cadre of men to answer the calls that came in and interviewed over 200 people who called the number over a period of approximately nine weeks. Most of the “respondents” were between 20 and 40 years old and 42% of the men identified their location as the north metro area, outside the urban core.

Approximately half (53%) of the respondents dropped off the call when there were too many questions pertaining to underage girls. Half of the sample said “yes” to wanting a girl “under 18.” The study found that many men requesting adolescent females were fully aware that paying for sex from an underage girl is more punishable (legally) than with an adult. The authors concluded that effective deterrence had nothing to do with raising awareness of the increased penalties advocates have achieved through the State Legislature, but rather by removing the thin veil of ignorance men seek to maintain when requesting "very young girls." For about half of men who seek to pay for sex with very young girls, about half abandoned the transaction through a series of three incrementally escalating warnings about the underage status of the girl. Most men would prefer to order sex with a young girl by avoiding any and all direct discussion of her age.

**Hotel Staff Interview Study**

The Schapiro Group undertook a study of 20 hotel employees in major hotels in Atlanta during November and December 2008. They were bartenders, valets, bell captains, etc. What’s new in the use of hotels for illegal sexual liaisons is that sites like Craigslist mean that hotel staff were less frequently used as the go-between for facilitating hook-ups, since johns can simply use their laptops and cell phones after they’ve checked in. In general, hotel staff were less likely to report suspicious looking behavior since the culture of this hospitality industry is to preserve the guest’s confidentiality.
and anonymity. Some were disturbed by very young looking girls whom they presumed were engaged in prostitution and who were usually escorted by a pimp. Again, this study focused on underage girls.

When asked how to stop prostitution, the principal at Schapiro suggested several names for The Man’s Pledge of men she considered honorable and above suspicion of having engaged in commercial sex: Tony Dungy (coach of Indiana Colts), Bill Curry (the football coach at the University of Georgia), Tom Hanks, and Robert Redford. Those names were offered “off the cuff” and with the caution, noting that anyone chosen needs to be vetted thoroughly. Each of these men seems to be above reproach, but that would need to be verified.

The person interviewed also suggested launching initiatives to thwart the “culture of tolerance,” and she was particularly disturbed by child beauty pageants of the sort that glamorized JonBenet Ramsay, who was an Atlanta resident. To build the political will for anti-demand efforts, she felt that the Atlanta Convention and Visitors Bureau should be engaged.

She suggested that while using sports and entertainment stars to capture the attention of men is probably a good idea, most “ordinary” men look at celebrities as being different from them. Her thought was to develop an ad campaign featuring "ordinary" men telling their true stories about engaging prostituted persons. These would be men who no longer buy sex because they started thinking about what they were doing to themselves and their families and they just couldn’t live with that anymore. Former Johns to talk about the impact on their psyches of buying sex and suggested a campaign that would feature men saying things to the effect of, ‘I always felt terrible afterward.’ Developed properly, this could be a powerful campaign. As is known from research on john schools, there are men who can and do modify their behavior. Of course, effective messaging is the area to retain PR or marketing experts.

**Ideas for Supporting Cities Attempting to End Demand for Commercial Sex: Upstream, Midstream and Downstream Strategies**

**Media Center**
- Have a team to launch immediate responses to news that mischaracterizes or shifts responsibility to victim instead of perpetrator, responds to abundance of press of women as the perpetrators or pimp.
- Proactive posting on Huffington Post, Daily Beast, other prominent blogs with victories or ironic and horrific failures of the system.

**Funding**
- Provide small grants to organizations for their own local campaigns, equipment to do stings, seed money to do feasibility studies on john schools, or media buys for local public education campaigns.

**Technical Assistance**
- Create a toolkit: “How to Start a John School in Your Community.”
- Launch shaming campaigns. What laws are needed to post photos in local publications or on the wall at City Hall, send “Dear John” postcards, etc.?
Social Marketing
- Tie local campaigns in with a national one. Suggest The Men’s Pledge, with Valentine’s Day as the national holiday to galvanize support and national as well as local male celebrities who will lend their voices. Publish a list of men, much like the Father’s Day Domestic Violence campaign (see annual NYT ad) who take the pledge.

Clearinghouse for Policy
- Which states have the best laws, who are the contact people in states willing to be helpful, what legal assistance or legislative strategy would be most helpful?
- Pursue the issues of adult entertainment and pornography, both of which fuel illegal commercial sex. Provide a progressive analysis of pornography and free speech so as not to cross the line into censorship and anti-sex culture.

Law Enforcement and Prosecution
- Training for police departments (especially vice units, human trafficking teams) on how to use existing laws to pursue the perpetrators.
- Training for judiciary on how to prosecute pimps and johns to best effect (the “broken windows” theory of crime and problem solving).

Focus on Children
- May want to consider a component for municipalities or local organizations who don’t want to go the whole route with all commercial sex but who only focus on child prostitution. What services do they need regarding best practices?

Convening
- Annual conference for activists, government personnel, law enforcement on ending demand for commercial sex with experts in the field and lots of practical information for taking communities to new levels of awareness and accountability.

Develop a Website
- A comprehensive website on best practices and networking activists from around the country is needed. Who is doing the best work and where are they?

References
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III. Combating Demand in San Francisco

Program Background

Like most cities, San Francisco has had a longstanding, substantial, and well known set of problems associated with prostitution and sex trafficking. In the early 1990s, there was a robust local commercial sex market, exacerbated by the city’s position as a major tourist destination and a busy port for markets throughout the world - particularly Asia and the Pacific Islands. While the terms “sex trafficking” and “modern-day slavery” were not yet in common use, officials from law enforcement agencies and the nonprofit community involved in providing services for victims of abuse and exploitation of immigrants were aware of a substantial criminal enterprise profiting from smuggling people into San Francisco. Individuals smuggled into the city were frequently subjected to debt bondage to pay off debts to smugglers. For women and girls, smugglers often forced servitude in brothels or in street prostitution to pay off the debt.

While this form of crime is now widely recognized as modern-day sexual slavery or sex trafficking, in the late 1980s and early 1990s San Francisco was one of the pioneers in making the connection between what appeared to be local street prostitution and larger systems of sexual exploitation. While not necessarily the first city to recognize demand for commercial sex is the key driving force behind sex trafficking and prostitution, they were definitely one of the “early adopters.”

Throughout the 1980s and early 1990s, the vice unit of the San Francisco Police Department routinely conducted reverse sting operations focusing on arresting men who sexually exploit prostituted persons, and made several hundred arrests of johns per year. Nationally, reverse stings were not as widely used in the 1980s and early 1990s as they are today, and San Francisco was more aggressive in using this tactic to pursue demand than were most cities in the U.S. While police and prosecutors believed that this tactic was attacking the cause and thus a far better approach than punishing commercial sex providers who were most often survivors of crime and exploitation and/or resorting to commercial sex to feed addictions or children, it was recognized that the punishment was not particularly severe for the men they arrested. They also sought ways to pursue restorative justice by somehow having the johns financially support programs for survivors, to help ameliorate some of the damage that their behavior causes.

The FOPP was (and still is) designed to reduce the demand for commercial sex in San Francisco by educating “customers” (or “johns”) about the negative consequences of prostitution. The program is a partnership of the San Francisco District Attorney’s office (SFDA), the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD), and a local nonprofit organization, Standing Against Global Exploitation (also referred to as the SAGE Project Inc., hereafter SAGE), with assistance from the San Francisco Department of Public Health and several non-governmental organizations.

Men arrested for soliciting prostitutes in San Francisco are screened by the SFDA for program eligibility, and those who qualify are given the option of paying a fee and attending a one day class (known generically as the “john school”) or being prosecuted. Fees partially support police operations resulting in the arrests of virtually all of the FOPP participants, and fully support processing participants and conducting the john school classes. A portion of the fee revenue also helps to support SAGE programs for women and girls involved in commercial sex. During nearly 15
years of operation (March, 1995 through January, 2008), over 7,500 men have attended the FOPP’s john school.

**Collaboration**

Aware of the plight of providers of commercial sex and the impact on neighborhoods, Assistant District Attorney Teri Jackson, SFPD Vice Division Lieutenant Joseph Dutto, and health educator Norma Hotaling (founder and director of Standing Against Global Exploitation, or SAGE) began collaborating to identify new approaches to reduce the volume and impact of commercial sex within San Francisco. The first formal meeting of this team for the purpose of planning the FOPP occurred in January 1995. The principals were in agreement that the most promising direction for the program would be a focus on reducing the demand for commercial sex, and that the best way to accomplish demand reduction was education rather than trying to punish the problem away.

One of the innovations of the partners involved in founding the FOPP (particularly SAGE) was framing street prostitution not as a local and victimless crime, but as part of larger systems of sexual exploitation, with street prostitution comprising just one facet of an illicit, global, multi-billion dollar industry. This view represented a significant departure from how prostitution typically had been framed by law enforcement and service agencies: a local street crime involving habitual low-level offenders. The FOPP partners see prostitutes as victims or survivors whose participation in commercial sex is often accomplished through force, fraud, or coercion by pimps and traffickers. For those without pimps, involvement in commercial sex is still seen as exploitation since it is usually the continuation of patterns of exploitation and degradation that began with childhood sexual abuse. These views informed the structure of the FOPP and provide the foundation for the John school educational programming that is the centerpiece of the program. They also informed the development of the FOPP as a “restorative justice” program30, where offenders (the customers of prostitutes) provide a form of restitution by funding programs supporting victims (prostitutes) and benefiting the community.

**Prior Education Programs for Men Who Solicit Sex**

As one would expect with an innovative program, there were few predecessors to serve as models for the FOPP. However, we identified two education or treatment programs for Johns that pre-date the FOPP, and one of these (in St. Paul, MN) was known to the founders of the FOPP prior to 1995. The first program began operating in Grand Rapids, Michigan in 1981 (Sikkema, 2007). The program, called the “John Group,” has been directed since 1983 by Cindy Sikkema, a probation officer for the 61st District Court in Grand Rapids (Shively et al., 2008). The John Group is a court-ordered treatment program that can be required as a condition of probation for men arrested for soliciting prostitutes. The intervention includes four group counseling sessions of about one hour each, and one individual session lasting about two hours. The group sessions convey information about prostitution

---

30 The program staff often refers to the Johns’ provision of fee revenue to support CSE survivor programs as the FOPP’s “restorative justice” component, but this is an unusual application of the term. While there is no universally accepted definition of restorative justice, most include offenders being directly involved in repairing the harm done to their victims (e.g., Cormier, 2002). In the FOPP, there is no direct involvement of offenders in the recovery or compensation of their specific victims. The restorative element is indirect, where a portion of the fees they pay for the FOPP are used to assist other victims of sexual exploitation.
including legal consequences, health risks, impact on survivors (including testimony from former prostitutes) and communities, sexual addiction, pimping, and healthy relationships. The individual session is where offenders develop plans for addressing how they will meet their needs through more prosocial avenues in the future. In addition, the program includes a mandatory screening for STDs and HIV (Sikkema, 2007). With the exception of the John Group’s mandatory health screening, the program’s educational content is remarkably similar to that of the FOPP. However, the earlier program did not serve as a model or guide the development of the FOPP: the founders of the San Francisco program were unaware of the existence of the Grand Rapids program until 2007, when they were informed by the Abt Associates evaluation team.

The only other similar program known to pre-date the FOPP was the Restorative Justice Program for Prostitution Patrons (RJPPP), which was implemented in 1988 in St. Paul, Minnesota. The RJPPP was founded and is still directed by Steven Sawyer, Director of Project Pathfinder Inc. The program is described as a psychoeducational program for men arrested for soliciting prostitutes (Sawyer et al., 1998). The main intervention is a set of classes. Initially, there were 12 classes of approximately one hour each. As the program gained experience and was refined over the years the number of classroom sessions were reduced, and since 2004 the program has required four classes totaling about six hours of instruction. While the structure of the FOPP is different than that of the RJPPP (one full day of classroom learning rather than multiple sessions occurring a span of weeks), the curricula are similar, with the RJPPP containing many of the elements that appear later in the FOPP, such as providing accurate information about prostitution to address johns’ denial and ignorance, discussing health and crime victimization risks, and confronting the negative impact of their behavior on communities.

In addition to the four classes, the RJPPP involves three sessions in which a panel of community representatives engages in facilitated discussions with offenders to convey and discuss the damage caused to communities by prostitution. The program also includes a flexible restorative justice component (now operated by Midtown Community Restorative Justice) that is codified in individual contracts with participants, can include financial restitution, and typically involves 30 to 40 hours of community service.

Unlike the Grand Rapids program, the RJPPP was known to those developing the FOPP and played a role in developing the FOPP. Norma Hotaling, one of the three individuals who founded the FOPP31, had known Steven Sawyer since the early 1990s, and they had discussed how education might be effective in helping prevent men from reoffending (Hotaling, 2007; Sawyer, 2007). The main contribution of the RJPPP to the FOPP is the basic concept of using education in a diversion program for johns. Once that concept was in place, Ms. Hotaling and her partners at the SFDA and SFPD developed the FOPP structure and the john school curriculum independently.

31 The others were SFPD Vice Division Lieutenant Joseph Dutto, and the SFDA’s Assistant District Attorney Teri Jackson.
Targeting the Educational Intervention

The FOPP founders assumed that there were several key attitudes and beliefs that cause or allow men to solicit sex. They concluded that the john school could reach at least some of the men by countering erroneous beliefs and filling gaps in knowledge. The program targeted the following:

1. The belief that the risk of arrest and legal sanction are low.
2. Denial or ignorance of the risk of contracting STDs or HIV through purchased sex.
3. Ignorance of the risk of being robbed or assaulted by prostitutes or pimps.
4. Denial or ignorance of the negative impact prostitution has on the neighborhoods in which it occurs.
5. Ignorance of the links between street prostitution and larger, organized systems of sex trafficking.
6. Denial or ignorance of what motivates them to solicit prostitutes (e.g., addictions, compulsions, unmet social or sexual needs).
7. Denial or ignorance of the negative impact of prostitution on “providers.”
8. Denial or ignorance of the fact that money is the only reason prostitutes have sex with them.
9. The mistaken belief that the women they hire care about them, and that they are in some kind of relationship with them.
10. Denial or ignorance of the anger, revulsion, or indifference that many prostitutes have while they are having sex with johns.
11. Ignorance about how to have the healthy relationships that could replace their reliance upon commercial sex.

Men who solicit sex would be correct in assuming that there is a low risk of arrest and legal sanction, particularly outside of San Francisco (which has some of the most aggressive law enforcement targeting johns in the Nation). On this point, the FOPP does not seek to correct a misperception, but instead to simply elevate the perceived risk from whatever level exists prior to the class. Since many of the men in the FOPP are first-time arrestees, they may be ignorant of the sanctions they may face if arrested a second time, and the program was designed to provide them with this information. On most of the other points, the program founders assumed that the men are ignorant or in denial about the risks and negative impact of prostitution, and the program curriculum was designed to provide them with factual information and “break down their denial systems” (Hotaling, 2006).

The FOPP’s John School Curriculum

To address the informational needs of offenders, the FOPP established a curriculum that was designed to be delivered in one eight-hour day, and would address the issues outlined above. The john school curriculum has evolved over the years, as one would expect with an innovative educational program. The general outline of the curriculum has remained remarkably stable, and the current outline

---

32 Sources: The John School Curriculum (undated document from the SFDA); interviews with FOPP staff, including Norma Hotaling (SAGE), Lisa Ortiz (SFDA), Linda Klee (SFDA), and Mary Petrie (SFPD); see Shively et al., 2008.
Captures most of what the program has addressed since its inception. The current curriculum is divided into six main sections, which are outlined briefly here:

1. **Prostitution Law and Street Facts**, focusing on the legal consequences of subsequent offenses and addressing johns’ vulnerability to being robbed or assaulted while involved in prostitution.

2. **Health Education**, describing the elevated risk of HIV and STD infection associated with prostitution, and stressing that many STDs are asymptomatic and/or difficult to detect and have long term negative impacts on health.

3. **Effect of Prostitution on Prostitutes**, focusing on numerous negative consequences for women serving as prostitutes, such as vulnerability to rape and assault, health problems, drug addiction, and various forms of exploitation.

4. **Dynamics of Pimping, Recruiting, and Trafficking**, featuring discussions of how pimps and traffickers recruit, control, and exploit women and girls for profit, and the links between local street prostitution and larger systems of human trafficking.

5. **Effect of Prostitution on the Community**, describing the drug use, violence, health hazards, and other adverse consequences that co-occur with street prostitution.

6. **Sexual Addiction**, focusing on how involvement in commercial sex may be driven by sexual addiction, and where help for this condition can be sought.

Although not listed as a core component of the curriculum, many of the classes contain a section on policing prostitution. The discussions focus on police surveillance of all types of commercial sex (street, brothels, escort services, massage parlors, storefronts, and web-based), and are intended to provide participants with the impression that they will stand a great chance of rearrest if they continue involvement in any type of commercial sex.

**The Structure of San Francisco’s John School Program**

As we’ve discussed above, the FOPP seeks to reduce the demand for prostitution by educating men about the negative consequences of engaging in commercial sex, and to generate resources supporting programs to assist survivors of sexual exploitation. Men arrested for soliciting a prostitute for the first time in San Francisco are offered the option of being prosecuted or avoiding criminal prosecution by paying a fee and attending a day-long john school where they learn about the legal and health risks of commercial sex, the negative consequences for women involved in the illicit business, the systems of sexual exploitation and trafficking, and the negative impact on communities. If during the year following their attendance in class they are not arrested for an additional prostitution offense, there is no further legal action and the charges are dismissed (although the record of the arrest remains). If there is a subsequent arrest, both the new and original charge may be prosecuted and there is no option of repeating the john school diversion program.

The FOPP was developed and continues to be operated by three primary partners: the SFDA, SFPD, and SAGE, a nonprofit organization based in San Francisco. Representatives from each of these three primary partner organizations make presentations at the john school and are involved in refining the curriculum. The SFPD vice unit conducts street-level decoy operations or “reverse stings” that
produce virtually all of the arrestees that are referred to the program. The SFDA (a) screens all arrestees for FOPP eligibility, (b) determines fees for each participant based upon the sliding scale, (c) collects these fees, (d) distributes the revenues to the partners, and (e) tracks participants for one year after their one-day john school class. The SFPD and SFDA also provide speakers and monitors for the john school classes. SAGE led development of the curriculum, co-facilitates the john school classes, and arranges for about half of the speakers presenting in the john school. Representatives from the San Francisco County Department of Public Health (SFCDPH) and members of NGOs such as Saving our Streets (SOS) and Sex Addicts Anonymous (SAA) also make presentations in the classes.

From the time of the program’s initiation in March 1995 through February 2002, the fee charged to participants was $500. In 2002 the fee was increased to $1,000, with a sliding scale for lower income arrestees. The three partner organizations equally share the revenue generated by the participant fees. SAGE uses most of its revenue to fund the FOPP programs for women and girls (EIPP, Lifeskills, Star program), and takes a relatively small portion to cover their john school expenses (e.g., compensating the john school facilitator for their time in the classroom and to perform administrative duties to keep the program functioning). The SFPD and SFDA use their portion of the fees to partially cover their direct expenses (e.g., paying SFPD officers and attorneys from the SFDA to make classroom presentations and to monitor offenders). The fees do not fully cover the expenses of SFPD decoy operations, and the department’s general operating budget provides the rest. Over the years, the john school fees have covered the all of the FOPP operating expenses for SAGE, SFDA, and SFPD, and has covered the majority of administrative expenses. The program has also generated over $1 million in revenue supporting SAGE programs for sexually exploited women and girls.

Evaluation Findings

In September 2005 the National Institute of Justice awarded a grant to Abt Associates Inc. to evaluate the FOPP. The evaluation addressed three priority issues: effectiveness, return on investment, and transferability. The evaluation methods and findings are discussed in detail in Shively and colleagues (2008). What follows is a summary of key findings from the evaluation.

- **Program Design and Logic Model:** The program design is well-conceived and logically sound. There is a good fit between the program’s goals, resources, activities, intended outcomes, and impact.

- **Program Implementation:** The program implementation is consistent with the program design. Police conduct highly efficient “reverse sting” operations, which target johns by using female officers posing as prostitutes. The SFDA screens arrestees for FOPP eligibility, establishes and collects fees, and monitors compliance with program requirements. SAGE staff facilitates john school classes, arranges for class presentations by community representatives and women who have been involved in commercial sex, and uses a portion of the fee revenue to support programs for victims of commercial sexual exploitation. All three primary partners contribute to the classes by giving presentations and monitoring and managing participants. The classroom presentations are usually consistent with the curriculum and generally are of good quality, but could be improved.
• **Program Stability and Sustainment:** The program has been operating under the same structure, administered by the same set of partners (SFDA, SFPD, and SAGE), and pursuing the same set of goals for over 12 years. The program has a strong revenue stream in the form of the fees paid by participants, and the program has solid support in the community and the partner agencies and organizations.

• **Changes in Attitudes and Knowledge Levels:** The FOPP intends to change behavior by providing information meant to change the attitudes and beliefs of participants. Evidence from our pre- and post-class survey suggests that the program effectively informed johns about the consequences of participating in prostitution, but did not significantly lower the self-reported likelihood of soliciting in the future. This result is consistent with the findings from our john school observations: the sessions focused on conveying facts, and did not attempt to develop problem solving skills or provide practical guidance about alternative ways of meeting their needs.

---

**Figure 6.1: Model of the FOPP’s Impact on Recidivism**
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• **Impact on Recidivism:** To evaluate the program’s impact on recidivism, we analyzed time series data for San Francisco and the rest of California for 10 years prior to implementation and 10 years after implementation (1985 through 2005). In San Francisco, there was a sharp drop in recidivism rates in the year of implementation (1995), and these lower levels were sustained over the subsequent 10 years. A similar pattern was observed in San Diego, where recidivism rates following implementation of a john school in 2000 were less than half of the pre-program levels. There were no significant statewide shifts in either 1995 or 2000 that might explain the recidivism declines in either San Francisco or San Diego. The results were repeatedly confirmed when applying various statistical modeling techniques and examining different subsets of arrestees over different timeframes. The collective evidence strongly supports the conclusion that the FOPP significantly reduces recidivism.

• **Revenue Generated by FOPP Fees:** The total fee revenue generated during the life of the program was over $3.1 million. The fee revenue from the FOPP has been approximately evenly split among the SFDA, SFPD, and SAGE, with each of the three partners receiving about $1 million between March 1995 and July, 2007. The fees covered:
  
  - All of the direct costs of the john school classes.
  - All FOPP administrative costs incurred by SFDA, SFPD, and SAGE.
  - Most (88%) of the SFDA’s costs for processing arrestees referred to the program.
  - About one-third of the cost of the SFPD’s reverse sting operations.

  In addition, approximately $980,000 in fee revenue was generated from 1995 to 2007 to support programs for women and girls involved in prostitution. Almost all (94%) of SAGE’s share of the FOPP fee revenue is used to support survivor programs.

• **Program Costs:** Since the SFPD is responsible for enforcing prostitution laws regardless of whether there is an FOPP program, and the SFDA must process those arrested by the SFPD, the reverse sting operations and processing arrestees cannot be regarded as unique program activities. It is debatable whether these activities should be included when calculating program costs. The main direct costs of the program are for holding the john school classes, which occur just six days per year. The classes require employees from the SFDA, SFPD, and SFDPH to be compensated for their work. Translators and staff from community groups and non-profits are paid modest stipends. The program uses existing, public-sector equipment and meeting space, and incurs no other significant direct costs aside from labor.

  - **Direct Costs of John School Classes:** Using data provided by the three primary FOPP partner organizations, we have calculated the average cost per class for “external” expenses (i.e., presenters and translators not employed by San Francisco criminal justice or public health agencies) to be $758, and the mean per class cost of government employee labor to be $2,341, for an average direct labor cost of $3,099 per john school class. This cost can be offset with an average enrollment of four participants per class.
o **Administrative Costs:** The SFDA is the managing partner of the FOPP, and over the life of the program the agencies administrative costs have totaled an estimated $143,000. The SFPD and SAGE also have an administrative burden (e.g., updating curricula, meetings, drafting MOUs, and accommodating visitors, researchers, and the press), and their total costs are approximately $71,000 and $30,000, respectively. The total cost of administering the program over 12 years is approximately $244,000, or about $20,000 per year.

o **Cost of SFPD “Reverse Sting” Operations:** The median labor cost of reverse sting operations (usually involving three to five officers during the street operation, and spanning four or five hours including setup and report writing) was $2,142. The mean cost per john arrest was $356, and per FOPP participant was $896. When offset by the fee revenue received by SFPD, the average net cost for police operations that place offenders into the FOPP was $418 per participant. Over the life of the FOPP, it has cost an estimated $3,516,479 for SFPD reverse stings. Close to one third of those costs were recovered through the SFPD’s share of fee revenue ($1,047, 706).

**SAGE Statement on Addressing Demand**

For the landscape assessment we asked the current leaders of SAGE to provide their input about the national campaign and more generally what they currently believe should be done to combat prostitution and sex trafficking. They provided the following statement:

The following are launching points for demand reduction programming developed by the SAGE Project. Each of the seven points is followed by one or more programming strategies on which interventions can be founded.

1. **Define the Issue:** Child sexual abuse can never be consensual; the term child prostitute is an oxymoron. Social workers, police officers, probation officers, district attorneys, public defenders, private attorneys, and judges all need to be trained to consistently look at so-called “child prostitution” cases as child sexual abuse, which can be prosecuted under existing laws.

   **Programming option:** develop and model trafficking modules that focus on law, language, and standards of practice that will be integrated into professional training curricula in key jurisdictions.

2. **Educate the Public.** Violence, sexual exploitation, sexual assault, and rape are not normal behaviors. Community education campaign must be integrated into primary care, human service, education, justice, and other service systems, along with faith and community-based organizations to counter the growing normalization of rape, sexual abuse, and learned and accepted exploitation and violence.

   **Programming option:** awareness raising programs in schools (elementary, middle, high school, and college) and after school programs (elementary and middle school) that raise awareness of the problem, that incorporate developmentally appropriate didactic, experiential, role plays in formats that speak to young people realistically.
Separate modules will be needed for urban, suburban, and rural settings. Among the speakers, at least at the three higher levels, should be former pimps and survivors.

3. **Don’t buy into the hype**: Stop normalizing pimps’ and johns’ behavior by ignoring child sexual abuse and statutory rape; enforce existing sexual abuse and statutory rape statutes and prosecute johns and pimps.

   **Programming option**: a massive public awareness campaign, using sequenced, 30 second maximum shots, incorporating credible public figures that get across a blunt, truthful anti-pimping message. Target audience: males and females, ages 5 to 25.

4. **Enforce the law**. Investigate, arrest, prosecute, and incarcerate pimps and johns; not children and women. There is no basis in ethical practice to revictimized victims; it simply transfers the exploitation from the private to the public sphere, reinforcing it (under a patina of legality) and crushes whatever slight hope the victim might have had of obtaining justice.

   **Programming option**: Create a mandatory training for inclusion into continuing education for members of the bar (contacts – National Association of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, if its credibility has been redeemed, state and local bar associations) that explains the laws in no uncertain terms. Speakers on film should include at least one US Attorney, a judge, and a defense attorney who represents trafficking victims.

5. **Rehabilitate the victims and survivors** outside the juvenile and criminal justice systems through peer-based counseling and mental health services.

   **Programming option**: fund a minimum of three victim service projects (one each of urban, suburban, rural, or two of one and one of the other and no rural) in communities that have identified trafficking problems and inadequate resources with which to deal with them. Must be coupled to a strong evaluation component.

6. **Focus on prevention**. Commercial sexual exploitation is a multi-faceted, multi-dimensional problem that cuts across all aspects of society. To end commercial sexual exploitation we need to reinvigorate our systemic and social responses to child abuse within families and communities; we need to address poverty; outdated legal doctrines and practices; gender inequality; racial stratification, and a horrifying societal tolerance of and demand for (most shamelessly in our media) violence against women and girls which ultimately fuels demand for commercial sexual exploitation.

   **Programming option**: John schools that require either longer engagements or follow-up beyond single day programs; a speaker’s bureau through which reformed johns are matched with speaking engagements in the community.

7. **Be comprehensive**. Demand reduction strategies must be coupled with service strategies to provide those trapped in systems of commercial sexual exploitation a way out. To increase their effectiveness, strategies should incorporate restorative justice components through which fines levied against pimps, exploiters, and johns fund these services. They should also
include victim-offender mediation strategies, the limits of which are the limits of our imagination and the circumstances in which we are working.

Programming option: fund strategies in all areas; fund complement art programs in hardest hit areas to minimize displacement and “too little too late” efforts; and evaluate, evaluate, evaluate.
Chapter 7: An Overview of Tactics Used to Combat Demand

Up to this point in the report, we have focused on strategic frameworks that can help the National Campaign to develop and launch successfully. We have presented evidence justifying a focus on combating demand for commercial sex, discussed how to establish and maintain coalitions, discussed issues to be considered when prioritizing actions and framing the issues for maximum effect, and provided input on how to generate awareness and support among policymakers and the general public. It is necessary to focus on such things when planning for the National Campaign, since a foundation of public awareness and political will is necessary for generating the support necessary for mobilizing resources and pursuing tactics for successful intervention. However, it is also important not to ignore the ground level, tactical, day-to-day work of combating commercial sex. Awareness and political will are necessary for success, but they are not sufficient. Once people become aware and motivated to act, the question then becomes, “What must be done?”

To inform discussions of what interventions can and should be pursued, this chapter presents an overview of programs and practices that have been developed and used to combat demand for prostitution and sex trafficking. We focus primarily on the United States, since the national campaign is intended to have a similar focus, and it is useful to concentrate on interventions that have been developed and employed within the same legal, cultural, and economic parameters within which the national campaign will operate.

Much of the information in this chapter derives from two studies: Abt Associates’ evaluation of the First Offender Prostitution Program (grant #2005-DD-BX-0037 from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention and the National Institute of Justice), and findings that have been approved by NIJ for public release from of our ongoing National Assessment of U.S. Efforts to Combat Demand for Sex Trafficking (grant #2008-IJ-CX-0010 from the National Institute of Justice). In those studies, we have compiled lists of sites that are known to have developed interventions to address the demand side of commercial sex, and gathered descriptive information about their structure and operations, and evidence of efficacy.

For the National Assessment, we conducted 200 interviews with program staff33 to confirm that programs operated there, when they began operating, and their basic structure (e.g., how they conducted reverse stings, where they publicized identities for arrested johns, whether they conducted single-session versus multiple-session “john schools”). All those interviewed were asked whether they knew of any other sites that may have demand reduction interventions. This “snowball sampling” method was augmented by literature review and web searches to develop the lists of U.S. sites engaged in demand reduction that we discuss below. For the landscape assessment, we have added to this foundation by conducting literature reviews, web searches, and additional interviews.

33 For National Action Plan project, we contacted people at 15 sites engaged in demand-reduction practices and asked additional questions pertaining specifically to the NAP project.
There are limitations to the information available about most of the programs and practices discussed below. Much of the information is from brief descriptions produced by program staff, or from media accounts. In the United States, there is no central source of information about demand reduction programs, and before the National Assessment project, there had been no attempts to systematically assemble information across sites nationwide, or to verify the reported information about each program.

Readers will notice that there is an emphasis on *john school programs*. We have given them particular attention in this report for several reasons. **First**, they are one of a handful of tactics that are programmatic responses uniquely tailored to address the buyers of commercial sex. Many of the other tactics we discuss are simply standard criminal justice procedures that are applied to the crime of purchasing sex. For example, seizing autos that are used in the commission of a crime community service programs, fines, and incarceration are not tactics developed particularly for combating demand. John schools are an innovation specifically designed to intervene with known buyers of commercial sex, attempting to reduce the incidence of reoffending through education and deterrence.

**Second**, john schools have become controversial among those working to address the problems of sexual exploitation and sex slavery. Many of the objections about the programs encountered in our landscape assessment and our prior research are based upon misconceptions or incomplete information. For example, some believe that john schools accept men arrested for soliciting sex from children, and believe that it is inappropriate for men to receive such a mild “punishment” from the criminal justice system for such serious offenses. They would be right, of course, if it were true that john schools treated men buying sex from children, but they do not. *None of the john schools in the United States accept men arrested for soliciting children*, and to the best of our knowledge, all U.S. john school diversion programs disqualify men with sex offenses in their criminal history.

Objections can stem from legitimate concerns about john schools, but people may reject the whole educational paradigm based on features of one john school program (usually, the FOPP) that are not inherent to the model. For example, some object to men being allowed to have their charges dismissed if they attend a john school. **One third of the john schools in the United States are structured as sentencing options**, in which participation is mandatory for men sentenced to attend, and attendance does not result in the dismissal of charges. In this chapter, we present evidence about the range of configurations of john schools, and discuss common misperceptions about them.

**Third**, the john school model is one of the few interventions designed to combat commercial sex markets for which there is *strong empirical evidence of effectiveness*. If the national campaign is to focus on “what works” and promote evidence-based practices, its leaders and coalition members should be well-informed about such practices.

### A Typology of Demand Reduction Programs and Practices

While they can be combined and categorized as education programs and law enforcement interventions, there is a wide array of specific tactics that have been developed, and many overlap categories in our strategic framework. There is vast expertise at the practice level that should be fostered and brought to bear on the collective efforts supported by the coalition and the Campaign. An effort has been underway for the past three years to inventory the range of extant demand reduction efforts operating at the local level in the United States. Among the demand reduction strategies employed are public education campaigns (e.g., Los
Angeles, CA; Madison, WI; Oakland, CA; Phoenix, AZ); auto seizure and license suspension programs (e.g., Anchorage, AK; Cincinnati, OH; Springfield, IL; and more than a dozen communities in California\textsuperscript{34}), geographic restraining orders or restricted zones (e.g., Everett, WA; Fort Lauderdale, FL; Knoxville, TN); community service programs (e.g., Akron, OH; Indianapolis, IN; Norfolk, VA); “shaming” offenders by publicly posting their names and photos (e.g., Baton Rouge, LA; Chicago, IL; New York, NY); and sending letters to arrestee’s homes (e.g., Arlington, TX; Raleigh, NC; Worcester, MA).

There are at least 10 distinct types of interventions that have been developed and implemented to combat demand, and many variations within each type. Specific tactics include:

- **Public education and awareness programs**
  - broad messaging to the general public
  - targeting specific groups, e.g.
    - state and local policy leaders, such as mayors, agency heads
    - professionals—law enforcement, public health, activists, education
    - men who sexually exploit others
    - boys
    - community organizations
    - military—leadership and armed forces
    - business—leadership and the workforce
    - teachers—school administrators, classroom teachers, school psychologists
    - parents
    - legislators—federal and state

- **Police decoy operations (“reverse stings”) aimed at johns**
  - street-level
    - women officers posing as prostituted persons
  - web-based
    - police respond to real ads, replace prostituted persons with police decoys, continue taking calls from johns
    - police post decoy ads, set up reverse sting
    - police decoys respond to ads placed by johns seeking prostituted persons
  - brothel-based
    - police investigate brothels, make arrests, replace brothel staff with decoys, continue fielding calls and walk-in from johns
    - police use “black books” or other call lists to investigate “customers”

- **Shaming**
  - publicizing identities of arrested johns, via news outlets, police websites

- **Seizing or forfeiting autos**
- **Suspending driver’s licenses**
- **Geographic restraining orders** (e.g., Stay Out of Areas with Prostitution, or SOAP orders)

\textsuperscript{34} On July 26, 2007 the California State Supreme Court overturned the city of Stockton’s ordinance that allowed autos to be seized from those arrested for soliciting, causing the practice to be discontinued or suspended throughout the state while city ordinances are being reviewed or revised. Previously, Washington DC had an auto seizure program that was declared unconstitutional and suspended in 2003.
• johns prohibited from visiting areas with known prostitution activity

• **Neighborhood action**
  • tips to police
  • citizen patrols
  • community-initiated events

• **Community impact panels**
  • residents and business representatives speak to arrestees about harm of prostitution to residents and businesses

• **“John school” education or treatment programs for arrestees**
  • as sentencing options, coupled with other criminal sanctions
  • as diversion programs
  • one-day classes versus multiple-session counseling models

• **Community service programs for arrestees**

Several of these categories of interventions are described below.

**The Prevalence of Demand Reduction Efforts in the United States**

From our research, we have compiled lists of sites in which these demand reduction efforts have occurred. A summary of our findings is presented in Table 7.1. As can be seen here, the most widespread demand reduction strategy is the police decoy operation, or **reverse sting**. We have identified over 650 sites in the U.S. that have conducted street-level reverse stings. A complete list of sites with indications of the anti-demand approaches that have been employed therein is presented in Appendix G.

Demand reduction efforts have operated in the District of Columbia and 49 states (Vermont being the only exception), and in communities of virtually all sizes. While it is well-known that prostitution and sex trafficking are not strictly urban problems (and with the advent of **web-based solicitation**, sexual exploitation is becoming even more decentralized), we were surprised to learn how many small towns had the resources and the need to conduct police decoy operations targeting johns. Forty-eight (48) towns with populations of under 10,000 have conducted reverse sting operations (including one town with a population of 555), and we have identified 322 communities with populations of less than 75,000 in which police have targeted johns. For the set of 568 cities and towns identified as having conducted reverse stings (the remaining 87 sites are counties), **the median population is 64,311**. The median population of counties conducting reverse stings is 389,418. A grouped population distribution for cities and counties that have pursued demand reduction tactics is presented in Table 7.2.
### Table 7.1: Number of Cities and Counties that have Implemented Anti-Demand Interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demand Reduction Strategy</th>
<th>Number of Sites Identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Law Enforcement</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverse stings</td>
<td>655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web-based reverse stings</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaming: Names and/or photos publicized</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dear John” letters sent to homes</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto seizure</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic restraining orders or zones</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community service</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveillance cameras in active prostitution zones</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspending driver’s licenses</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Awareness/Education Campaigns</strong></td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighborhood Programs Targeting Johns</strong></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>John School Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently active john schools</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discontinued john schools</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considering or planning john schools</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education programs covering health topics only</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 7.2: Grouped Population Distribution of U.S. Cities, Towns, and Counties That Have Conducted Reverse Stings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 – 9,999</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 – 24,999</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000 – 49,999</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 – 74,999</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75,000 – 99,000</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000 – 149,000</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150,000 – 199,999</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200,000 – 499,999</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500,000 – 999,999</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000,000 or more</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>655</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public education & Awareness Programs

While most experts agree that public education and awareness are critical to combating prostitution and sex trafficking, there are a few examples of programs designed for these purposes. The best-known and most ambitious public awareness campaign is the “Dear John” campaign implemented in the greater Atlanta area. The campaign is described in detail in Chapter 6 of this report, so we will not repeat ourselves here, except to note that it involved a series of professionally produced public service announcements and print media images that were circulated via the web in printed and posted in public areas (such as buses) in Atlanta.

Most of the other 40 communities that have employed some form of awareness or education effort aimed at reaching the buyers of commercial sex have done so with less extensive campaigns, and using simpler methods. For example Rochester New York put up billboards reading, “Dear John, you’re not welcome in our community.” In Cleveland, there was a neighborhood initiated campaign targeting johns in which residents took turns carrying signs in troubled neighborhoods carrying posters stating, “Dear Johns, your plate number is being recorded. Yours truly the neighbors.” In San Antonio, a neighborhood-initiated campaign involved residents taking photos of johns in cars, recording license plate numbers, and sending the photos and information to police.

Reverse Stings

The most commonly used tactic to address demand for commercial sex is most usually referred to as the reverse sting. These police special operations feature one or more women officers serving as a decoy (or decoys), posing as a prostitute to await being approached by those attempting to purchase sex (e.g., Dodge et al., 2005; Jetmore, 2008).

The term “reverse sting” is an artifact of the historic gender inequity in the enforcement of prostitution. Until relatively recently, the vast majority of all police attention devoted to prostitution was focused on arresting providers of commercial sex. The most common police tactic to combat commercial sex was operations using plainclothes male officers use to elicit offers of commercial sex from prostituted persons. These operations were known as “stings.” Beginning in the 1970s, but not becoming widespread until well into the 1980s, were operations focusing on buyers rather than providers of commercial sex. To distinguish those operations from the more traditional stings, the term “reverse stings” devolved into common usage, and implies that those operations are something other than the typical or default tactic.

The term is somewhat controversial particularly for advocates of approaches in which the majority of police attention is focused on buyers rather than sellers sex. It has been proposed by many that the movement to eradicate sexual exploitation should promote the use of the term sting to apply to operations aimed at johns, and not to arrests providers of commercial sex at all. Since the Campaign and this report will address broad audiences and the term reverse sting is still the most common usage, we will continue to use that. As the National Campaign works on messaging, one of the considerations regarding use of language may be whether to work on changing the terminology used to describe police decoy operations.
Street-Level Reverse Stings

In our observations of reverse stings, and in descriptions gathered from interviews with police and review of the literature (Jetmore, 2008; Newman, 2007; Nolan, 2001; Scott, 1999; Spruill, 2009), we found the following to be typical. Areas of the city known to be active for street prostitution are selected, and a tactical plan is either discussed or written and submitted for a supervisor’s approval. Usually at least five officers are used in a street reverse sting. In addition to the female officer or officers, there are usually several additional undercover officers in supporting roles. The operations often consist of one or two male plainclothes officers on foot, posing as pedestrians, and one or more unmarked patrol cars, each carrying plainclothes officers. There are usually other officers participating in the operations by processing arrestees. In some cases, they are in a van serving as a mobile booking or screening station, and in other instances the operations occur near police stations or substations. In the latter circumstance, the operations require more on-site officers so that there is less down time between arrests. It usually requires at least two officers to transport the arrestees away from the site of the arrest, at least one escorting the arrestee and another driving the arrestees car (when applicable). While there is no good data source that would allow a firm average to be calculated, from our observations and literature we believe that at least five police officers are required for reverse stings using one female decoy.

A supervising Sergeant is usually in charge of the reverse stings. Decoys are escorted to the drop-off locations at which the operations will occur. An unmarked police van serving as a mobile screening or booking station is usually parked nearby, but out of sight of the street operation. The decoy officer is often dropped off with a tape recorder, hidden mic, and cell phone (for safety, in case she is abducted). Some police departments videotape the reverse stings surreptitiously from one of the unmarked police cars. The decoy always tries to remain in visual contact with the other officers. When potential “clients” speak with the decoy, the supporting officers track her carefully until she makes a pre-arranged signal indicating a “good case,” which is when the man has made an offer of money in exchange for sex and has committed an “act in furtherance” of that offer. Any overt behavior that can be construed reasonably to move toward consummating the act of prostitution implied by the verbal exchange completes the legal requirements for making an arrest. “Acts in furtherance” can include reaching for a wallet, pointing to money on a bed or a car seat, driving around the block to the area where the actual take place, or opening a car or hotel door so that the decoy can enter.

When the signal for a “good case” is given, the officers on foot and in unmarked cars converge and make the arrest. At this point, the decoy officer enters the police car as quickly as possible and leaves the scene, while the man is arrested and driven to a point where he will be processed. Sometimes he is driven in his own car by a plainclothes officer, and other times they are driven in a police car while another officer drives the offender’s car. Arrestees who are on foot are driven to the van or police station in a patrol car.

The license plate number of the car and the man’s driver’s license number and other identifiers are radioed or sent via computer to a dispatcher, and the determination is made whether to issue a citation and notice to appear in court, or to book the arrestee and take him into custody. If they have identification and no outstanding warrants, they are usually issued a citation and allowed to leave. If these conditions do not apply or if there are concurrent offenses (e.g., possession of drugs or illegal weapons), the johns can be taken into custody.
After the decision to cite or arrest is made, offenders in jurisdictions with criminal justice diversion programs for johns are issued a citation and informed of their responsibility to call the prosecutor's office for processing (either a city attorney's office when johns are cited for violating municipal ordinances, or the district attorney's office when johns are arrested for committing a penal code violation).

In the time it takes the officers to process the arrestee, the decoy officer usually remains in an unmarked car writing notes for her report and (if applicable) checking to ensure that the quality of the tape of the transaction was acceptable. She then removes and marks the tape and inserts a blank in the recorder. She stays out of sight of the arrestee and away from the location where the arrest was made, until it is time to set the operation. When reverse stings use multiple decoys, it is possible to keep the street operations going continuously: if one or two of the decoys have made a good case and the men are being processed, there can still be one or more decoys active, provided that there are enough support officers for a safe operation.

**Web-Based Reverse Stings**

Since its inception, the Internet has been used with increasing frequency to transact commercial sex. Ads are posted websites devoted to commercial sex (eroticreview.com, worldsexguide.com, myredbook.com) or on websites serving a broader spectrum of commercial transactions, such as Craigslist, BackPage.com, Yellow Pages, and local entertainment periodicals, such as the Phoenix New Times. It is widely observed that soliciting commercial sex throughout the United States has shifted from the streets to online. For
example, in San Francisco the yield of arrests per reverse sting operation fell by half between 2004 and 2007 (Shively et al., 2008). The Police Department's vice unit personnel believes that the decline has resulted in part from the effectiveness of the city's john school program and their persistence in conducting reverse stings over the years, but that the largest factor is the rise of online solicitation - particularly the use of Craigslist.

Many police departments throughout the United States have tried to use this to their advantage. Approximately one third of all police departments that do street-level reverse stings (232 sites have been identified) also have conducted their online equivalents.

Online reverse stings are easy for police to initiate. The typical procedure is to post a decoy ad, and when potential johns respond with a phone call or an e-mail, the officers pose as prostituted persons and arrange for a meeting - usually at a hotel that has been prepared for a reverse sting. At the hotel, a female officer poses as a prostituted person, and once the john is face-to-face with the officer, the operation is essentially the same as that used in conventional reverse stings.

Some of the police officers interviewed hope that Craigslist continues to be used for transacting commercial sex, since it facilitates effective reverse sting operations. They believe that if efforts succeed in persuading Craigslist to discontinue serving as “an online pimp,” that the market forces would simply respond by having people shift operations to other websites that make it harder for policy to post decoy ads. One of the advantages of Craigslist for police is that posting ads is inexpensive (now $10 for an ad, and five dollars for reposting). Posting decoy ads in Yellow Pages or escort services sections of other periodicals can cost hundreds of dollars, and commercial sex (or “escort”) websites can charge $30 or more for an ad. By discussing this, we do not mean to suggest that Craigslist ought to be encouraged or ignored as they facilitate sexual exploitation and sex trafficking. We are simply reporting what some police officers have conveyed to us.

Shaming

Shaming is a simple tactic for combating demand: The identities of men arrested for soliciting commercial sex are publicized, typically through police press releases that are carried by local media outlets. More than half (59%) of the 655 communities in the U.S. that are known to have conducted reverse stings publicize the identities of arrestees.

For many police departments, revealing identities of arrestees proceeds from an intent to deliver a punishment and serve as a specific deterrent, and for general deterrence - sending a message to potential johns that their identities will be revealed if they are apprehended for soliciting sex. For some police departments, publicizing identities does not appear to be programmatic – instead, it is a matter of routines whereby identities of adult arrestees across all offense categories are revealed. For example, the identities of arrestees sometimes appears in local news “crime logs” or “police blotters,” with johns’ identities revealed alongside those of burglars, vandals, and drunk drivers. However, the lack of a specific intent of reducing demand for commercial sex does not directly affect its potential for effectiveness as a deterrent.

The most common method of disseminating identities is through news outlets – both online and in print. Other methods include police websites (e.g., El Cajon, CA; Nashville, TN); billboards (e.g., Rochester, NY; Minneapolis, MN); community websites (e.g., “Trick the Johns” in Chattanooga, TN, “JohnTV” in Oklahoma City, OK); and public access television (e.g., New York, NY). Variations on shaming tactics
include an effort in Baltimore County, MD in which police inform residents of court dates for prostitution-related cases, encouraging them to appear at hearings and trials. The tactic is intended not only to shame offenders by bringing residents to witness them being accused in court, but also to encourage judges and prosecutors to follow through with charges and impose fair penalties. Another variation of shaming is letters sent to the homes of alleged buyers of commercial sex, or to the homes of registered owners of vehicles used in known or suspected instances of soliciting commercial sex (these “Dear John” letters are described below).

There are compelling arguments both for and against shaming. Proponents argue that it is a powerful deterrent, perhaps more important than arrest and legal sanctions. Surveys and anecdotal evidence lend support to this argument (e.g., Durschlag & Goswami, 2008; Farley et al., 2009). When asked to name the tactics that would prevent or deter men from buying sex, having their identities publicly circulated was listed most frequently. For example, in the Durschlag & Goswami study, 87% of the men listed “photo and or name in local paper” in response to the question, “What would deter you from buying sex?” This was the most frequently cited potential consequence, followed by “jail time” and ”photo and/or name on billboard (both at 82%), “photo and/or name on the Internet” (82%), and “a letter sent to family saying you were arrested for soliciting a woman in prostitution” (79%). Four of the top five consequences that men say would deter them involve others finding out that they have had sex with prostituted persons. While men's perceptions of what may deter them in response to hypothetical questions does not necessarily correspond perfectly to what actually deters men in real situations, the results are certainly provocative and provide an empirically-based reason to suspect that shaming may be effective.

There are compelling arguments both for and against shaming. Proponents argue that it is a powerful deterrent, perhaps more important than arrest and legal sanctions. Aforementioned surveys and anecdotal evidence lend support to this argument (e.g., Durschlag & Goswami, 2008; Farley et al., 2009), as does a body of criminology literature on the effects of extralegal sanctions on deterrence (e.g., Vold et al., 1998; Zimring and Hawkins, 1973). Opponents contend that deterrence is unproven, that shaming violates due process rights since identities are typically publicized upon arrest and prior to adjudication (American Civil Liberties Union, 2008), and that it negatively affects families of arrestees. Some cities (e.g., San Francisco) do not pursue shaming specifically because of the impact it may have on those associated with alleged offenders. Given the prevalence of shaming and the potential for unintended consequences, it is important to determine whether effectiveness justifies its use.

For cities and counties with prostitution and sex trafficking problems, the results of an evaluation attesting to its effectiveness would be immediately useful. Police and concerned non-profit organizations would be interested in any measured “treatment effects,” while individuals somewhat further from the operational level would be interested in how any observed effects weigh against due process concerns and potential negative impact on the families and associates of men whose identities are publicized. Passing a risk/reward “balance test” requires that the tactic is an effective treatment or deterrent.
“Dear John” Letters

A tactic that has been employed in 29 U.S. sites is sending letters to the homes of known or suspected buyers of commercial sex. The intention is to make it more difficult for johns to engage in sexual exploitation anonymously, or at least, unbeknownst to spouses or partners. Those we have interviewed for the national assessment cite as the primary reasons for using this tactic as (1) to alert partners of buyers of commercial sex so that they can protect themselves from contracting infectious disease, given the higher probability that the johns may be carriers, (2) to bring pressure to bear from whomever lives with sex buyers to discourage them from buying sex.

There are two main variants of this approach. The first is sending letters to the registered owners of cars seen “cruising” known prostitution strips or are otherwise suspected of being driven for the purpose of soliciting sex from prostituted persons. This tactic requires that police acquire the license plate number of the car that is being used in a way consistent with soliciting commercial sex. An example of suspicious behavior would be when a car circles a block repeatedly and pulls up to the curb so the driver can engage in conversations with women who have prior arrests for prostitution. It may also be observed that a person known to have been prostituted enters the car and leaves with the driver, and then returns minutes later.

While the purpose of this interaction is apparent on a commonsense level, in most jurisdictions there would be insufficient evidence to arrest the John for soliciting commercial sex, since there is reasonable doubt
about what actually occurred between the two parties. In such circumstances, police in some jurisdictions will record the license number of the vehicle, and later find the address of a registered owner and send them a letter. Sometimes the observation is made not by the police, but instead by members of the community who observed this kind of activity and record the license plate numbers, and make a report to police departments. For example, police in Minneapolis and Des Moines have asked residents to record license plate numbers and descriptions of johns, and to forward the information to police so they can send letters to the alleged offenders. Some police departments have forms for recording the information, which asked members of the community to record the location of the event, the time, make and color of the vehicle, and most importantly, the plate number. Once police have been given this information, they can follow the same procedure as if they had made the observations themselves.

The letters typically strive to make it clear that the police do not assume that the registered owner of the vehicle was necessarily driving the car when the suspicious behavior was observed, and also that the letter does not constitute being charged with a crime. Some of the letters explicitly address the fact that the suspicious behavior may have occurred while someone other than the registered owner was driving. The tone may even be friendly, suggesting that the registered owner’s vehicle is being used improperly, and that they should take care not to allow others to use their vehicle for such purposes.

A version of this approach is used when an arrest for soliciting commercial sex has been made by a person using a particular vehicle. In this case, the letters do not say that suspicious behavior occurred, but instead say that arrest was made for prostitution by the driver of that vehicle. Again, the letters make it clear that police are not assuming that the registered owner is the person arrested. Except for this difference, the procedures are similar to those described above. A sample letter used by the Escambia County Sheriff's Office is presented in Figure 7.3.

**Vehicle Seizure**

Most state criminal codes allow for the seizure of vehicles used in the commission of crimes. Often this is interpreted as felonies such as kidnapping, drug smuggling, etc., but over 100 communities in the United States have applied auto seizures to soliciting prostitution. In the vast majority of communities that sees the autos of men attempting to purchase sex, the vehicles are retrievable after paying an impound fee of $400 or less.

Auto seizures have been successfully challenged in courts. The basic issues generally are whether the auto seizure constitutes a penalty that exceeds the maximum allowed for misdemeanors, and in other instances, local ordinances may conflict with state law. For example, on July 26, 2007 the California State Supreme Court overturned the city of Stockton’s ordinance that allowed autos to be seized from those arrested for soliciting, causing the practice to be suspended throughout the state while city ordinances were being reviewed or revised. Seizures resumed in several California cities in 2008 (e.g., Riverside, Sacramento). Similarly, Washington DC had a seizure program that was declared unconstitutional and suspended in 2003. A Miami ordinance that was passed by the city council in 1997 was declared unconstitutional in response to a 1999 case, and that decision was upheld on appeal.

A few communities have instituted forfeiture programs in which cars used by men to solicit sex with prostituted persons could be forfeited, sold at auction, and the proceeds retained by law enforcement to fund their efforts. For example, the Easton, PA city council passed an ordinance on July 9, 2008 allowing for
forfeiture of vehicles within one year of arrest, allowing time for due process. However, the first set of men arrested in reverse stings who had their autos seized filed suit, challenging the forfeitures as excessive punishment since the penalty of the local ordinance exceeded misdemeanor sentencing standards for the state’s prostitution statutes. In September, 2008, all of the autos in Easton were returned and forfeitures suspended pending the outcome of the lawsuit. In Genesee County, MI johns have been required to forfeit vehicles, and can buy them back for $900 after a first arrest; $1800 for 2nd; and $2,700 for a 3rd arrest. If they don’t pay, the vehicle is sold.

Geographic Restraining (“SOAP”) Orders

Over 70 cities and counties have applied geographic restraining orders or restricted zones to men arrested for buying sex. The court orders for arrestees to avoid these zones are often referred to as SOAP orders (an acronym for Stay Out of Areas with Prostitution). For example, in 1993 Portland, OR established a “prostitution-free zone” along a corridor or long known to be area with the city’s highest concentration of street prostitution. We have provided the ordinance for this zone in Appendix D. Essentially, this ordinance allowed judges to order those arrested for prostitution offenses (including johns) not to enter the designated, restricted area. The ordinance allows for several consequences to be meted out against those who violate the order. Although it was widely regarded as successful locally, budget cuts rendered the Police Department unable to enforce the zone properly, and the City Council allowed the ordinance to expire. Area residents and businesses soon observed an increase in visible prostitution and related activity, and the mayor has proposed reviving the prostitution-free zone.

Other cities have implemented or proposed variations of such zones. For example, Arlington Texas is currently considering creating “exclusion zones” to discourage prostituted persons and their “customers” from frequent tanning areas in an entertainment and terrorist District (Schrock, 2010).

Neighborhood Action

Throughout the United States there has been a wide array of tactics employed that focus on the buyers of commercial sex that feature residents, businesses, or organize community groups either taking their own action or engaging in partnerships with law enforcement. We have identified 80 cities and counties that have engaged in some variation. For example:

- **Chattanooga**, TN has a neighborhood led effort to shame johns (in addition to pimps and prostituted persons), asking for submissions of photos to be posted on an independent website: [www.trick.the.johns.com](http://www.trick.the.johns.com).

- **Baltimore**, MD has the Baltimore John Watch which encourages residents to record license numbers of cars and submitting descriptions of the make, model, and license numbers of vehicles and descriptions of the driver, and posting them on [www.baltimorejohnwatch.blogspot.com](http://www.baltimorejohnwatch.blogspot.com).

- **Houston**, TX contains neighborhoods in which residents have placed “no prostitution” signs on their lawns.
• **Tacoma, WA** has placed conspicuous surveillance cameras in areas known to be active for street prostitution, and has posted signs alerting potential johns of the cameras’ presence.

• **Lansing, MI** police developed the “hot spot card program” involving distributing cards that encourage residents to record information about known or suspected vice crimes and provide that information to police.
Community Impact Panels

Several communities have been found to rely upon residents and other representatives of communities to appeal directly to the buyers of commercial sex, in hopes of dissuading them from that behavior. Usually, this occurs in john school programs, since that is often the context in which known buyers of commercial sex are “captive audiences,” accessible to community members and required to listen to their views. In john school classes we observed in San Francisco, Phoenix, Worcester (MA), and Indianapolis, community representatives from local organizations discussed a range of negative effects that prostitution has on communities. Among the most common messages conveyed to johns is that where there is prostitution, residents and businesses experience the following:

- Drugs and violence.
- Condoms, syringes, and broken bottles on sidewalks and in parks that children and others can contact.
- Screaming, fighting, and loud cursing late at night.
- “Drunks” and “addicts” sleep in doorways.
- People defecate and perform oral sex in doorways to apartment buildings.
- Pimps “beat up prostitutes.”
- Prostitutes and pimps assault johns.
- In working class neighborhoods, people cannot afford to lose sleep, and should not have to be deprived of sleep just because people choose to commit crimes there.
- There can be repercussions for women and girls who have been propositioned by johns. Anecdotally, it was asserted that women and girls of specific ethnic groups could face consequences from their husbands or fathers if it was learned that they had been propositioned by a john, even if they did nothing to encourage it and it was unavoidable.
- Johns “can do their business there and leave,” but residents have to stay in their neighborhood and deal with the aftermath. In one presentation, the community representative asked whether the men in the class were arrested in the neighborhood in which they lived. None of the 27 men said they had been arrested in their home neighborhood.

Members of the communities emphasize that johns contribute to the problem, or in fact are the chief cause of the problem, since without “customers” there would be no prostituted persons or pimps.

John Schools

“John school” is a generic term that is used to describe a wide range of programs. A useful working definition for john school is: An education program for men arrested for soliciting illegal commercial sex. To that basic definition, one could add that in order for an education program to be considered a john school, it must cover a range of topics designed to persuade or deter men from buying sex.
There are several education programs in the United States that involve education for arrested John's that we would not consider to be a john school. For example, at 10 communities in the United States have a health education session (usually focused on HIV) for prostitution arrestees - including johns - but we would not consider that to be a john school program, since the model’s basic intention is to help men avoid infection and not necessarily to convince men to avoid commercial sex because of the harm it causes.

A wide variety of programs are often grouped together and labeled john schools. Among the key dimensions of variability are:

- **Number of sessions:** Most john schools are single sessions, but they can arrange up to 10 sessions spaced a week apart.

- **Diversion versus sentencing option:** About two-thirds of john schools in the United States are structured as criminal justice diversion programs, and the remainder are structured as conditions of a sentence. In the former, charges are usually dismissed upon completing the education program; in the latter, they must complete the john school to satisfy the conditions of their sentence, but doing so does not result in their charges being dismissed.

- **Fees or fines:** The average fee or fine for john schools in the U.S. is roughly $400, and the range is from $0 to $1,500.

- **Curricula:** the common denominators of most john schools are that they discuss health and legal consequences for johns if they were to continue engaging in commercial sex, and the negative impact of prostitution on prostituted women and girls and communities. With a common foundation, there is a wide range of topics covered by at least one John school. For example, the Indianapolis “Red Zone” program features a community impact panel, and then has the men spend three hours doing community service by picking up trash on the streets with high levels of prostitution activity. Other curriculum components include discussions of healthy relationships, anger management, sexual addiction, pimping and pandering, human trafficking, and johns’ vulnerability to criminal victimization while engaged in commercial sex.

**Generic John School Logic Model**

Like any program, john schools are grounded in a set of goals. To pursue these goals, programs use resources that support activities intended to produce targeted results—from those results that are immediate and specific, to those that are broader and longer-term outcomes. A logic model is a useful device for illustrating the linkages from program goals, to the resources committed to the program, to activities, to outputs (the direct representation of activities), to program outcomes (the manifestation of the change that activities are seeking to accomplish) and finally to impacts (the indications that the program’s broader goals have been realized). The logic model for the most common type of john school (modeled in part on the FOPP) is presented in Figure 7.4.

The ultimate program goal is to decrease the demand for prostitution, and hence, reduce the amount of human trafficking and sexual exploitation that occurs. Program goals are pursued by committing resources (inputs) that support program activities (in john schools, the primary program activity is the educational intervention for arrestees). The measurable indicators of these activities are the program “outputs.” The activities are designed to lead to the aforementioned outcomes of knowledge and attitude change: increased awareness of the legal and health risks of engaging in prostitution, and awareness of the negative impact of
the behavior on prostitutes, communities, and others. These outcomes are intended to reduce the likelihood that men will continue to solicit prostitution (i.e., the program *impact*).

**Figure 7.4: Generic John School Logic Model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input/Resources</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Staff</td>
<td>• Vice operations</td>
<td>• Number of men arrested</td>
<td>• Pro-social shifts in attitudes</td>
<td>• Reduced incidence of prostitution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Equipment</td>
<td>• Referral of arrestees to john school</td>
<td>• Number of referrals to john school</td>
<td>• Increased levels of knowledge</td>
<td>• Reduced trauma to providers and consumers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Space</td>
<td>• Screening arrestees</td>
<td>• Number of men educated in john school</td>
<td>• Specific deterrence</td>
<td>• Improved community quality of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Partnerships</td>
<td>• Conducting john school classes</td>
<td>• Fees collected and revenue distributed</td>
<td>• Program sustainment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Funding</td>
<td>• Staff training</td>
<td>• Number of staff trained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Targeting the Educational Intervention

John school directors typically assume that there are several key attitudes and beliefs that cause or allow men to solicit sex, and that the programs reach at least some of the men by countering erroneous beliefs and filling gaps in knowledge. The programs target some or all of the following:

1. The belief that the risk of arrest and legal sanction are low.
2. Denial or ignorance of the risk of contracting STDs or HIV through purchased sex.
3. Ignorance of the risk of being robbed or assaulted by prostitutes or pimps.
4. Denial or ignorance of the negative impact prostitution has on the neighborhoods in which it occurs.
5. Ignorance of the links between street prostitution and larger, organized systems of sex trafficking.
6. Denial or ignorance of what motivates them to solicit prostituted women or girls (e.g., addictions, compulsions, unmet social or sexual needs).
7. Denial or ignorance of the negative impact of prostitution on “providers.”
8. Denial or ignorance of the fact that money is the only reason prostituted persons have sex with them.
9. The mistaken belief that the women they hire care about them, and that they are in some kind of relationship with them.
10. Denial or ignorance of the anger, revulsion, or indifference that many prostituted women have while they are having sex with johns.

11. Ignorance about how to have the healthy relationships that could replace their reliance upon commercial sex.

Men who solicit sex would be correct in assuming that there is a low risk of arrest and legal sanction. On this point, john schools seldom seek to correct a misperception, but instead to simply elevate the perceived risk from whatever level exists prior to the class. Since many of the men in john schools are first-time arrestees, they may be ignorant of the sanctions they may face if arrested a second time, and the program was designed to provide them with this information. On most of the other points, the program managers usually assume that the men are ignorant or in denial about the risks and negative impact of prostitution, and the program curriculum was designed to provide them with factual information and “break down their denial systems” (Hotaling, 2006).

A precondition for a sustainable john school program is a sufficient flow of eligible participants. Usually, this requires a proactive approach on the part of law enforcement to conduct operations designed to arrest men for soliciting. Several john school programs have been suspended or discontinued due to an insufficient flow of participants (e.g., Buffalo; Tampa). This flow is determined primarily by whether police have and will commit the resources needed to conduct reverse sting operations. Programs whose fees are used only to support john school classes can survive with very small numbers (as few as 10 to 20 per year, enough for one class per year), but programs that rely upon the fee revenue to sustain programs for women and girls involved in commercial sex must have a reliable and substantial volume of program participants. A serious, current challenge for all john schools is cutbacks in police budgets that have resulted in reducing the frequency of reverse stings.

**Prevalence of John School Programs**

In addition to San Francisco, we have identified at least 58 U.S. cities and counties that implemented john schools in lieu of, or in addition to, criminal penalties. Fifty have programs that are still operating (Table 7.3), and 11 sites have had john schools that were discontinued (Chicago, IL, Dallas, TX, Dover, DE, Hillsborough County, FL, King County, WA, Madison, WI, Pinellas County, FL, Portland, OR, Santa Clara, CA, Snohomish County, WA, Tucson, AZ). Forty-five additional sites are known to have considered or are planning a john school program. Of these 45 sites, two are actively planning programs that are scheduled to come online in 2010 (Atlanta, Baltimore). An additional 12 sites have education programs for johns that are restricted to health topics were identified (Chicago, IL, Covington, KY, Fitchburg, MA, Forsyth County, NC, Ft. Lauderdale, FL, Guilford County, NC, Hollywood, CA, New York, NY, Pasadena, CA, Seattle, WA, Ventura, CA, Virginia35). New john school programs have come online at a remarkably steady rate. On average, about four new programs have begun each year from 1997 to 2009.

35 Virginia state law requires HIV counseling when arrested for soliciting prostitution.
Table 7.3: U.S. Sites with Current John School Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>City, State</th>
<th></th>
<th>City, State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Aurora, IL</td>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Nashville, TN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Brooklyn, NY</td>
<td>27.</td>
<td>New Hanover County, NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Charlotte, NC</td>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Orange County, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Phoenix, AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Cincinnati, OH</td>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Pierce County, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Columbus, OH</td>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Pittsburgh, PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Dallas, TX</td>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Prairie Village, KS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Denver, CO</td>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Salt Lake City, UT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Erie County, NY</td>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Salt Lake County, UT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Fife, WA</td>
<td>37.</td>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Fresno, CA</td>
<td>38.</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Grand Rapids, MI</td>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Santa Monica, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Hamilton County, OH</td>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Seattle, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Hartford, CT</td>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Tacoma, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Indianapolis, IN</td>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Tampa, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Johnson County, MO</td>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Topeka, KS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Kansas City, KS</td>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Waco, TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Kansas City, MO</td>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Lakewood, WA</td>
<td>46.</td>
<td>West Palm Beach, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Las Vegas, NV</td>
<td>47.</td>
<td>Winston-Salem, NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td>49.</td>
<td>Wyandotte County, KS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Minneapolis, MN</td>
<td>50.</td>
<td>Ypsilanti, MI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While there are 50 cities and counties that are served by john schools, there are 40 separate programs, since some serve multiple communities. The Cincinnati john school serves the city of Cincinnati and Hamilton County. Kansas City’s program receives men from Kansas City, KS, Kansas City, MO, Lenexa, Prairie Village, Johnson County and Wyandotte County. Salt Lake City serves both the city and county, and the john school in Tacoma serves that city plus Lakewood, Fife, and Pierce County.

Over time, some cities have had more than one program:

- **Chicago** has had two john schools: one was operated by Genesis House and Chicago Coalition for the Homeless, and was disbanded in 2005. The second is still operating, and has been operated by Amend and the Chicago Police Department since 2005.

- The Adult Probation Community Resources Directory and the website of the Nebraska Department of Correctional Services lists a Wellspring program in **Omaha** that provides “therapy … for men who solicit sex.” The “Men’s Own Responsibility, Recovery, and Education (MORRE) Program operated by Wellsprings in Omaha is described by Hughes (2004). We have not confirmed whether either program still operates.
• **Portland** has had two programs: (1) Sexual Exploitation Education Project (SEEP), operated in 1995-1997 by Council for Prostitution Alternatives through an informal agreement with Multnomah County District Attorney and the District Court, and (2) the Portland Prostitution Offender Program (PPOP), operated in 2003-2005 by the Lola Greene Baldwin Foundation in conjunction with the Multnomah County Community and Circuit Courts. Both programs were unsustainable primarily due to charging fees too low ($62) to support the program. Portland and Multnomah County are currently planning a third john school, to be modeled more closely after San Francisco’s FOPP.

• **Seattle** has had two programs: (1) the Men Against Risk Program, operated from 2006-2008 by the Street Outreach Services, the City Attorney, and Seattle’s municipal courts, and (2) Johns School, operated since 2009 by the Seattle Public Health Department, Police Department, and the City Attorney’s Office.

• **St. Paul** has two programs: The Restorative Justice Program Prostitution Patrons, operated since 1988 by Project Pathfinder Inc., and the Offenders Prostitution Program, operated by Breaking Free since 1999. The latter program was modeled after the FOPP, while the former program pre-dates the FOPP.

• **Tampa** has had a program since 2001, but since 2006 has had few participants due to police shifting focus away from prostitution. A similar situation occurred in **Buffalo** from 2004 to the present.

• **Tucson** has had two programs: (1) the STD Program (Safety Through Deterrence), operated in 2004 by the Tucson Police Department, and (2) Odyssey, operated since January 2007 by the Tucson’s District Attorneys and Police Department, Southwest Intervention Services, and Cactus Counseling.

Staff at nearly all of the john school programs we have identified said that they used the FOPP as a model, but when we examined these programs’ major features, no other program was found to be structured like the FOPP along all basic dimensions. For example, most of the other programs collect just enough fee revenue to support the john school classes, and are not designed to generate fees for survivor programs. The FOPP staff (particularly from SAGE) regards the “restorative justice” component as one of the most crucial elements of their program, and believes that it is a serious shortcoming to omit that feature.

**The TVPA - 2005 and John Schools**

Federal support would allow current programs to expand and other sites to consider implementing new john schools. The 2005 reauthorization of the Trafficking Victim Protection Act (HR-972; hereafter, TVPA-2005) provides support for demand reduction programs generally and particularly emphasizes john schools. Sec 104 (b)(1)(A) calls for enhancements of U.S. efforts to combat trafficking via “measures to reduce the demand for commercial sex acts.” Sec 204 (a)(1) addresses the establishment of a grant program for law enforcement: “The Attorney General may make grants to States and local law enforcement agencies to establish, develop, expand, or strengthen programs… (C) educat(ing) persons charged with, or convicted of, purchasing or attempting to purchase commercial sex acts.” While the TVPA-2005 provides for Federal support for john schools, Congress has not appropriated funds for the grant program as of July, 2010. The programs within the “End Demand” provisions of the TVPA-2005 were authorized for $25 million per year. Failure to appropriate this provision has resulted, so far, in the absence of $125 million in authorized
program funds that could have been put to use in the field. If funds were appropriated, it would add momentum to the nationwide, “grass-roots” growth of local demand reduction efforts such as john schools.

Table 7.4: U.S. Sites with Current John School Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Started</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Grand Rapids, MI</td>
<td>The John Group</td>
<td>Probation, Health, NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>St. Paul, MN</td>
<td>Project Pathfinder</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Everett, WA</td>
<td></td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>First Offender Prostitution Program</td>
<td>PD, DA, NGOs, Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portland, OR</td>
<td>Sexual Exploitation Education Project</td>
<td>DA, District Court, NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Nashville, TN</td>
<td>Johns School</td>
<td>PD, DA, NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Buffalo, NY</td>
<td>The John School</td>
<td>DA, NGOs, Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Las Vegas, NV</td>
<td>First Offender Prostitution Program</td>
<td>PD, DA, City Attorney, Health, Courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minneapolis, MN</td>
<td>Midtown Community Restorative Justice</td>
<td>NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phoenix, AZ</td>
<td>Offender Program for Persons Soliciting</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pittsburg, PA</td>
<td>John School</td>
<td>PD, DA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Fresno, CA</td>
<td>First Offender Program</td>
<td>City Attorney, DA, PD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Denver, CO</td>
<td>Diversion Program</td>
<td>NGO, City Attorney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indianapolis, IN</td>
<td>The Red Zone Program</td>
<td>DA, NGOs, Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salt Lake City, UT</td>
<td>Johns Offender Program</td>
<td>Criminal Justice Services, DA, NGO, PD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Portland, OR</td>
<td>Sexual Exploitation Education Project</td>
<td>DA, PD, NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minneapolis, MN</td>
<td>Midtown Community Restorative Justice</td>
<td>NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phoenix, AZ</td>
<td>Offender Program for Persons Soliciting</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. Paul, MN</td>
<td>John School</td>
<td>City Attorney, DA, PD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phoenix, AZ</td>
<td>Offender Program for Persons Soliciting</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portland, OR</td>
<td>Portland Prostitution Offender Program</td>
<td>Courts, NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Norfolk County, VA</td>
<td>John School</td>
<td>Sheriff, PD, City Attorney, Health, NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tampa, FL</td>
<td>Johns Awareness, Diversion, &amp; Education</td>
<td>PD, NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>John School</td>
<td>U.S. Attorney’s Office, PD, CSOSA, Health, NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hillsborough County, FL</td>
<td>Project HOPE</td>
<td>Corrections, NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pinellas County, FL</td>
<td>Project HOPE</td>
<td>Corrections, NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waco, TX</td>
<td>John School</td>
<td>PD, City Attorney, Health, NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orange County, NY</td>
<td>Orange County John School</td>
<td>DA, Health, PD, NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portland, OR</td>
<td>Portland Prostitution Offender Program</td>
<td>Courts, NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Norfolk County, VA</td>
<td>John School</td>
<td>Sheriff, PD, City Attorney, Health, NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tampa, FL</td>
<td>Johns Awareness, Diversion, &amp; Education</td>
<td>PD, NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>John School</td>
<td>U.S. Attorney’s Office, PD, CSOSA, Health, NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hillsborough County, FL</td>
<td>Project HOPE</td>
<td>Corrections, NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pinellas County, FL</td>
<td>Project HOPE</td>
<td>Corrections, NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waco, TX</td>
<td>John School</td>
<td>PD, City Attorney, Health, NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orange County, NY</td>
<td>Orange County John School</td>
<td>DA, Health, PD, NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portland, OR</td>
<td>Portland Prostitution Offender Program</td>
<td>Courts, NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tampa, FL</td>
<td>Johns Awareness, Diversion, &amp; Education</td>
<td>PD, NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Norfolk County, VA</td>
<td>John School</td>
<td>Sheriff, PD, City Attorney, Health, NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tampa, FL</td>
<td>Johns Awareness, Diversion, &amp; Education</td>
<td>PD, NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>John School</td>
<td>U.S. Attorney’s Office, PD, CSOSA, Health, NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hillsborough County, FL</td>
<td>Project HOPE</td>
<td>Corrections, NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pinellas County, FL</td>
<td>Project HOPE</td>
<td>Corrections, NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waco, TX</td>
<td>John School</td>
<td>PD, City Attorney, Health, NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orange County, NY</td>
<td>Orange County John School</td>
<td>DA, Health, PD, NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portland, OR</td>
<td>Portland Prostitution Offender Program</td>
<td>Courts, NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Norfolk County, VA</td>
<td>John School</td>
<td>Sheriff, PD, City Attorney, Health, NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tampa, FL</td>
<td>Johns Awareness, Diversion, &amp; Education</td>
<td>PD, NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>John School</td>
<td>U.S. Attorney’s Office, PD, CSOSA, Health, NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hillsborough County, FL</td>
<td>Project HOPE</td>
<td>Corrections, NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pinellas County, FL</td>
<td>Project HOPE</td>
<td>Corrections, NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waco, TX</td>
<td>John School</td>
<td>PD, City Attorney, Health, NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orange County, NY</td>
<td>Orange County John School</td>
<td>DA, Health, PD, NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portland, OR</td>
<td>Portland Prostitution Offender Program</td>
<td>Courts, NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tampa, FL</td>
<td>Johns Awareness, Diversion, &amp; Education</td>
<td>PD, NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>John School</td>
<td>U.S. Attorney’s Office, PD, CSOSA, Health, NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hillsborough County, FL</td>
<td>Project HOPE</td>
<td>Corrections, NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pinellas County, FL</td>
<td>Project HOPE</td>
<td>Corrections, NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waco, TX</td>
<td>John School</td>
<td>PD, City Attorney, Health, NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orange County, NY</td>
<td>Orange County John School</td>
<td>DA, Health, PD, NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portland, OR</td>
<td>Portland Prostitution Offender Program</td>
<td>Courts, NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tampa, FL</td>
<td>Johns Awareness, Diversion, &amp; Education</td>
<td>PD, NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Norfolk County, VA</td>
<td>John School</td>
<td>Sheriff, PD, City Attorney, Health, NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tampa, FL</td>
<td>Johns Awareness, Diversion, &amp; Education</td>
<td>PD, NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>John School</td>
<td>U.S. Attorney’s Office, PD, CSOSA, Health, NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Norfolk County, VA</td>
<td>John School</td>
<td>Sheriff, PD, City Attorney, Health, NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tampa, FL</td>
<td>Johns Awareness, Diversion, &amp; Education</td>
<td>PD, NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>John School</td>
<td>U.S. Attorney’s Office, PD, CSOSA, Health, NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Norfolk County, VA</td>
<td>John School</td>
<td>Sheriff, PD, City Attorney, Health, NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tampa, FL</td>
<td>Johns Awareness, Diversion, &amp; Education</td>
<td>PD, NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>John School</td>
<td>U.S. Attorney’s Office, PD, CSOSA, Health, NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Norfolk County, VA</td>
<td>John School</td>
<td>Sheriff, PD, City Attorney, Health, NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tampa, FL</td>
<td>Johns Awareness, Diversion, &amp; Education</td>
<td>PD, NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Norfolk County, VA</td>
<td>John School</td>
<td>Sheriff, PD, City Attorney, Health, NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tampa, FL</td>
<td>Johns Awareness, Diversion, &amp; Education</td>
<td>PD, NGO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Date Began</th>
<th>Diversion or Sentence</th>
<th>Fee/Fine</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>$ Supports Survivor Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aurora, IL</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Diversion</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn, NY</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Diversion</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>1 class, 5 hrs.</td>
<td>◆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo, NY</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Diversion</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1 class, 8 hrs.</td>
<td>◆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte, NC</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Diversion</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>5 group sessions, 10 hrs.</td>
<td>◆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Diversion</td>
<td>500**</td>
<td>1 class, 8 hrs.</td>
<td>◆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati, OH</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Either</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1 class, 8 hrs.</td>
<td>◆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus, OH</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Sentence</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>1 class, 8 hrs.</td>
<td>◆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton, OH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurora, IL</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Diversion</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2 sessions, 4 hrs.</td>
<td>20-40 hrs. comm. service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn, NY</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Diversion</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1 class, 8 hrs.</td>
<td>◆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo, NY</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Diversion</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1 class, 8 hrs.</td>
<td>◆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte, NC</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Sentence</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>5 sessions, 10 hours</td>
<td>◆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Either</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 class, 2 hrs.;</td>
<td>10 days community service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati, OH</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Either</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1 class, 8 hrs.</td>
<td>◆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus, OH</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Sentence</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>1 class, 8 hrs.</td>
<td>◆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton, OH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver, CO</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Diversion</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>1 class, 8 hrs.</td>
<td>◆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fife, WA</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Diversion</td>
<td>1,500*</td>
<td>1 class, 8 hrs.; plus 1 day com. service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno, CA</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Diversion</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1 class, 8 hrs.</td>
<td>◆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Rapids, MI</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Sentence</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>1 class, 8 hrs.</td>
<td>◆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartford, CT</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Either</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 class, 2 hrs.;</td>
<td>10 days community service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis, IN</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Diversion</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1 class, 3 hrs.;</td>
<td>5 hrs. comm. service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City, MO</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Diversion</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>1 class, 8 hrs.</td>
<td>◆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood, WA</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Diversion</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>1 class, 8 hrs.</td>
<td>◆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas, NV</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Diversion</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>1 class, 2.5 hrs.</td>
<td>◆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Diversion</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>4 sessions, 6 hrs.; 40 hrs. comm service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison, WI</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Diversion</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>10 weekly sessions, 15 hrs.</td>
<td>◆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis, MN</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Diversion</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1 class, 2.5 hrs.</td>
<td>◆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville, TN</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Diversion</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1 class, 2.5 hrs.</td>
<td>◆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange County, NY</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Either</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1 class, 8 hrs.</td>
<td>◆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Diversion</td>
<td>348*</td>
<td>1 class, 8 hrs.</td>
<td>◆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce County</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Diversion</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>1 class, 8 hrs.</td>
<td>◆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Diversion</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>1 class, 8 hrs.</td>
<td>◆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul (John School)</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Diversion</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>4 sessions, plus 6 hrs. restorative justice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Diversion</td>
<td>1,000**</td>
<td>1 class, 8 hrs.</td>
<td>◆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Diversion</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1 class, 8 hrs.</td>
<td>◆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Diversion</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>1 class, 8 hrs.</td>
<td>◆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Sentence</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1 class, 7 hrs.</td>
<td>◆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacoma</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Diversion</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1 class, 8 hrs.</td>
<td>◆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Diversion</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>6 sessions, 6 hrs.</td>
<td>◆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Sentence</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>1 class, 8 hrs.</td>
<td>◆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Palm Beach</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Diversion</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1 class, 4 hrs.</td>
<td>◆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Either</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1 class, 8 hrs.</td>
<td>◆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ypsilanti</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Sentence</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1 class, 8 hrs.</td>
<td>◆</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Fees are on a sliding scale.

a Added to that fine are auto impound fee of $400 and a community supervision fee of $30/day.

b Added to that John school fee is $117.50 for court costs and a $230 fine.
Common Misconceptions about John schools

1. *All john schools are, and must be, diversion programs, allowing men who buy sex to avoid prosecution.*

The most common criticism of john schools is that they are diversion programs that allow men arrested for attempting to purchase sex to avoid an arrest record and or criminal punishment. While it is true that the model program that most people refer to when they are speaking about john schools (San Francisco’s FOPP) is a diversion program that results in dismissal of charges upon successful completion, the structure of these programs as diversion versus sentencing options is independent of the educational component that is the backbone of the program. In other words, it is mistaken to believe that john schools must be structured as diversion programs.

Attendance in john schools is not at the offender’s option in one-third of U.S. john schools: courts sentence men to participate in the program if they feel it is inappropriate treatment or punishment, and in such systems participation is mandatory, and charges are not dismissed for successfully completing the program. Men are sentenced to participate in nearly one-third (31%) of john schools, and another 17% are structured as either a diversion or sentencing options. Just 52% of the john schools in the United States are structured only as diversion programs.

![Figure 7.5: U.S. John Schools Structured as Diversion Versus Sentencing Options](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>John School Program Structure</th>
<th>Number of John Schools</th>
<th>Percent of John Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diversion</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Either Diversion or Sentence</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For those debating the merits of john schools, it is legitimate to debate whether it is fair or just for men arrested for soliciting sex to have access to a program that allows their cases to be dismissed, and avoid having a conviction on their records. In jurisdictions where men arrested for soliciting sex have the option of diversion programs, but women arrested for prostitution do not have equivalent options, the inequity is manifest. However, it is not logical to oppose all john schools because one disapproves of diversion programs. The educational component of john schools is independent of their being structured as diversion or sentencing options. Those who believe that diversion programs such as the FOPP let men escape with “a slap on the wrist” should argue against having john school participation be voluntary and result in avoiding a conviction. However, those features do not provide a legitimate basis for opposing the john school concept, which is built around classes educating men who have been arrested for buying sex about the harm of such behavior.

2. *John schools accept men arrested for soliciting sex with children.*

Some critics of john school programs argue that it is inappropriate for men who prey upon children to have the option of attending a john school and then have their charges dismissed and escape serious punishment.
No rational person would disagree that this would be inappropriate - but the premise has no basis in fact. John schools do not accept men arrested for soliciting sex with children.

None of the publicly available information about john schools suggests that any of these programs are designed for men arrested for soliciting sex from minors. All of the eligibility criteria we have seen exclude men with sex offenses in their criminal history, and stipulate the range of offenses for those who are targeted. In California, for example, the john school programs admit men arrested for penal codes 647.b (soliciting sex) and 653.22 (loitering with intent to solicit sex), both misdemeanors.

The FOPP in San Francisco is the largest john school in the country and has served as the model for nearly all of the 50 john schools that have been launched in the U.S. since 1995. The eligibility criteria for the FOPP exclude anyone with a prior violent offense, sex offense, or domestic violence offenses, and all of the 7,500+ program participants were arrested during police operations using adults as decoys. One can safely say that and none of the participants was attempting to buy sex from a child when they were arrested, nor would they be allowed to participate in the program if they had such offenses in their criminal history. None of the other john school programs in the United States is known to operate differently.

The pathway into john schools begins with arrest. Virtually all of the men who attend john schools in the United States are arrested for soliciting sex from a police decoy during reverse sting operations. All of the police decoys are adults, and none of them present themselves as minors. On occasions when reverse stings are web based, the bogus ads lead to men appearing at prearranged locations where an adult police officer serves as the decoy. It is true that police will conduct reverse stings specifically to find men who sexually exploit children, such as the large-scale operations coordinated by the federal Operation Lost Innocence. However, none of the men arrested for attempting to buy sex from children are eligible for any of the john schools in the United States.

We have no knowledge of a single case of a john school attendee who was arrested for soliciting sex from a child, but it is possible that there are some exceptions – albeit extremely rare. For example, a few of the john schools in the United States (e.g., Kansas City) accept self referrals. It is possible that some of the men who self-refer have serious offenses in their histories - but even so, such men would not be allowed to escape or reduce their punishment through attending a john school, since their self-referral would mean that they were not sent to the program as a condition of a diversion program.

3. There is no evidence that john schools reduce recidivism.

Some john school critics argue that evidence of the programs impact on reoffending is either absent or inconclusive. There are a few formal evaluations of john schools, but the one methodologically rigorous evaluation found the model program to be effective in reducing reoffending (the other evaluation was inconclusive, but did not have data sufficient to make a determination about impact on recidivism).

At this time, there have been only two formal evaluations estimating the impact of John schools on recidivism rates. The first was a study by Monto and Garcia (2001), who studied a sample of 91 participants in the Sexual Exploitation Education Project (SEEP), a discontinued john school program that operated in Portland, Oregon from 1995 to 1997. The recidivism rates of the SEEP participants were compared to a group of 100 men arrested locally for soliciting sex but who did not attend the program. Monto and Garcia found no significant difference in the recidivism rates of the two groups, but the design does not support any conclusion about the effectiveness or lack of effectiveness of SEEP. A weakness in
the study is that there were only three recidivists in the treatment and comparison group combined. There was simply too little statistical power to detect any program effect. Aside from the sample limitations, the SEEP program did not provide a sound basis on which to assess the efficacy of the john school program model. The Portland program studied by Monto and Garcia was atypical of john schools in the U.S., being a 15-hour, three-day program that was discontinued in 1997 due in part to an excessively low fee ($62) making the program not self-sufficient, and amid complaints that it was little more than an extended ideological monologue rather than an educational program (Franzen, 2003).

Research suggests that arrest is probably productive in reducing recidivism. Educating arrestees is also productive, and produces another reduction in recidivism. Whether john school programs ought to be structured as diversion or sentencing options is another matter, separate from whether education is worthwhile or effective. A model for being both punitive and rehabilitative is the Norfolk john school, which levies a fine of $1,500, and seizes autos, and requires payment of an impound fee of $300 to retrieve autos, and mandates community service, and charges a supervision fee of $40 per day while doing community service, and requires attendance at a john school program. Attendance at the john school does not result in dismissed charges. The program provides both an educational intervention and applies relatively severe criminal sanctions – particularly for an offense classified as a misdemeanor, and far beyond what we have seen in other cities applied to those soliciting prostituted persons.

Brewer and colleagues (2007) used the Monto and Garcia (2003) study’s results to argue that john school programs do not add anything beyond the deterrent effect of arrest. At the time Brewer and colleagues’ research was underway, the prior study of the SEEP program was the only evaluation of a john school’s impact on recidivism, and it is true that Monto and Garcia did not find a program effect. However, given the acknowledged limitations of the small-scale, comparison group study of one atypical, quickly defunct john school program (Monto and Garcia, 2003), it was premature for to conclude that the john school approach was ineffective in lowering recidivism.

4. The deterrent effect of arrest is the real cause of the reduction in recidivism attributed to the San Francisco john school.

One could argue that the arrest process alone – and not the john school program – could teach men how to avoid recapture. However, arrest was a constant across all of the cases in the database used to evaluate the program. Since all of the men have the experience of arrest from 1985 to 2005 (in research jargon, arrest was a constant across all 20 years of data on 80,000 men), something besides arrest must have produced the post-1995 drop in recidivism rates in San Francisco.

Second, the drop in recidivism could be the result of FOPP graduates taking their commercial sex activity elsewhere. This is unlikely to explain more than a small portion of the observed effect. Our database allows us to capture rearrest anywhere within the state of California, and can therefore measure recidivism displaced outside of San Francisco, except that pushed out of state. In addition, one must ask whether the FOPP would produce greater crime displacement than would occur without the program. The FOPP is a voluntary program that allows offenders to have the charges against them dismissed. The participants must see the program as less punitive than tradition adjudication, or they would not choose that option. If so, it is reasonable to ask why the less punitive FOPP would be more likely to displace crime than the more punitive traditional sanctions. A possibility is that the class informs men of the increasingly harsh sanctions they will face for subsequent offenses, and that those men who are either ineligible for the FOPP or who
decline the option are not provided with the same information about the more severe consequences of reoffending.

Third, the FOPP may motivate participants to stop pursuing commercial sex on the streets and to use escorts or solicit prostitutes in brothels or via the web. This displacement indoors or online is a plausible explanation and may account for some of the FOPP’s effect. Since the SFPD conducts reverse stings almost exclusively as street operations, men who solicit sex online have almost no chance of being arrested in San Francisco. But again, there is no reason to expect that the FOPP would cause crime to be displaced online, beyond whatever displacement may be produced by arrest alone. Since John school presenters tell participants that police monitor prostitution transacted over the web, and this message is not conveyed to men adjudicated normally, we would expect the opposite effect: participants of the FOPP should be less likely than others to shift their activity online.

5. John schools are costly.

One of the recurring criticisms of John schools are that they are costly, and divert scarce resources away from pursuing more serious crime. There is little empirical support for any part of such criticisms. First, John school programs are not costly, and the modest resources that are necessary to support them are normally fully supported by fees or fines that are paid by arrestees. A few of the John school programs that charge smaller fees do not fully support themselves, but still cover most of their costs.

Most of the John schools in the U.S. are one-day programs from 4 to 8 hours in length. Most of the one-day programs meet four to six times per year, and some a few as once per year. Most of the presenters who are not public servants are paid modest stipends of $50-$200 per day, and many come and present as volunteers. There are usually one or two people from the Police Department or prosecutors office who stay for the entire session, and sometimes other public servants (e.g., from a public health department) come for one hour or so to make brief presentations. We have not found any John school program to cost more than $3,500 per class to conduct; and single classes have been found to yield over $40,000 in revenue.

There is little substance to fiscal criticisms of programs with low annual costs that typically cover all of those costs through participant fees or fines, and can generate additional net revenue used to subsidize police enforcement operations and survivor support programs. The typical John school does not cost taxpayers anything, making them one of the most cost effective offender interventions.

6. John schools are designed to shame.

John schools have been portrayed as being shame-based, or built around the intent to humiliate or publicly berate men who buy sex. Whether this is true depends upon the John school program, the separate presentations within the program, and what is meant by “shaming.” If one defines shame as the personal feeling of shame about one’s own behavior, then the programs may promote shame. All of the John schools we have observed work hard to convey the message that buying sex is harmful, and that the men – knowingly or otherwise - contribute to a vast array of social ills with their behavior. We have observed individual presenters and community impact panels in John schools in Phoenix, San Diego, San Francisco, Indianapolis, and Worcester (MA) who were confrontational and could rightly be described as intending to humiliate or embarrass the men, or make them feel ashamed of themselves. However, those sessions are atypical, and if one assumes that the arrestees’ behavior is harmful, there is little reason to avoid pointing out the harm in the behavior. Shame in response to learning that one's behavior harms others is actually a prosocial response, and can motivate change.
If one defines shame as public censure, or social stigma, then most John schools work in the opposite direction. Since slightly over have of john schools are either exclusively diversion programs, or can be either diversion or sentencing options, diversion from normal prosecution helped the men to avoid being publicly shamed. Diverse programs allow demand to avoid a conviction for the offense, making it easier to escape having one’s employer, family, or friends learn about the arrest. However, about one-third of the john schools in the United States are structured as conditions of sentences where participation is not optional, and does not result avoiding a conviction. When sentenced to a john school, the program has neither more nor less of an impact on public shame than most other sentencing options.

Key Recommendations Regarding Anti-Demand Tactics

1. **Support law enforcement.** Aside from proactive education, most of the direct interventions with commercial sex buyers are dependent upon law enforcement. We have identified at least 10 different types of anti-demand efforts engaged in by police: street-level reverse stings; web-based reverse stings; print media reverse stings; publicizing identities of arrestees; neighborhood collaborations, such as tip lines and citizen patrols used to provide intelligence about sex buyers to police; auto seizure; community service programs; geographic restraining orders; letters sent to arrestees’ homes; john school programs; and driver’s license suspensions. Evidence shows two approaches to work: arresting, and educating, known johns (Poland et. al., 2009; Shively et al., 2008; Weisburd et al., 2006). Others are likely to be effective if directly targeted and properly executed (education programs and social marketing campaigns). The effectiveness of other approaches is still untested, and we do not know whether, why, or under what conditions most approaches are more versus less successful. Many tactics are either promising but untired (educating school-age boys), or are unevaluated and of indeterminate value (shaming, auto seizure).

There are a number of ways in which the National Campaign can and should provide support for this indispensable element in combating demand. In our national assessment and the landscape analysis we identified a number of needs. Among the most critical is practical, operational information about how to conduct demand reduction interventions, including research, peer support, and technical assistance. The National Campaign could support local law enforcement in their efforts to combat demand by facilitating the assembly and delivery of information to practitioners. We discuss a number of tactics for providing this and other support later in the report.

2. **Support those collaborating with educators and police.** In recent decades it has been established that public health and public safety interventions are less productive when operating in isolation. The more effective model is collaborative, where police, public health, social service, community groups, and businesses contribute to proactive problem solving and system improvement interventions (e.g., Butler et al., 2002; Carter, 2006; Smithey et al., 2002). Law enforcement efforts show the best results when they are part of comprehensive systems to solve particular problems. There are examples of effective collaborations working to combat demand that include partnerships among public health, law enforcement, community groups, businesses, and NGOs (e.g., National City Police Department, 1997; Shively et al., 2008; Tucson Police Department, 1997).
The economic downturn has hit many collaborators hard. Law enforcement tends to be one of the last pieces of the public service infrastructure to experience severe budget cuts, while social services, education, and nonprofits often are decimated during economic hardship. While the National Campaign is unlikely to prioritize grantmaking as one of its primary contributions, there other ways that it could support organizations critical to effective local action. For example, the Campaign could centrally develop materials and make them available locally to allow collaborators to stretch their own resources. The Campaign could also provide assistance in shifting public opinion and generating the political will for local governments and businesses to prioritize and devote resources to their anti-demand efforts. Other possibilities include providing grant writing assistance, and providing some grant support to exemplary programs or to a limited number of new demonstration projects.

3. **Provide technical assistance for local initiatives.** Social marketing is designed to draw attention, but one of the potential pitfalls is that once people start paying attention, they will want to know what tangible things should be done. This is where an over reliance or exclusive focus on social marketing research reveals itself as ineffective unless it is a complementary piece of more comprehensive action. Awareness alone does not create change; awareness must lead to action, and action must be well thought out and properly directed and executed if it is to produce results. For the Campaign to be sustainable and maintain the long-term support of a broad coalition that includes front-line, grassroots practitioners out in communities who are arresting offenders and preventing crime, the first set of National Campaign activities should include a plan for helping them.

Using the criteria to establish priorities, we recommend that technical assistance be one of the first initiatives aimed at supporting practitioners. The benefit of this is that there is broad support and consensus about the need for it. Technical assistance can be inexpensive and can be mobilized quickly, and it can provide an impact by tangibly helping local programs, which would help to create a positive “buzz” about the Campaign at the grassroots level. The Campaign could also sponsor web-based or in-person conferences that could have additional benefits of garnering media attention. Obviously there is more to technical assistance than websites and conferences, but these options can be launched quickly and without large investments and then presented as victories of the Campaign quickly, cheaply, and with little effort. The development of the technical assistance component could happen concurrently with the development of the social marketing campaign, but would not be publicized or pushed forward as the leading initiative of the Campaign. It would be intended to support the foundation of the field, which is comprised of practitioners who do the heavy lifting in the fight against sexual exploitation.
Chapter 8: Social Marketing

The single most important policy lever is the will of policymakers’ constituents. Key constituencies include the public—broadly defined—and any number of identifiable segments of the population. Depending upon the jurisdiction, it may be important to target faith-based groups; community leaders; heads of professional associations; affinity groups, associations, or unions; and businesses, business sectors, or business associations. In generating public support and galvanizing political will, one of the most important allies is the media: cultivating relationships with reporters and editors can be indispensable in moving public opinion and motivating policymakers to take action against sexual exploitation.

To promote public awareness and commitment to action attacking the causes of sexual slavery, the National Campaign will consider conducting social marketing campaigns. While social marketing is only one of many ways to shifting public opinion and use that to generate the political will to take effective action, it is an important tool.

We do not go into detail about social marketing in this report. Abt Associates and members of the coalition have experience developing and implementing social marketing campaigns, and the successful approach features focusing first on content issues, then enlisting the help of public relations or marketing firms once it is clear what one wishes to accomplish through social marketing. In social marketing, content expertise is critical in (a) diagnosing needs, (b) formulating objectives, (c) identifying target audiences, and (d) determining what each audience needs to hear in order to take productive action. Social marketing expertise is critical in determining how to shape messages so that they resonate with target audiences, and in determining how best to deliver or disseminate these messages.

Therefore, in this report we have devoted most of our energy to discussing issues of strategy and providing content information on issues about which information is harder to obtain or interpret – such as local program and practices. If the National Campaign leaders decide to invest in social marketing campaigns, an efficient and effective approach will be to have the campaign’s content experts identify goals and objectives that are best pursued through social marketing, and identify target audiences and their information needs. The campaigns leaders could then issue a solicitation for proposals from social marketing firms. As Hunt Alternatives Fund learned during the early phases of the development of the national action plan, experienced social marketing firms responding to a solicitation can quickly produce an array of messages and strategies, without cost to the Campaign.

Overview

Social marketing is the application of proven concepts and techniques drawn from the commercial sector to promote changes in diverse socially beneficial ideas, attitudes, and behaviors (Kotler & Andreasen, 1996). While social marketing is not new, beginning formally as an academic discipline in the 1970s, only recently has enough evidence been amassed to determine its effectiveness in promoting social change. The impact and cost-effectiveness of social marketing must be considered in order to determine its optimal role in the National Campaign.
A 40 year record of evaluations of social marketing campaigns finds that large-scale campaigns using traditional media conveyance are typically very costly and, if not done properly, produce little or no effect on targeted behaviors (e.g., Hornik, 2002; Noar, 2006; Rice & Atkins, 2001; Wechler et al., 2003). For example, a social marketing campaign designed to prevent syphilis among men who have sex with men found that although the campaign reached its target audiences and there was success in raising awareness, risky sexual practices and drug use did not change, nor did other potentially beneficial behaviors such as clinic visits or testing for infection (Darrow & Biersteker, 2008). Meta-analyses of evaluations find that even the better social marketing campaigns produce an effect size of about 7% to 10% on the targeted behavior. These campaigns are resource intensive and heavy investment in them can be risky, since the can have unattractive cost/benefit ratios.

Nevertheless, social marketing is capable of reaching a large number of people simultaneous with a uniform message, and can therefore potentially have an effect in engendering social change (Evans, 2008; Grier and Bryant, 2005; Noar 2006). Social marketing can help move forward all of the other kinds of initiatives—the “boots on the ground” work of public health professionals, police, social service providers as well as legislative efforts and campaigns—to convince agencies to prioritize this issue. It can "knit together" the numerous other elements necessary for a truly comprehensive campaign. As a result, there should be a role for social marketing in the national campaign, particularly if varied and innovative techniques of disseminating messages are used creatively to increase cost-effectiveness. Evans (2008) states that successful social marketing is not only a means of producing behavior change, but also motivates policy change and new legislation.

**Principals of Successful Social Marketing**

As mentioned above, in order to produce results, social marketing campaigns (like any endeavor) must be well-executed. Key principles of effectiveness have been derived from comparisons of more-versus-less effective social marketing campaigns. Among the recommendations derived from these principles are:

- **Conduct formative research** with the target audience to clearly understand the behavior and the problem area; pretest messages with target audience to be sure they are both appropriate and effective. Types of formative research include focus groups and qualitative interviews.

- **Segment the audience** into meaningful subgroups based on important characteristics such as demographic variables (e.g., gender, race, age group, socioeconomic status, and language), risk characteristics, experience with the behavior, personality characteristics (e.g., sensation seeking), and so forth.

- **Use theory** to provide a conceptual foundation to the campaign; theory will suggest important determinants around which to develop messages, and will help ensure that campaign messages guide individuals through the process of attitude and/or behavior change. Examples of useful theoretical underpinnings include:
• Use a **message design approach** that is *targeted* and likely to be effective with each audience segment; develop novel and creative messages; design messages that will spark interpersonal discussions and may persuade individuals important to the target audience (e.g., influencers).

• Place messages in **channels** widely viewed by the target audience; *strategically position campaign messages* within the selected channels. Channels might include:

  o Televised media including short films, public service announcements, press coverage, and other spots
  o Radio and other audio spots
  o Print media (e.g., newspapers, magazines)
  o Community-based activities including mobilization, community events, workshops, peer education, and public relations activities
  o Posters and/or leaflets
  o Billboards and/or bus signs
  o Toll-free hotlines
  o Internet websites
  o School-based components
  o Work-site programs, take-home audio tapes, direct mail coupons, cookbooks and recipe cards, merchandise such as t-shirts, hats, mugs, dog tags, temporary tattoos, stickers, inserts in CDs

• Couple campaign messages with **policy changes** to encourage behavior change (e.g., law enforcement for seat belt use and cigarette tax increases) or with **materials** that can help foster behavior change (e.g., condom packets, sexually transmitted disease test kits).

• **Conduct process evaluation** including monitoring and collecting of data on implementation of campaign activities; ensure high message exposure among members of the target audience, including both reach and frequency.

• Use a **sensitive outcome evaluation design** that reduces threats to internal validity and permits firm causal conclusions about the campaign’s influence on attitudes and behaviors to be made.
Very similar to the key principles of effective campaigns as found by Noar 2006 in his comprehensive literature review is the U.S. National Cancer Institute’s framework for social marketing, the “Social Marketing Wheel.” NCI presents these principles as a set of six consecutive steps, which build on each other:

1. Plan and develop strategy using behavioral theory;
2. Select communication channels and materials based on behavior change objectives and knowledge of the target audience (e.g., using extant data on consumer health status or behavior);
3. Develop and pretest materials, typically using qualitative methods (e.g., focus group testing of potential health messages);
4. Implement the communication program or “campaign” (e.g., a mass media campaign, or a planned program of one-on-one communication about preventive behavior by a health care practitioner);
5. Assess effectiveness in terms of audience exposure, awareness, reactions to messages and behavioral outcomes (e.g., evaluation research on the extent of improvements in diet or continued cessation of smoking); and
6. Refine the materials for future communications.

As presented in the figure below, the sixth step feeds back into the first in what is a continuous process of planning, implementation, and improvement.

Figure 8.1. Social Marketing Wheel

Knowing what the effective principles of social marketing are begs the question of who should take the lead in ensuring that those principles are adhered to and guide the campaign. The steps
should involve true partnerships between content experts and marketing experts. Content expertise should drive any educational effort or social marketing campaign. Target audiences and the message they need to be exposed to can best be identified by content experts. Social marketers can not and should not develop the content of the messages nor determine who the audiences should be. What they offer is expertise in how best to shape the messages and how to move them out to the target audiences.

Examples of Successful Social Marketing Campaigns

What follows are examples of social marketing campaigns that have been implemented while adhering to effectiveness principles, and had the campaigns’ approaches validated by evaluations.

A. “Take a Bite Out of Crime”

The “Take a Bite Out of Crime” campaign for the National Crime Prevention Council is considered one of the most successful branding campaigns (Lurigio & Rosenbaum, 1991; O’Keefe. 1985) ever conducted. The campaign, started in October, 1979 and still active today, is focused on enhancing crime prevention behaviors, i.e., self-protective behaviors as well as burglary protection for oneself and for others, through neighborhood cooperation and through the enhancement of prevention programs at local, state and national levels (O’Keefe, 1985).

The campaign’s effectiveness (measured in terms of coverage or market penetration as well as impact on behavior) can be linked to the implementation of a variety of key social marketing principles (Lurigio & Rosenbaum, 1991; O’Keefe. 1985). First, in addition to targeting children and teenagers, those “prone” to crime and less “prevention competent”, the campaign also targeted messaging to interpersonal influencers of child and teen behavior: parents, community members, schools, and law enforcement. The campaign increased cooperative efforts among neighbors, community groups, and police, showing the police as a community resource and as allies in the fight against crime.

In order for the campaign to be accessible to but taken seriously by this variety of audiences, the messaging adapted a non-intimidating but sober tone. Positive approaches were also stressed to minimize negative feelings on prevention. A mascot character, McGruff, was developed and portrayed as kind yet stern, approachable yet authoritative. The character was well received by audiences (57% reported liking him) and was very recognizable and familiar in appearance and voice. The “Take a Bite Out of Crime” phrase linked McGruff’s persona directly to the campaign’s objectives while simultaneously making it catchy and easily remembered.

The messaging was placed in multi-modal communication channels –most prominently PSAs, radio spots, billboards, posters, and car cards—which resulted in a highly visible campaign. Sixty-three percent of surveyed respondents stated they had recently seen or heard the ads, and over one-third responded they had seen or heard the ads ten or more times.

Coupled with these media communication channels, the campaign provided a wide range of user-friendly resources for parents and their children including games, toys, interactive websites, CD’s, and clothing as well as community elements such as “McGruff Houses” and “McGruff
Trucks”, easily recognizable safe havens for children in immediate danger (http://policechiefmagazine.org). These resources helped to make the campaign memorable and also assisted behavior change in crime protection for individuals and communities by spurring dialogue and facilitating the practice and actual implementation of preventative behaviors.

The campaign also included an outcome evaluation component, which had the following results:

1. Due to McGruff’s PSAs, one-fourth of those exposed had taken crime preventative actions.
2. Twenty-two percent of respondents had learned something new and 46% were reminded of something the campaign had previously taught them.
3. More than 50% of respondents stated as a result of the ads they became more confident about protecting themselves/more aware of crime and also viewed citizen groups as effective.

The campaign was developed through a partnership of content experts and social marketing experts, which independent evaluations have cited as a key factor in its success. The campaign appeared to “[transcend] many of the audience-bound constraints that seem to inhibit the wider dissemination of other crime prevention information campaign efforts” (O’Keefe, 1985).

B. “Stop the Sores”

The “Stop the Sores” campaign in Los Angeles is another example of a well-designed and well-implemented social marketing campaign. While there could have been many objectives, formative research encouraged campaign initiators to focus on one behavior, testing for syphilis rather than prevention of syphilis. Many public health problems are too complex to solve with a singular intervention; targeting a specific behavior makes the campaign more focused and manageable. This message was then targeted to a specific population of gay men to whom it was particularly pertinent. The message was designed to have a light-hearted tone to contrast the seriousness of HIV campaigns and thus prevent the fatiguing of the gay community with a litany of safe sex directives. In addition, the message itself was delivered through “cartoonish” characters on “The Daily Show,” a website, and a communication channel, which were widely accessible to the target audience. In fact, website traffic increased by 1300%. The unique delivery of the message also attracted media attention, which increased the reach and frequency with which the message was heard. In addition to heavily branding the campaign so that the message was recognizable and memorable, materials that helped facilitate the behavior change were made readily available. These included health information—where and how to get tested and how much it would cost—as well as the actual provision of both after hours testing and mobile testing from a van. The campaign incorporated process evaluation by continually gathering feedback on the campaign’s implementation through focus groups and making applicable changes on a yearly basis. This type of flexibility was essential to keep the message fresh and sustainable (Plant et al., 2010). As a result of this well-designed campaign, gay men exposed to “Stop the Sores” were two times as likely to get tested as gay men who were not exposed to the campaign (Plant et al., 2010).

C. “Click It or Ticket”

Since it is so frequently mentioned as an example to follow by coalition members, we will discuss the “Click It or Ticket” social marketing campaign. The designers of “Click It or Ticket”
recognized that unbelted drivers were already well aware of the risks involved in not wearing seat belts and still chose not to wear them. The campaign approached the intervention from a strictly legal or position. The catchy phrase and highly visible law enforcement presence and heavy fines have shown increased seat belt usage (65% to 84% in North Carolina) and lowered fatalities (14% reduction in North Carolina) and lowered economic costs ($125 million in health-care savings and $33 million in insurance premiums) (http://www.social-marketing.org/success/cs-clickit.html). This successful coupling of a campaign message with policy change is consistent with evidence based practiced identified through meta-analyses, which found social marketing campaigns to have the strongest effects when tied to law enforcement (Snyder and Hamilton 2002). As described in the introduction, social marketing campaigns produce an effect size of about 9% on target behavior; this effect size was shown to decrease to 5% when the law enforcement aspect was removed.

While the campaign is successful, there are limitations to its applicability to the National Campaign. Equating a campaign to combat demand for commercial sex with social marketing campaigns to promote seatbelt use is inappropriate and likely to be misleading if the seatbelt campaign is used as a model. Compared to combating the demand driving sex trafficking, promoting seatbelt use is an exceedingly simple challenge. Failure to use seatbelts puts people’s own health at risk. With seatbelt use campaigns, there were no opponents saying, "unrestrained driving is the world’s oldest profession, it is hardwired for people to do this, and it can never be changed." Seatbelt use involves a person in a car deciding to wear it or not, to protect their own safety or not. There is incontrovertible evidence of harm (and it is straightforward, physical harm to self – face versus windshield), easily understood.

Prostitution involves another person, not a seatbelt, and many of the people selling sex claim to do it voluntarily—some even arguing that it is empowering, a feminist act demonstrating personal freedom and control over what one does with one’s body. Representatives from HHS, USAID, and health care delivery systems around the world have argued that in impoverished areas, commercial sex is a legitimate survival strategy for women, girls, and mothers, and that reducing sex markets will literally kill people relying upon them to survive. Many pursue a “harm reduction” model that assumes that commercial sex can and should continue, so the goal is to make it safer through condom use, health screenings, and other means. As we’ve argued in this report, we would advocate other solutions, but such voices cannot be ignored and they remain a complicating factor in mobilizing support to combat demand, especially since public opposition to commercial sex is relatively weak and a substantial proportion see commercial sex as a harmless vice. This “pushback” from “sex-work” advocates and their potential to influence public opinion against an anti-demand effort cannot be ignored when considering how to form campaigns intended to produce a paradigm shift in how culture perceives and responds to commercial sex. There is no analogous opposition to seatbelt use, other than a simple libertarian argument for being free to place oneself at risk which does not and cannot refute that the risk of harm exists.

A more relevant comparison is the fight to change how people responded to date rape, where the willingness of the victim was directly questioned, and all the specious but prevalent arguments about sex and rape as male imperatives came into play. Other more relevant comparisons are to condom use as an HIV prevention measure, family violence campaigns, or human rights.
movements to advance the status of women or eliminate racism. There are many relevant comparisons, and models of success for producing social change. The task ahead of the National Campaign is to get people to universally condemn prostitution and sex trafficking, to realize that the source of the problem is male sexual entitlement and cultural acceptance of that misguided sense of entitlement, and to replace ignorance and skepticism with the belief that prostitution is not an intractable problem. These challenges have direct parallels to persuading the general public as well as law enforcement and health care providers to take date rape victims seriously, and to work on the attitudes of the men who are the perpetrators.

D. The VERB

The VERB: It’s What You Do program, launched in 2002 with a $125 million budget (Wong et al., 2004). It is a physical intervention for children ages 9-13 (“tweens”). Planners did extensive background work and heavily researched its intended audience, including identifying potential barriers to effectively delivering and receiving the program’s messages. Carefully considering the audience can not be stressed enough: “…all programming planning decisions must emanate from a consideration of the consumers’ wants and needs” (Grier and Bryant, 2005). Segmentation or specifically targeting part of a population allows efforts to be maximized and interventions to be individually tailored. A national, multicultural program using “mass media” advertising, public relations, guerrilla (i.e., interpersonal) marketing, and partnership efforts with professional sports leagues and athletes” was created. Additionally, VERB had strong partnerships with schools and continued to evolve (use of CELL #8372 interactively locates a nearby park). As a result of the VERB program, there was 34% increase in physical activity sessions for 9-10 year olds (Grier & Bryant 2005).

Implications for the NAP

The portions of the National Action Plan involving social marketing should be formulated with an eye on applying the principals of effectiveness. Content experts should help identify key audiences and determine what these groups need to hear to mobilize action to combat demand among those who exploit women and girls. Social marketing firms can help develop and convey these messages effectively. We also would anticipate that there will be “micro-campaigns” targeting highly specific subpopulations such as lawmakers, judges, public health officials and practitioners, the general public (to combat the belief that commercial sex is a harmless and intractable behavior) as well as the actual and potential johns themselves in a variety of contexts. We anticipate that a large, national social marketing campaign would be useful in knitting together the disparate pieces of a national campaign and in helping to create broad “buy in” and recognition that there is a new social movement to combat demand. Such approaches have been effective in mobilizing change in Atlanta and Chicago and appear to be effective in the United Kingdom.

Social marketing and other initiatives would work synergistically and would be linked together in a cohesive campaign. The campaigns should consider the following:
• **Link the issue to the interests of those whom we seek to influence.** For example, if a key concern of a political coalition or party is a perceived erosion of individual liberty, then sexual exploitation can be framed (accurately) as one of the most egregious violations of individual liberty. If another constituency is concerned about the rights of women or certain ethnic groups, then persuade by emphasizing the fact that sexual exploitation violates the rights of women, girls, and people of certain ethnicities disproportionately.

• **Recruit and support high-profile and effective champions of combating demand.** This would be helpful in coalition building, social marketing, lobbying congress, fundraising, and doing public outreach. Possibilities include prominent lawmakers, celebrities, athletes, and business leaders. There are several effective champions currently in Congress, such as Representatives Chris Smith and Caroline Maloney, but they need additional support to push through appropriations and they need more committed cosponsors. Several celebrities are already involved or interested in combating demand, such as Ashley Judd, Ashton Kutcher, and Demi Moore. Other celebrities are involved in anti-trafficking efforts and could become interested in combating demand, such as Mira Sorvino, Julia Ormond, Ricky Martin, Tony Shaloub, Emma Thompson, and Ron Livingstone. Current corporate leaders include Manpower, Inc. and the Body Shop.

• **Support and utilize survivor leadership.** Survivors have led many of the efforts producing the successes bringing us to where we are today. Their involvement has been and will continue to be critical in shifting public opinion and generating political will to combat sexual exploitation.

• **Marketing to law and policymakers.** Messages can be tailored to reach legislators and public officials, who would establish laws and policies that would allow or require resources to be commended to efforts to combat demand

• **Marketing to practitioners.** Within the parameters of law and policy, practitioners often have discretion to pursue issues they regard as priorities. For example, health educators can choose to include or omit references to the special health consequences associated with sexual exploitation, and police can choose to conduct enforcement operations focusing on sexual exploitation, or to focus those resources on other issues if they regard them as higher priority. Social marketing campaigns could be developed specifically to appeal to practitioners to prioritize and effectively pursue the demand driving sexual exploitation.

Social marketing and other initiatives would work synergistically, and would be linked together in a coordinated campaign. Figure 8.2 illustrates how policy, practice, and public opinion can each be influenced by social marketing efforts, and how they can help create support for interventions working directly to combat demand.
Some social marketing campaigns can be targeted directly to the broad public, with the objective of the public insisting upon serious efforts to eliminate sexual exploitation. First, an educated and motivated public may pressure public officials to pass strong laws and establish and follow sound policies that effectively address demand for commercial sex. Second, the public could appeal to local authorities to commit the resources necessary to combat demand; for example, they could convince the mayor and the chief of police to prioritize combating sexual exploitation. Third, the public can more directly influence demand by failing to tolerate or enable sexual exploitation.
The United States Government has formally stated its position that human trafficking is an egregious human rights violation and a serious threat to individual and collective security at the national and international level. To counter these threats, it has employed a range of policy and legislative tools to combat the trade in human beings.

Federal policy over the past 10 years has been distinctly abolitionist regarding sex trafficking and prostitution. The U.S. Government addressed the crisis of trafficking in persons in the late 1990s when the Clinton Administration promoted an inter-agency working group through the International Crime Control Strategy. This inter-agency vehicle was established to respond to the international crime implications of human trafficking. On March 11, 1998 -- International Women’s Day --President Clinton issued a directive establishing a U.S. Government anti-trafficking strategy to protect and serve victims, prosecute traffickers and prevent human trafficking. The prevention component of the policy directive emphasized the dissemination of information in other countries to increase public awareness of trafficking dangers and established funding for research on trafficking. This directive also promoted prevention efforts which incorporate increased economic opportunities for victims. The hallmark of the U.S. policy protecting victims from modern day slavery was an emphasis on a victim-centered approach, establishing a focus on rescue, rehabilitation and reintegration.

The Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000

A decade ago, The Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (P.L.106-386) was signed into law by President Clinton and is still considered the centerpiece of the U.S. Government’s response to eliminating trafficking in persons. The passage of this federal initiative, commonly referred to as the TPVA, represented years of work which culminated in a profound change in government efforts legally, programmatically, and in policy.

For the first time, a legal definition of severe forms of human trafficking was established:

a. sex trafficking in which a commercial sex act is induced by force, fraud or coercion, or in which the person induced to perform such as an act has not attained 18 years of age; or

b. the recruitment, harboring, transportation, provision, or obtaining of a person for labor or services, through the use of force, fraud or coercion for the purpose of subjection to involuntary servitude, peonage, debt bondage or slavery. This law was considered the first comprehensive reform to protect victims, and address the inadequacy of federal law relating to criminal sanctions.

Specifically, the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000:

36 The Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (P.L.106-386)
• Defined for the first time in U.S. law a specific crime of human trafficking;
• Expanded the crimes and increased the penalties for a number of human trafficking offenses, including involuntary servitude, peonage and slavery;
• Established a federal task force to coordinate all U.S. Government efforts. The Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking would enhance inter-agency procedures to collect data, evaluate the U.S. and other countries’ victims services, protections and prevention efforts; examine the role of the sex tourism industry; facilitate cooperation among countries; consult and advocate with governmental and non-governmental agencies;
• Required a ranking of countries based on standards relating to the protection of victims, prevention strategies and prosecution;
• Provided substantial funding for victim assistance and enforcement;
• Created a new visa program which allowed victims to receive benefits and services;
• Authorized $95 million for two years of funding for victim services and enforcement activities;
• Provided assistance to other countries to draft new laws;
• Provided assistance to other countries to enhance investigations and prosecutions.

In February of 2002, as mandated by Federal law, President George W. Bush established the major President’s Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons. Chaired by the Secretary of State, the task force is composed of members of the President’s cabinet. They are convened to establish and coordinate policies and programs to fight human trafficking in the U.S. and abroad. The mission of the interagency task force is to coordinate activities across the federal government and to monitor the compliance of those agencies with overall U.S. government policies relating to human trafficking. Pursuant to federal law, another policy vehicle was created: the Senior Policy Operating Group on Trafficking in Persons (SPOG). Chaired by the Ambassador for the Department’s Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, the SPOG meets quarterly to address the policy concerns that are formulated by the Interagency Task Force.

Congress reauthorized the Trafficking Victims Protection Act in 2003 (TVPRA 2003) and again in 2005 (TVPRA 2005). Select provisions of the new laws included:
• Expanded victim assistance programs to provide services to U.S. citizens;
• Additional grant programs for state and local law enforcement and victim services;
• A new remedy so that victims may civilly sue their traffickers in federal district court;
• Provisions which refined the criminal law sections of the TVPA 2000

In the TVPRA 2005, Congress passed a provision relating to ending demand, which specified minimum standards for the elimination of trafficking. This includes measures to reduce the demand for commercial sex acts and for participation in international sex tourism; nationals of the country who are deployed abroad as part of a peacekeeping or other similar missions do not engage in or facilitate severe forms of trafficking in persons or exploit victims of such trafficking.37

37 Trafficking Victims Protection Act (TVPRA) 2005
Federal Agency Policies and Programs: Implications For Combating Demand

The primary federal government agencies with mandates to address sex trafficking are the Department of Justice (DOJ), Department of State (DOS), Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and the Department of Defense (DOD).

Within the Department of Justice, the Office of Justice Programs (OJP) provides leadership to federal, state and local justice systems by disseminating knowledge and practices, and by providing research and program grants. Staff of the Office of Justice Programs is working to find solutions to the most pressing human trafficking challenges. OJP provides professionals who are working to eliminate human trafficking with information, training, technical assistance, coordination, innovative strategies and approaches. This umbrella agency within the Justice Department has several bureaus and offices under its domain. The lead agencies in OJP with legal, policy or programmatic mandates involving human trafficking include the Bureau of Justice Assistance, The Office for Victims of Crime, The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, the National Institute of Justice, and the Bureau of Justice Statistics. A brief summary of each bureau’s mandates to combat human trafficking, and whenever relevant, recommendations for working in partnership on demand elimination, are noted below.

The Department of Justice (DOJ)

Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA)

The central focus of the Bureau of Justice Assistance’s efforts to combat human trafficking is the development, monitoring and training of 42 anti-trafficking task forces. As a result of the TVPA and its subsequent reauthorizations, BJA, working in collaboration with OVC, established and funded multi-disciplinary, inter-jurisdictional task forces throughout the United States. Members include local, state and federal law enforcement, prosecutors, victim assistance professionals and other disciplines working to respond to and prevent human trafficking. In addition to supporting victims and prosecuting traffickers, the task forces members developed policies and protocols to harmonize with state and federal laws and policy. Frequently, members of these task forces have joined with government or private coalitions in efforts to end demand. Task forces have implemented reverse-sting operations; referred individuals for John School programs; developed training modules related to ending demand; implemented education programs on gender equity in schools; and developed public awareness campaigns in their communities. In some jurisdictions, task force members are involved with civil suits, pursuing sanctions against those who buy commercial sex and against traffickers and businesses that are complicit in the trafficking trade. In addition to developing task forces, BJA staff monitored a human trafficking policy grant awarded to the Center for Women’s Policy Studies (CWPS). This congressionally mandated earmark authorized the creation of a policy guide for state legislators and a training program for legislative leaders. CWPS staff developed a model anti-trafficking bill and other tools for state policy makers, including model regulatory and policy reforms to combat human trafficking stemming from illicit adoptions, illicit international marriage brokers and sex tourism operators.
Office for Victims of Crime (OVC)

The Office for Victims of Crime administers the Victims of Trafficking Discretionary Grant Programs. OVC’s anti-trafficking efforts include the development and monitoring of these grants and programs providing direct services to trafficking victims. A major mission for OVC is the technical assistance and training of victim service providers and the BJA anti-trafficking task force grantees. The OVC Training and Technical Assistance Center (OVC TTAC), along with other federal agencies, has organized a group of grantees and federal partners to plan training programs and develop training materials. These publications include model protocols, a law enforcement investigator manual and an operations guide for task forces. This program supports the efforts of law enforcement and victim service providers throughout the country in addressing human trafficking.

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP)

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention has developed grant programs and research in the arena of human trafficking and commercial sexual exploitation before the federal mandates of the TVPA. In the mid-1990s, OJJDP provided funding for a review of best practices and resources and a regional training program on preventing commercial sexual exploitation of children (CSEC). The project’s staff conducted a nationwide review and drafted a blueprint for action on best practices. In the last several years, OJJDP funded a new program to prevent commercial sexual exploitation. OJJDP supported the development of “My Life, My Choice,” a curriculum and training program for the education of young girls who are most vulnerable to exploitation. This prevention strategy effectively provides girls and young women with the resistance skills to ignore pimps and traffickers who have carefully identified, selected and groomed their trafficking and exploitation targets. The curriculum also directly addresses demand issues.

OJJDP-funded research entitled “The Pathways Project,” was recently completed by UMass- Lowell. Researchers studied commercial sexual exploitation of girls and the pathways in and out of CSEC. OJJDP in many other ways is a key agency that could contribute to the work of the elimination of demand. OJJDP is the funding source for the Internet Crime Against Children (ICAC). Like the human trafficking and the Innocence Lost Task Forces, ICAC task Forces deal with a substantial level of cases of commercial sexual exploitation of children. Especially because so much of the activity in sex trafficking and commercial exploitation of children is on the internet and sometimes involves child pornography, these police professionals are in a prime position to hear the message about demand, contribute to the discussion, and adopt policies and procedures with their task forces which are akin to the mission of ending demand. This is the longest serving group dealing enforcement of these crimes. The earliest grants when ICAC was just being formed and there were individual ICAC agents and officers, dates back to the early to mid-nineties.

SUGGESTION: Develop a calendar for training conferences and have an anti-demand team attend and present at law enforcement and other conferences.

National Institute of Justice (NIJ)

The research and evaluation agency of the Department of Justice has funded research and evaluations of demand activities.
Most recently, NIJ posted two grant solicitations for Research and Evaluation on Human Trafficking and both have implications for ending demand in the United States. Under this research grant program, NIJ will fund evaluations of programs that operate demand-reduction interventions for sex trafficking and commercial sex acts. In the most recent solicitation, NIJ requested proposals to fund research that describes and estimates the unlawful commercial sex economy in the United States. Over the last several years, NIJ has funded research and evaluation projects to address the knowledge gaps related to trafficking in persons, prostitution and commercial sexual exploitation.

**Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS)**

As a result of the TVPA mandate to collect data on human trafficking, the Bureau of Justice Statistics awarded a grant to Northeastern University and Urban Institute to develop and maintain the National Human Trafficking Database. All federally funded task forces are required to report their case statistics as a condition of funding.

**The Office for Community Oriented Policing (COPS)**

The Regional COPS Office has developed anti-trafficking training materials and conducts regional training sessions for law enforcement.

**Civil Rights, Office of Human Trafficking Prosecution**

In addition to investigating and prosecuting some of the nation’s most complex human trafficking cases, the Office of Human Trafficking Prosecution has provided training and technical assistance on case-investigative methods and prosecution strategies to all the task forces. Along with a number of agencies mentioned above, the Civil Rights Division has been instrumental in providing training on USDOJ policies, procedures and the evolving federal laws on the issues of human trafficking.

**The Office of Violence against Women (OVW)**

The Office of Violence against Women (OVAW) funded the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) to develop training materials on combating human trafficking. The association developed a roll call guide entitled “The Crime of Human Trafficking: A Law Enforcement Guide for Identification and Investigation.”

**SUGGESTION:** The IACP guide and the accompanying roll call video should be updated to include information on the elimination of demand. Best practices in law enforcement investigations, a range of demand strategies and the current state of practice would be useful to include.

The Office for Violence against Women has launched a program called “Engaging Men and Youth Program” which will provide funding for local projects. A solicitation is planned for this program in 2010.

**SUGGESTION:** To begin work with OVW to replicate this program to support engaging men and youth in ending demand.
**The Federal Bureau of Investigation**

The FBI participates operationally in all anti-trafficking task forces and provides training relating to federal law and policy. The FBI also directs the Innocence Lost Task forces which concentrate on arresting pimps, traffickers and those who buy commercial sex. These task forces have developed additional training materials and provide cross training for all federal agencies involved with these task forces. The simultaneous operations throughout the country have resulted in arrests of those involved in solicitation.

**SUGGESTION:** Urge the FBI to include content on end demand investigative strategies, approaches, and case examples in their national training efforts. FBI agents are represented in the Anti-Trafficking Task Forces and the Innocence Lost Task Force, which continues to combat the exploitation of children in prostitution.

The primary agencies with mandates to address human trafficking are the Department of Justice (DOJ), Department of State (DOS), Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), Department of Homeland Security (DHS), Department of Labor (DOL) and the Department of Defense (DOD).

**The Department of State (DOS)**

According to the Assessment of Activities to Combat Trafficking in Persons published in August of 2003, much of the federal government’s prevention effort is executed by the State Department outside the U.S. The DOS has enhanced its efforts to create awareness of end-demand activities and campaigns in others nations. The Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons supports prevention, public awareness campaigns, victim assistance programs and anti-tip programs.

The SPOG has made recommendations for FY2008 to expand their education materials for education and community entities and to expand their media campaign. The SPOG has also reviewed demand reduction activities in all the SPOG agencies and other government efforts, and has produced a brochure on the issue of demand reduction.

**Department of Health and Human Services (HHS)**

Mandated by the TPVA of 2000, HHS is responsible for assistance to victims in rebuilding their lives in the U.S. This is accomplished through a network of service providers. The Anti-Trafficking in Persons program (ATIP) has developed a national public awareness campaign, “Rescue and Restore,” aimed at aiding victims. HHS builds capacity at the regional level through Rescue and Restore Coalitions, which have at the heart of their mission increasing the numbers of identified victims and comprehensive services.

ATIP has developed a training program internally within the department of HHS. A select list of trained agencies includes:

- U.S. Public Health Service Commission Corps
- Centers for Disease Control (CDC)
- Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA)
• Administration of Children, Youth and Families
• Office of Women’s Health
• The National Institute of Health

**SUGGESTION:** Engage the agencies within HHS and urge more training on issues of health and the consequences of buying sex.

**SUGGESTION:** The development of end demand materials for public health venues and emphasizing the health and public health consequences. The Department of State awarded a grant to the Harvard School of Public Health to research the implications of human trafficking and the issue of HIV-AIDS.

**Department of Defense (DOD)**

Under federal law, the Department of Defense has developed a comprehensive program to end the demand for human trafficking, including the following:

- A total prohibition against commercial sex for military personnel;
- Education and training stressing the impact of human trafficking, and disciplinary actions taken against members of the U.S. Armed Forces who engage in such illegal practices;
- The development of materials for use in the training of the armed forces of foreign countries;
- Efforts to ensure that U.S. Government contractors and sub-contractors, and their respective employees, do not engage in trafficking of persons.

In the last several years, the Department of Defense has developed and implemented a DOD-wide awareness training for all personnel on combating human trafficking and commercial sexual exploitation. The demand elimination component of this campaign requires that no service person shall buy commercial sex. This policy and regulation are backed by:

- A strict disciplinary action for all military personnel who breach the regulations, and a variety of sanctions including legal, economic, professional, and other means;
- Accountability standards for monitoring the mandatory training by the chain of command.

A number of factors appear to be helpful in adopting this training effort in all of the service branches, including the legal mandates. However, it appears that DOD has taken this mandate seriously after an undercover investigation was undertaken by a major news network which identified service men frequenting commercial sex trafficking establishments. In the aftermath of this disclosure, codes of conduct, disciplinary practices and attendance at training programs were revised and enforced. In addition to selling this training initiative on moral, ethical, and humanitarian grounds, DOD trainers introduce additional rationales in an effort to change behavior, including education and reinforcement that promotes an understanding that buying sex:

- Undermines the military mission;
- May boost the profits of organized crime;
- Funds other criminal activities;
- Fuels the profits of terrorists;
- Aids and abets the enemy;
- Contributes to decline in the morale of the host country;
• Contributes to the erosion of military families;
• Increases the likelihood of long-term health consequences, including sexually transmitted diseases

Service members are issued “off limits” notices for known commercial sexual exploitation locations, including those masquerading as legitimate businesses. There are also severe limitations on the use of pornography for military personnel. This model program has been replicated by North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).

**SUGGESTION:** The DOD training program needs to be evaluated and the materials reviewed including the training curriculum, codes of conduct, sanctions, and setting limits on the opportunities to engage in the behavior.

**Department Of Education**

The Department has provided information and resources to U.S. school districts and defense schools, and DOE Secretary and Assistant Secretary of the Office of Safe and Drug Free Schools (OSDFS) sits on the SPOG and a representative of DOE is a member of the Interagency Task Force. OSDFS is a member of the Federal Agency Task Force On Missing and Exploited Children and is a new member of the Innocence Lost Working Group.

**SUGGESTION:** Inventory education and school related material.

**Summary Comments and General Recommendations For The Federal Government**

• Congressional Oversight: Congress should hold hearings on what federal agencies have developed and not developed relating demand elimination.

• Department of Justice Resource Guide for State Legislators and Model Provisions for State Anti-Trafficking Laws so not include Model Law provisions relating to eliminating demand. This material needs to be updated and new material should be drafted on demand elimination.

• The Department of Justice was mandated in TPVA reauthorization to develop a new state model law which should include a comprehensive approach to ending demand

• Hold public hearings on Human Trafficking and demand issues

• Continue to urge the State Department to assess the U.S. and other countries on the basis of their demand activities. Rank or grade the U.S. on minimum standards related to demand elimination.

• Review all training curricula developed by U.S. government on trafficking and commercial sexual exploitation. Each federal agency has its own materials. In the enforcement area alone there are well over 12 different training manual/curricula relating to commercial sexual exploitation and human trafficking. Draft a standardized set of material on demand issues. In the future, develop sessions that are customized for each enforcement agency.
• Request a meeting with the SPOG agencies to discuss an overall plan and development of materials for each agency.

• Prompt Congress to appropriate funds for the demand activities authorized in the End Demand provisions of the TVPA-2005 and the Wilberforce Act as noted previously in this report.
This chapter provides a very brief review of some key issues in state law on prostitution and human trafficking, specifically as they relate to penalizing or attempting to deter the buyers of commercial or trafficked sex. It is intended to serve as a primer for those collaborators who work within fields other than criminal justice or law, and to highlight certain issues for those who work in these fields. However, to fully execute an analysis of prostitution and human trafficking law, a separate study should be pursued, conducted by a panel including prosecutors, police, judges, and other legal experts. Law reform regarding prostitution and sex trafficking is an active issue, with bills making substantial changes currently being considered or recently passed in Georgia, Illinois, New York, Vermont, and Washington. If law reform becomes one of the foci of the Campaign, teams from these and other legislative efforts could be assembled to advise about key needs, opportunities, challenges, and effective strategies.

Several steps were taken in the analysis of law pertaining to prostitution, and those laws explicitly addressing demand through special provisions regarding the purchase of commercial sex and human trafficking. We reviewed state prostitution statutes of all 50 states and the District of Columbia, and local ordinances in several cities that address demand (or laws that were role-neutral). In the reviews we examined whether separate codes exist for those buying versus “selling” sex, and we examined minimum and maximum penalties. We also reviewed state human trafficking laws, with a focus on special sex trafficking provisions, and in particular, those addressing buyers of sex from trafficked persons.

We also provide a brief overview of the Swedish prostitution law and discuss its application in the United States. Although the Swedish law is within their national penal code (analogous to our Federal law), we discuss it in our chapter on state law because that is the level of government within which passage of prostitution laws like the Swedish model would most likely occur.

**Overview**

Laws addressing prostitution and sex trafficking receive a great deal of attention among advocates and public officials, and for good reasons. Law is a codification of social norms and values, and provides parameters, mandates, and authority for taking action against proscribed behavior. Examination of law finds that within the United States, sex trafficking is illegal universally via Federal statutes, and in state trafficking laws in all but five states. Well over 99% of all Americans live in jurisdictions with laws against both sex trafficking and prostitution; the only exception is that prostitution is legal in specified areas within 12 rural counties in Nevada.

Our review of the law confirms what we have observed over years of conducting applied research with law enforcement and other practitioners to address commercial sex and trafficking. Laws currently exist throughout the United States (again, except for parts of Nevada), that are sufficient to take effective action to combat demand (e.g., DeStephano, 2007; Farely, 2007). All state penal codes allow for arrest, fines,
and incarceration, sanctions that can be applied to first-time arrestees. In many states, second and third offenses can result in more substantial fines and jail terms, from 60 days up to one year.

While commercial sexual exploitation is proscribed in the law, it is evident to anyone associated with efforts to address prostitution or sex trafficking that there is considerable room for improvement in state and federal law regarding human trafficking sexual slavery, and for state law governing prostitution. Five states don't have any human trafficking laws, those that do enforce them only minimally, and most of the laws have great gaps - particularly regarding special provisions for the buyers of sex from enslaved persons. Only three state human trafficking laws mention or allude to demand.

Currently, U.S. state and local law’s treatment of prostitution and of trafficking is markedly different: Overall, the law is tougher on the crime of trafficking and significantly more sympathetic to - and protective of - those who have been trafficked, as opposed to those who are prostituted. The sharp distinction between these two broad categories of commercial sex is in the law’s historical development around each issue. Trafficking laws are tied to the human rights and modern anti-slavery movements, and labor trafficking is classed alongside trafficking for sexual purposes. Prostitution laws are historically rooted in community morals, “vice crimes”, community disorders, and public health, and often are enforced via charges of “lewdness,” and “indecent exposure.” While laws addressing prostitution often reserve the harshest penalties for third parties that benefit from the prostitution of another person, the people most often punished for prostitution are the prostituted persons themselves, as opposed to third party beneficiaries (pimps) or the patrons purchasing sexual acts.

**Address Demand in State Prostitution Laws**

There are substantial differences in how state laws address the demand side of prostitution, with variability in vocabulary, definitions, and penalties. However, police and prosecutors in all states address demand in some manner; there is no state where a purchaser is certain to go unpunished due to an absence of laws against purchasing sex. Key observations on laws addressing demand include:

- Some states are more explicit than others in specifying the act of purchasing sex (often termed “patronizing” or “soliciting”).
- Some states explicitly mention purchasing as part of their definition of the prohibited act of prostitution.
- Some states have definitions of prostitution that are worded broadly enough that they can be used to address the “purchaser.”
- Some states have none of the above in their law.

**Sentencing of the Prostituted Person**

Generally, the same level of offense is applied to the “patron” (or exploiter) and the prostituted person. Demand is generally met with a misdemeanor penalty, although this penalty is sometimes enhanced to a felony under specific circumstances, such as in the state of Colorado where if the patron is HIV positive the offense is automatically a felony. Colorado statute 18-7-205, “patronizing a prostitute” states:

1) Any person who performs any of the following with a person not his spouse commits patronizing a prostitute:
(a) Engages in an act of sexual intercourse or of deviate sexual conduct with a prostitute; or
(b) Enters or remains in a place of prostitution with intent to engage in an act of sexual intercourse or deviate sexual conduct

Followed by Colorado statute 18-7-205.7, “patronizing a prostitute with knowledge of being infected with acquired immune deficiency syndrome:”

- Any person who performs any of the acts described in section 18-7-205 (1), with any person not his spouse, and if such person has been tested for acquired immune deficiency syndrome pursuant to section 18-7-201.5 or 18-7-205.5 or otherwise, and the results of such test indicate the presence of the human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) which causes acquired immune deficiency syndrome, such person commits patronizing a prostitute with knowledge of being infected with acquired immune deficiency syndrome.
- (2) Patronizing a prostitute with knowledge of being infected with acquired immune deficiency syndrome is a class 6 felony.

It is important to contrast this with trafficking laws, for which the penalty is always a felony. In a few states the penalties are harsher for the patron. For example, in Nebraska the patron’s offense can be escalated to a felony, but the prostituted person will not receive a charge more severe than a misdemeanor. Nebraska’s prostitution laws note that solicitors are “equally” part of the prostitution problem. The Nebraska Prostitution Intervention and Treatment Act finds that:

- Sec. 2. (3): Solicitors of prostitution are equally contributing sexual offenders.
- Sec. 8. (1) Any person who solicits another person not his or her spouse to perform any act of sexual contact or sexual penetration, as those terms are defined in section 28-318, in exchange for money or other thing of value, commits solicitation of prostitution.
- Sec. 8. (2) Any person convicted of violating subsection (1) of this section shall be punished as follows:
  (a) If such person has had no prior convictions, such person shall be guilty of a Class I misdemeanor (compare to prostituted person’s lesser sentence of a Class II misdemeanor) and pay a fine of not less than two hundred fifty dollars.
  (b) If such person has had one or more prior convictions, such person shall be guilty of a Class IV felony and pay a fine of not less than five hundred dollars. (compare to prostituted persons, still only a misdemeanor. Even if such person has had two or more prior convictions, such person shall be guilty of a Class I misdemeanor).

In some rare cases there are sentencing enhancements that apply to the prostituted person or the pimp that do not apply to the patron. The law is written in such a way that the patron seems deliberately excluded from this sentencing enhancement. New Hampshire statute 645:2 Prostitution and Related Offenses is an example of this, the language “involves” represents the pimp and does not apply to the patron:

- II. A person is guilty of a class B felony if such person violates the provisions of subparagraphs (b), (c), (d), or (e) of paragraph I and the violation:
  (a) Involves another person who is under the age of 18; or
  (b) Involved compelling another person by force or intimidation.
In Tennessee statute 39-13-514 there is a stipulation for “aggravated prostitution” when testing HIV positive. This is an enhancement that applies only to the prostituted person.

There are several reasons an enhancement from misdemeanor to felony can be implemented. There are provisions for addressing minors and strict liability. For example, both New Jersey and Ohio have strict liability for engaging in prostitution with a minor; there is no defense for mistaken age and no effective arguments for mitigating culpability. These “patrons” are automatically charged with a felony. As described in New Jersey statute 2C:34-1:

(1) "Prostitution" is sexual activity with another person in exchange for something of economic value, or the offer or acceptance of an offer to engage in sexual activity in exchange for something of economic value.

b. A person commits an offense if:

(1) The actor engages in prostitution;

(7) The actor knowingly engages in prostitution with a person under the age of 18, or if the actor enters into or remains in a house of prostitution for the purpose of engaging in sexual activity with a child under the age of 18, or if the actor solicits or requests a child under the age of 18 to engage in sexual activity. It shall be no defense to a prosecution under this paragraph that the actor mistakenly believed that the child was 18 years of age or older, even if such mistaken belief was reasonable.

Conversely, New York’s current law explicitly preserves defense of mistaken age and many other states do not address the issue. New York offers S 230.07 as a defense for patronizing an underage prostitute:

- In any prosecution for patronizing a prostitute in the first, second or third degrees, it is a defense that the defendant did not have reasonable grounds to believe that the person was less than the age specified.

Other examples of penalty enhancement include:

- HIV/AIDS: In California, Colorado, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and Utah, it is a felony for patronizing when known to be HIV positive.
- In some states (Louisiana and Vermont) incarceration is an option for repeat offenders.
- Vehicle seizure of vehicle used in soliciting/patronizing: Delaware, Rhode Island, and Washington.
- Driver’s license suspension or traffic record notation when motor vehicle is used; California, Minnesota; New Jersey, and Ohio.

**Penalties by State for Prostituted Persons and “Patrons”**

The penalties for soliciting commercial sex vary across the nation and may include a combination of incarceration (in jails and/or prison) and fines. For a first time conviction on a commercial sex charge, the penalties range from a maximum penalty with two years incarceration and/or $500 to $5,000 fine (Iowa) to a minimum of 15 days with no fine (Arizona).
Even though Arizona has the minimum penalties for first-time commercial sex convictions, Arizona also has a system of graduated sanctions for subsequent convictions. For example, the second and third offenses respectively carries a 30 days and 60 days penalty whereas the fourth and consequent offenses carries a sentence of 180 days to one and half years. Several states, including Louisiana, Oklahoma, South Carolina, and Pennsylvania, followed Arizona’s lead and adopted a system of graduated sanctions. Among these such states, Texas has the largest jump in penalties at each subsequent conviction as the follows: first offense—up to 180 days and/or $2,000 fine; second offense—up to one year and/or $4,000 fine; three or more offenses—180 days to two years and/or $10,000.

Among all states (including the District of Columbia), Iowa has highest penalties for first-time convictions of commercial sex customers, which is classified as an aggravated misdemeanor in Iowa, with up to two years incarceration and/or $500 to $5,000 in punitive fines. However, the states of Indiana and Illinois impose the heaviest penalties of any U.S. state for subsequent convictions after the initial conviction. In Illinois, subsequent convictions are classified as a class four felony and carries penalties that range from one to three years and/or $25,000. Similarly, individuals convicted on subsequent commercial sex charges in Indiana may be incarcerated anywhere from six months to three years and/or a $10,000 fine.

Presented below are summaries of federal and state laws on prostitution within the United States.\textsuperscript{38}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Penalty for Prostitutes (Crime Classification)</th>
<th>Penalty for Customers (Crime Classification)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Alabama</td>
<td>Up to 1 yr and/or $6,000 (Class A misdemeanor)</td>
<td>Up to 1 yr and/or $6,000 (Class A misdemeanor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Alaska</td>
<td>Up to 90 days and/or $2,000 (Class B misdemeanor)</td>
<td>Up to 90 days and/or $2,000 (Class B misdemeanor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Arizona</td>
<td>1st offense 15 days, 2nd 30 days, 3rd 60 days, 4+ offenses 180 days-1.5 yrs (First offense class 1 misdemeanor, 4 or more offenses are a class 5 felony)</td>
<td>Up to 30 days and/or $500 (Class 3 misdemeanor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Arkansas</td>
<td>Up to 90 days and/or $500, then up to 1 yr and/or $1,000 (First offense class B misdemeanor, subsequent offense class A misdemeanor)</td>
<td>Up to 90 days and/or $500, then up to 1 yr and/or $1,000 (First offense class B misdemeanor, subsequent offense class A misdemeanor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. California</td>
<td>Up to 1 yr and/or $1,000 (Misdemeanor)</td>
<td>Up to 1 yr and/or $1,000 (Misdemeanor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Colorado</td>
<td>Up to 6 months and/or $50-$750 (Class 3 misdemeanor)</td>
<td>Up 6 months and/or $500, then 6-18 months and/or $500-$5,000 (First offense class 1 petty offense, 3+ offenses class 1 misdemeanor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Connecticut</td>
<td>Up to 1 yr and/or $2,000 (Class A misdemeanor)</td>
<td>Up to 1 yr and/or $2,000 (Class A misdemeanor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Delaware</td>
<td>Up to 6 months and/or $1,150 (Class B misdemeanor)</td>
<td>Up to 30 days and a minimum mandatory fine of $500 (Misdemeanor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. District of Columbia</td>
<td>First offense 1-90 days and $500, 2nd 1-135 days and $750, 3+ 1-180 days and $1,000</td>
<td>First offense 1-90 days and $500, 2nd 1-135 days and $750, 3+ 1-180 days and $1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Florida</td>
<td>First offense 2nd degree misdemeanor, 2nd offense 1 misdemeanor, 3+ offenses 3 felony</td>
<td>2nd degree misdemeanor-3 felony $500 fine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Georgia</td>
<td>Up to 1 yr and/or $1,000 (Misdemeanor)</td>
<td>Up to 1 yr and/or $1,000 (Misdemeanor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Hawaii</td>
<td>30 days and/or $500 (Petty misdemeanor)</td>
<td>30 days and/or $500 (Petty misdemeanor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Idaho</td>
<td>1-6 months and/or $500, then 1-5 yrs (First offense misdemeanor, 3+ offenses are a felony)</td>
<td>1-6 months and/or $500, then 1-5 yrs (First offense misdemeanor, 3+ offenses are a felony)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Illinois</td>
<td>Up to 1 yr and/or $2,500 then 1-3 yrs and/or $25,000 (First offense class A misdemeanor, subsequent convictions are a 4 felony)</td>
<td>Up to 1 yr and/or $2,500 then 1-3 yrs and/or $25,000 (First offense class A misdemeanor, subsequent convictions are a 4 felony)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Indiana</td>
<td>Up to 1 yr and/or $5,000, then 6 months-3 yrs and/or $10,000 (First offense class A misdemeanor, 3+ convictions are a D felony)</td>
<td>Up to 1 yr and/or $5,000, then 6 months-3 yrs and/or $10,000 (First offense class A misdemeanor, 3+ convictions are a D felony)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Iowa</td>
<td>Up to 2 yrs and/or $500-$5,000 (Aggravated misdemeanor)</td>
<td>Up to 2 yrs and/or $500-$5,000 (Aggravated misdemeanor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Kansas</td>
<td>Up to 6 months and/or $1,000 (Class B nonperson misdemeanor)</td>
<td>Up to 1 month and/or $500 (Class C misdemeanor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Penalty for Prostitutes (Crime Classification)</td>
<td>Penalty for Customers (Crime Classification)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Kentucky</td>
<td>Up to 90 days and/or $250 (Class B misdemeanor)</td>
<td>Up to 90 days and/or $250 (Class B misdemeanor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Louisiana</td>
<td>First offense up to 6 months and/or $500, 2nd offense up to 2 yrs and/or $250- $2,000, 3+ convictions 2-4 yrs and/or $500-$4,000</td>
<td>Up to 6 months and/or $500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Maine</td>
<td>Up to 6 months and/or $1,000 then up to 1 yr and/or $2,000 (First offense Class E crime, then consequent offenses class D crime)</td>
<td>Up to 6 months and/or $1,000 then up to 1 yr and/or $2,000 (First offense Class E crime, then consequent offenses class D crime)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Maryland</td>
<td>Up to 1 yr and/or $500 (Misdemeanor)</td>
<td>Up to 1 yr and/or $500 (Misdemeanor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Massachusetts</td>
<td>Up to 1 yr and/or $500</td>
<td>Up to 1 yr and/or $500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Michigan</td>
<td>First offense up 93 days and/or $500, 2nd offense up to 1 yr and/or $1,000, 3+ convictions up to 2 yrs and/or $2,000 (1-2 offense misdemeanor, 3rd offense felony)</td>
<td>First offense up 93 days and/or $500, 2nd offense up to 1 yr and/or $1,000, 3+ convictions up to 2 yrs and/or $2,000 (1-2 offense misdemeanor, 3rd offense felony)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Minnesota</td>
<td>First offense is up to 90 days and/or $1,000, consequence offense is up to 1 yr and/or $3,000</td>
<td>First offense is up to 90 days and/or $500-$1,000, consequence offense is up to 1 yr and/or $1,500-$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Mississippi</td>
<td>6 months and/or $200</td>
<td>6 months and/or $200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Missouri</td>
<td>30 days-6 months and/or $500 (Class B misdemeanor)</td>
<td>30 days-6 months and/or $500 (Class B misdemeanor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Montana</td>
<td>6 months and/or $500</td>
<td>First offense up to 1 yr and/or $1,000, consequence offense up to 5 yr and/or $10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Nebraska</td>
<td>Up to 1 yr and/or $1,000 (Class I misdemeanor)</td>
<td>First offense at least $200, consequence convictions at least $500 (First offense class I misdemeanor, subsequent offenses class IV felony)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Nevada</td>
<td>See Section III below for legal prostitution</td>
<td>Up to 6 months and/or $1,000 (Misdemeanor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. New Hampshire</td>
<td>Up to 1 yr and/or $2,000 (Misdemeanor)</td>
<td>Up to 1 yr and/or $2,000 (Misdemeanor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. New Jersey</td>
<td>First offense up to 6 months and/or fine, consequent convictions up to 18 months and/or fine (First disorderly persons offense, subsequent offenses crime of the fourth degree)</td>
<td>First offense up to 6 months and/or fine, consequent convictions up to 18 months and/or fine (First disorderly persons offense, subsequent offenses crime of the fourth degree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. New Mexico</td>
<td>First offense up to 6 months in a county jail and/or $500, subsequent offenses up to 1 yr in a county jail and/or $1,000 (First offense petty misdemeanor, subsequent offenses misdemeanor)</td>
<td>First offense up to 6 months in a county jail and/or $500, subsequent offenses up to 1 yr in a county jail and/or $1,000 (First offense petty misdemeanor, subsequent offenses misdemeanor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Penalty for Prostitutes (Crime Classification)</td>
<td>Penalty for Customers (Crime Classification)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. New York</td>
<td>Up to 3 months and/or $500 (Class B misdemeanor)</td>
<td>Up to 1 yr and/or $1,000 (Class A misdemeanor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. North Carolina</td>
<td>Up to 45 days and a fine (Class 1 misdemeanor)</td>
<td>Up to 45 days and a fine (Class 1 misdemeanor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. North Dakota</td>
<td>Up to 30 days and/or $1,000 (Class B misdemeanor)</td>
<td>Up to 30 days and/or $1,000 (Class B misdemeanor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Ohio</td>
<td>Up to 60 days and/or $500 (Third degree misdemeanor)</td>
<td>Up to 60 days and/or $500 (Third degree misdemeanor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Oklahoma</td>
<td>First offense 30 days-1 yr or up to $2,500, 2nd offense 30 days-1 yr or up to $5,000, consequent offenses 30 days-1 yr or up to $7,500 (Misdemeanor)</td>
<td>First offense 30 days-1 yr or up to $2,500, 2nd offense 30 days-1 yr or up to $5,000, consequent offenses 30 days-1 yr or up to $7,500 (Misdemeanor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Oregon</td>
<td>Up to 1 yr and/or $6,250 (Class A misdemeanor)</td>
<td>Up to 1 yr and/or $6,250 (Class A misdemeanor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Pennsylvania</td>
<td>First two offenses up to 1 yr, 3rd offense up to 2 yrs, and subsequent offenses up to 5 yr (1st and 2nd offense a 3rd deg. misdemeanor, 3rd offense a 2nd deg. misdemeanor, 4+ offenses 1st deg. misdemeanor)</td>
<td>First two offenses up to 1 yr, 3rd offense up to 2 yrs, and subsequent offenses up to 5 yr (1st and 2nd offense a 3rd deg. misdemeanor, 3rd offense a 2nd deg. misdemeanor, 4+ offenses 1st deg. misdemeanor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Rhode Island</td>
<td>Up to 6 months and/or $250-$1,000, subsequent convictions up to 1 yr and/or $500-$1,000 (Misdemeanor)</td>
<td>Up to 1 yr and/or $250-$1,000, subsequent convictions up to 1 yr and/or $500-$1,000 (Misdemeanor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Note: Indoor prostitution became legal in 1980 as a result of an unintentional legal loophole created by legislators when enacting laws targeting street prostitution. The state passed new legislation to close this loophole on Nov. 3, 2009.]</td>
<td>Up to 6 months and/or $250-$1,000, subsequent convictions up to 1 yr and/or $500-$1,000 (Misdemeanor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. South Carolina</td>
<td>First offense up to 30 days or $200, 2nd offense up to 6 months and $1,000, 3+ at least 1 yr and/or up to $3,000</td>
<td>First offense up to 30 days or $200, 2nd offense up to 6 months and $1,000, 3+ at least 1 yr and/or up to $3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. South Dakota</td>
<td>Up to 1 yr in county jail and/or $2,000 (Class 1 misdemeanor)</td>
<td>Up to 1 yr in county jail and/or $2,000 (Class 1 misdemeanor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Tennessee</td>
<td>Up to 6 months and/or $500 (Class B misdemeanor)</td>
<td>Up to 6 months and/or $500 (Class B misdemeanor)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Extent to which States Address Demand in their Human Trafficking Laws

U.S. trafficking laws generally fail to address “purchasers” or demand (see a listing of state human trafficking laws in Appendix E). Most laws address pimps or traffickers as the persons responsible for the trafficking and not the purchaser of sex with a trafficked person. However, in three states there is specific language regarding patrons/solicitors (Iowa, Maryland, and Massachusetts). The language in these trafficking statutes specifically addresses those who solicit trafficked persons for sexual acts/prostitution. Each of these states require that the person soliciting have “knowledge” that the person whom they solicit is trafficked - the knowledge requirement is a barrier to arrest and prosecution. Section 3. 710A.2 of Iowa’s Human Trafficking law states:

- A person who knowingly engages in human trafficking by soliciting services or benefiting from the services of a victim is guilty of a class “D” felony, except that if the victim is under the age of eighteen, the person is guilty of a class “C” felony.

Massachusetts law against knowingly patronizing a trafficked person for prostitution states in Section 8:

- Whoever violates section 53A of chapter 272 (prostitution code) knowing or having reason to know that the person engaging in sexual conduct for a fee or other thing of value is a human trafficking victim shall be punished by imprisonment in state prison for not less than 3 years nor more than 5 years and by a fine of $2,000, or if the human trafficking victim is a child,
shall be punished by imprisonment in state prison for not less than 5 years nor more than 10 years and by a fine of $2,000.

Currently, state and local law has not addressed the idea of strict liability for soliciting a trafficked person (as can be compared to the rules of strict liability for prostitution in Ohio, when purchasing sex from a minor is always a felony).

Twenty-one state laws have general language that addresses the knowledge that one is obtaining sex with a trafficked person. This language could be used to apply to patrons of trafficked persons. Knowledge that the person is trafficked is a requirement for each of these provisions, which acts as a barrier to arrest and prosecution. As mentioned, the key word that could implicate patrons is often “obtains,” which if explicitly defined in the statute could usually mean “secure the services thereof” and purchasing sex would fit into this category. In some of these 21 states, the language of the statute would only allow this interpretation against persons who have patronized trafficked minors; this is often because these provisions removed the “force/fraud/coercion” element for minors, making it a crime to “obtain” these minors even if there is no force. As well, in some of these statutes a person who patronizes a trafficked minor is held strictly liable regarding the age of the trafficked person. In Wisconsin there is no force/fraud/coercion requirement in the definition of trafficking; only lack of consent, making arrest and prosecution easier.

Trafficking is always classified as a felony to some degree. The degree of the felony is typically increased if minors are involved; in some cases there are three tiers or levels of felony based on the age of the minor.

**Summary Observations Regarding U.S. Law**

Given that demand drives sexual exploitation, and that prostitution and sex trafficking are correlated with or causally implicated in the full range of felonies, many people involved in combating exploitation believe that *more severe penalties* for buying sex are necessary. In addition, given the inherently risky nature of buying sex, arrest provides the opportunity to educate men who solicit prostitution—particularly about health risks and the trauma experienced by survivors.

One clearly apparent need is to elevate the status of, and increase penalties for, violating prostitution laws. This does not mean to more severely punish prostituted or trafficked persons. It is almost universally agreed among those familiar with sexual slavery and prostitution that a therapeutic, social service approach is needed rather than a punitive approach. The default should be to consider providers of commercial sex first as victims or survivors, and not to assume that (nor treat them as if) they are criminal offenders.

One of the major obstacles to more aggressive law enforcement is having prostitution classified as a *misdemeanor*. Given the general rule codified in the law that felonies are more serious offenses than misdemeanors, police understandably tend to *prioritize enforcing* laws against *felony* offenses rather than misdemeanors. Experientially, most law enforcement personnel understand that prostitution is often intertwined with weapons offenses, drug abuse, rape, kidnapping, robbery, and murder, and many departments put substantial resources into enforcing prostitution law in spite of its misdemeanor
classification. However, with police budgets nationwide in distress, it is easier to justify cutting spending on pursuing misdemeanors than it is to reduce enforcement of felonies such as homicide and robbery.

One of the ways in which law enforcement (including both prosecutors and police) measure the benefits of enforcement activity is with conviction rates and severity of sanctions. A conviction and a long prison sentence is seen as a more substantial payoff for the investment in policing resources than is a small fine, suspended sentence, or dismissal of charges. If purchasing sex were a felony, it would motivate many police departments to devote additional resources to its enforcement.

As stated earlier in the report, before advocating for reforms it is necessary to conduct a rigorous analysis of the content of state criminal codes and municipal ordinances, as well as the establishment of a general coalition underlying the National Campaign and perhaps a separate coalition or task force. Several salient issues emerge from the preliminary research:

Among the possibilities of law reform that the national campaign may consider pursuing are:

- Make the purchase of sex a felony.
- Establish mandatory, substantial jail sentences for first offenses, and prison terms for subsequent offenses.
- Require those convicted of purchasing sex to register as sex offenders.
- Eliminate diversion programs that allow johns to have their charges dismissed.
- Mandate severe fines, and use the revenue to support “restorative justice” programs for survivors.
- Mandate education for men arrested for buying sex, without necessarily offering education as an optional diversion in lieu of criminal sanctions.
- Require men arrested for buying sex to assist law enforcement in investigating and prosecuting pimps and traffickers

It is evident that laws are meaningful in proportion to their enforcement and compliance with their mandates. Given sufficient resources, public interest, and political will, more could be done to effectively prevent and respond to sexual slavery and sexual exploitation within current laws. Many of the laws in place are essentially “paper tigers” unless and until action is taken to enforce of comply with them. For example, we have discussed elsewhere that the TVPA-2005 provides for, and Congress authorized, a substantial grant program to launch, expand, sustain, and improve law enforcement efforts to combat demand for commercial sex. The Wilberforce Act and prior reauthorizations of the TVPA have mandated numerous studies and reports that have never materialized. At the local level, 45 states have passed human trafficking laws, and nationwide there have been less than a dozen convictions for violating these laws, even though most credible estimates (albeit all imperfect, given the dearth of data) place the number of human trafficking victims in the United States in the hundreds of thousands. Laws against pimping and pandering have been in state criminal codes for decades, and have more substantial penalties than laws for providing or patronizing prostitution, but they are rarely enforced.

Buying sex is illegal, and that provides law enforcement with the tools to take action. However, in our national assessment, we’ve been able to identify just over 650 cities and counties that are known to have taken law enforcement actions focused on the buyers of commercial sex. The United States has over 20,000 cities and towns, and over 3000 counties.
Raising public awareness and passing laws mean little if they do not result in concrete action, and concrete action requires resources. Furthermore, action intended to produce change must also lay the groundwork for maintaining and expanding upon the positive changes produced. Law is one tool that can be used to establish and institutionalize change, and facilitates mobilizing of resources to pursue new lines of action.

Finally, since many states have prostitution criminal codes that are role neutral, it will be difficult to satisfy the Wilberforce provision requiring the Uniform Crime Reports to separate the buyers from the sellers of commercial sex. Either state law must be revised, or law enforcement agencies must implement new tracking procedures that will allow them to make the distinction when they tally and report their prostitution crime statistics to the FBI.

The “Swedish Model” Law

Sweden’s laws for prohibiting demand for prostitution explicitly states that a person who obtains sex in return for payment shall be sentenced for the purchase of sexual service to a fine or imprisonment for six months or less. One of the key features of the law is that it is a criminal law, integrated into Sweden’s national penal code. The penalty for breaking the law is a misdemeanor, and can result in a fine or up to 6 months in jail.

The law is extra-territorial—it remains criminal for Swedish citizens to purchase sexual services no matter where they are in the world. The extraterritoriality of the law is intended to have a powerful normative effect, sending the signal that the action is always wrong, regardless of the location or local laws allowing prostitution. It is meant to deter by inducing people to consider the legal consequences of purchasing sex even while abroad.

As discussed previously regarding U.S. states using strict liability for prostituted underage persons, it appears that mistaken age when the prostituted person is found to be under 18 is not an allowable or valid defense.

- Chapter 6 Section 13: Criminal responsibility as provided for in this Chapter for an act committed against someone under a given age shall also be required of a perpetrator who did not realize, but had reasonable grounds for assuming, that the other person had not attained that age.

The removal of this defense is designed to sends several signals. There is strict liability for sexually abusing and sexually exploiting children, and that children are a protected group that deserve the added assistance of the state; persons who transgress the law to purchase sex do not constitute a protected group.

The Government of Sweden claims that a normative “paradigm shift” has occurred, towards a reluctance to buy sex. Swedish officials have been quoted saying: “Many men have also reported that the law has led to the fact that they refrain from buying sexual services. The secondary purpose of the legislation is to create norms in Sweden based on gender equality and international human rights: that no woman, man, boy or girl is for sale, and that no one has a right to purchase someone else and sexually exploit her or

and that “in Stockholm, the police report that this specific law works very well and has reduced the amount of buyers of sexual services in the streets to a minimum.” 41 The law enjoys wide public support, “several opinion polls, conducted in 2000 and 2001, show that approximately 80 per cent of the Swedish population supports the law. Of those who want to repeal it, the majority are men, with only seven per cent of women in support.” 42

The law is currently being evaluated per a 2008 government order. 43 The evaluation studies the rates of arrest, prosecution, conviction, and penalties imposed since 1999. The report of the evaluation was originally set to be released April 30, 2010 (in Swedish), but its release has been delayed by several months. The law has been described and analyzed thoroughly elsewhere 44; here, we provide a brief overview and then comments about the desirability and prospects for implementing similar laws in the United States, and the National Campaign’s potential involvement in promoting the Swedish model.

The Social Context for the Law: Sex Equality

The Swedish law was created explicitly to help achieve equality between women and men. The Swedish government asserted that when it is legal for men to purchase women and children for sex, this sends a signal that inequality is acceptable. The creation and enactment of the law has been attributed primarily to the work of women’s rights advocacy groups 45. Swedish government officials often champion the social meaning and normative impact of the law abroad. A speech by the Deputy Prime Minister of Sweden, Ms. Margareta Winberg clearly summarizes Sweden’s goal of addressing gender inequality and the demand for commercial sex in conjunction with one another:


43 In April 2008, “the Government appointed an inquiry to evaluate the legislation on the purchase of sexual services and its effects (ToR 2008:44).” http://www.sweden.gov.se/sb/d/4096/a/119861


45 Interview with Wiveca Holst, April 25, 2010.
“Prostitution constitutes one of the most serious expressions of the oppression and discrimination of women and girls and a major obstacle to equality between the sexes. It is also a threat to our common efforts to develop sustainable solutions that will allow women and children in all our societies to lead lives free of oppression and male violence.

We cannot achieve gender equality and equal participation of women and men in all fields of society as long as women and children in our countries are victims of prostitution and trafficking. It is time to focus our work on the root cause of this despicable trade with human beings, that is, the demand for women and children for prostitution and sexual exploitation.

...Prostitution is male violence against women and children and an unacceptable contradiction in a civilized modern society in which women and men are equal.”

The Swedish Law on Human Trafficking

Sweden’s trafficking law, in its main criminal code, does not appear to specifically address demand. It addresses itself mostly to the criminalization of trafficking of the person and pandering (pimping). The crime is considered a felony, with a sentence of a 2-10 years. To be clear, this is a substantial sentence in Sweden (e.g. one can receive 10 years for murder in Sweden; most people that commit rape receive a penalty of 2 years imprisonment). The law went into effect in 2002 and was amended in 2004.

However, Sweden takes an integrated approach by addressing trafficking and prostitution in tandem. Philosophically, they do not separate prostitution from trafficking in human beings. They believe the two issues are inherently linked, because ultimately prostitution and trafficking attracts the same market of patrons of sexual services. The buyers of commercial sex are the most important link in the criminal chain that makes trafficking in human beings possible and profitable.

The main law criminalizing prostitution applies equally to demand for prostituted persons. As well, the prostitution law is believed to be successful in reducing trafficking. “Victims of trafficking for sexual

---

46 Speech by Deputy Prime Minister of Sweden, Ms. Margareta Winberg, at the 47th session of the Commission of the Status of Women March 5, 2003 http://www.regeringen.se/sb/d/1204/a/7096


purposes have several times told the police that traffickers and pimps talk about Sweden as a bad market for trafficking. Victims of trafficking, transiting through Sweden, have also told the police that the country of their destination has been for instance Spain, Denmark and the Netherlands. Cleary, traffickers transport women to sell them to buyers in countries wherever the demand is greatest, and hence giving them the largest profit.50

Recent Statistics from Sweden

According to the Prostitution Department of the Stockholm City Report51:

- Since 1999 702 people have been convicted.
- Since 1999 1700 men have been arrested under this law.52
- The number of people selling sexual services on the street has decreased 1/3 in Stockholm since the enactment of the legislation in 1999.
- 1996: 270 individuals were selling sexual services on the street in Stockholm
- 2008: 180 individuals were selling sexual services on the street in Stockholm

Opposing Views Regarding the Potential Transferability of the Swedish Model in the United States

Many people in the anti-slavery movement strongly believe that U.S. states should adopt laws consistent with the Swedish model – with no sanctions for selling sex while maintaining criminal penalties for buying sex. The model promotes a therapeutic approach for survivors, and a punitive approach for “buyers” and pimps/traffickers. Among the relevant points of the discussion in debates over the merits of this approach are:

- Decriminalizing selling in Sweden is coupled with referrals to social services for prostituted persons. In relative terms, Sweden has a robust social service system, and services are more readily available than in the U.S. Law enforcement agencies in many cities in the US claim that the only meager services available for survivors are those linked to juvenile justice or correctional systems, and while a bad option, are sometimes the only support options available.

- Many people disagree with the preceding point, and argue that it is simply inhumane and unjust to arrest people who are victims rather than offenders - particularly minors who are being sexually exploited and raped. The costs to survivors to be treated as criminals are argued to be disproportional to the benefits of access to services, which are usually minimal. These costs include developing a criminal record which hurts future employability, and the emotional harm of many survivors who are forced into

50  Statement by Kajsa Wahlberg, Swedish National Rapporteur on Trafficking in Human Beings, Conference on the “Preventing and Combating Trafficking in Human Beings and reducing prostitution and sexual exploitation,” Plzen, The Czech Republic, June 3, 2009, p.6


commercial sex. This represents being punished by the government for terrible circumstances over which they have little or no control.

- Some opponents of the Swedish model in the United States argue that the ability to arrest those alleged to be engaged in prostitution is one of the only means by which women and girls can be extracted from the control of pimps and traffickers, thus protected and perhaps linked to support services. Many police officers also argue that it is very difficult to identify potential victims without fingerprinting them, since they often lie about their identities (either to avoid arrest or due to fear of retaliation by their pimps or traffickers if they cooperate with police) and have false identification - and thus making it difficult to know whether to treat the situation as child sex trafficking or prostitution.

- Those who disagree with the preceding point to argue that police can still lawfully order the separation of women and girls from potential pimps and traffickers without arresting them, and that the identification challenges do not justify arresting and punishing those who are victims - particularly children.

- The tracking data suggest that the Swedish model laws are effective, but until more rigorous evaluation results are produced, it is unclear whether the low number of offenders (johns) reflects an improvement in the problem or lax enforcement. Most experts in the field believe the program has produced a positive impact. A formal evaluation of the impact is underway.

- The passage of the Swedish law was the culmination of over 50 years of work on gender equity. It frames the law as exploitation of women by men. Having a different set of laws for men and women in the United States could be challenging, where color- and gender-blind laws have been longstanding goals. Efforts to propose gender-based prostitution and sex trafficking laws could also run counter to efforts to increase the arrest and treatment of johns by arguing for gender equity in law enforcement. A response to that critique is that the Swedish model could be adapted to the U.S. by focusing on the roles of buyer and seller of sex, rather than gender.

- Police have great discretion in how they enforce laws, and there is nothing within U.S. state prostitution laws that prohibit police from establishing a de facto Swedish model without any changes to current law. Police could put all of their law enforcement effort into arresting pimps and buyers, and could respond to providers of commercial sex by referring them to protective and support services, unless they are engaged and other criminal activity aside from commercial sex. However, although it is presently possible to do so, very few jurisdictions come close to implementing this approach. San Francisco and Cook County probably come closest, yet they still put approximately 50% of their enforcement resources into arresting survivors of sexual exploitation.

---
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Unusual turn at prostitution hearing
May 15, 2010
By Julie Manganis Staff writer

SALEM — A sentencing hearing for a woman charged with prostitution turned into a brief discussion between a judge and a defense lawyer of the merits of legalizing the world's oldest profession yesterday.

"If there was ever a victimless crime, this is it," defense lawyer Neil Hourihan remarked during Lisa Anderson's hearing. "If we were in Vegas, this wouldn't even be a crime." [Note: This is an error. Prostitution is illegal in Las Vegas.]

Judge Richard Mori did not appear to disagree. "Prostitution is legal in Australia, too," the judge said. "In Australia, they legalize it and they tax it." [Note: Yes, but studies show that for every legal brothel there are four illegal brothels that are unregulated and untaxed.]

(While prostitution is legal in most of Nevada, it is not legal in Clark County, where Las Vegas is.)

When Hourihan went on to compare it to activities like gambling and marijuana use, Mori commented, "All these mala prohibita crimes," a Latin phrase that is used to describe acts that are illegal not because they're inherently wrong but because they've been made illegal by the state. [Note: The evidence of the harm – and therefore the “wrong” underlying the law – of prostitution is overwhelming.]

It may be fair to say police and prosecutors don't share that view. Prosecutor Michelle DeCourcey did not take part in the exchange. [Note: Massachusetts state law also does not share that view.]

Anderson, 47, was arrested last October after an investigation by Salem police, who had been tipped off about an "escort" business Anderson was operating out of her 134 Bridge St. apartment, DeCourcey told the judge.

Police discovered that "Lisa of Boston" was advertising herself as a $300-an-hour companion with a $100 off "recession special" and full weekend packages of up to $2,000, offering "the full girlfriend experience," on her website, which has since been taken down.

Veteran Salem police Detective William Jennings made an appointment and, after negotiating a price for specific sexual acts, arrested Anderson, DeCourcey said.

Anderson admitted that prosecutors had sufficient evidence for a conviction on a charge of sexual conduct for a fee.

"I think I'm inclined to follow the Australians and tax it," said Mori, who continued the case without a finding for a year and assessed $500 in court costs. If Anderson stays out of further trouble, the
charge will be dismissed. [Note: Interesting comment, given that the judge is sworn to uphold the law and prostitution is illegal in Massachusetts.]

She was originally also charged with maintaining a house of prostitution but Hourihan convinced prosecutors that the two charges conflicted with each other — one cannot be charged as being both a "madam" and a prostitute, he argued.

Police will also have to return the $5,000 they seized from Anderson's home during her arrest because there is no provision in the law for forfeiture of money seized from a prostitute, only from a madam or pimp.
Prostitution: the other prohibition

Thu, 06/24/2010 - 1:28pm | posted by Tom Knighton

The idea of freedom seems pretty easy. Let people do what they want to do. However, if you do that, then people are going to rape, kill, rob, or whatever else strikes their fancy, so you need some kind of limit. That is where the sticking point has always been.

For libertarians such as myself, the answer to where you draw the line is simple: in the place that has the least impact. For many, the rule we go by is the “punch principle”. That idea is that your right to throw a punch ends at my nose. The expanded version is that you have a right to do whatever you want, unless it impacts another against their wishes.

Few argue that stealing is wrong, or that assault is permissible. No, these are universal wrongs just as murder and rape are. The problem arises when we each put forth more things for the “wrong” list that have no bearing on anything else.

Prostitution, for one, is considered taboo in most of the nation. The majority of people consider it wrong. They have decided to lay down laws that prevent the selling of sex. Law enforcement spends money catching prostitutes and their customers, all because it has been deemed “wrong” by society. But is it?

Prostitution, as one example, is called a “victimless” crime, and in truth, it really is. Both parties are consenting to what is essentially a financial transaction where money is exchanged for a service. There is no “evil” involved in the transaction, no one is hurt. Yet, for some reason it is illegal.

Many arguments are used to prop up the injunctions against prostitution, though all ultimately fall flat. Each justification for such laws fails on different levels, but all ultimately fail.

One justification I’ve heard is that prostitution should remain illegal due to the violence that is often visited against prostitutes. Basically, it’s a “it’s for their own good” kind of argument. After all, if we outlaw prostitution, then prostitutes won’t go into the profession and be hurt.

The prime failing of this argument is that prostitutes are often the victims of such crimes due to the reduced likelihood that they’ll report the violence. After all, they were committing a crime. People who are committing crimes tend not to tell the police about it. By virtue of prostitution being illegal, prostitutes have become wonderful targets for some of the worst sorts of people.

In addition, many prostitutes who are the victims of violence are victims at the hands of their own pimps. These men know the women are unable to approach the police, and take advantage of it. If the practice were legalized, then the pimps would lose sway. As legal vendors of a service, prostitutes wouldn’t need any of the so-called advantages a pimp offers, namely protection.

Another argument deals with the young age of many prostitutes. Many are underage, and not just by a few years. No, many prostitutes walking the streets of America tonight are barely in their teens. They should be talking about Hannah Montana, not any of the explicit acts they’ll be engaging in for a price.
Here again, the prohibitionist argument falls flat. In truth, legalized prostitution would actually reduce the number of young girls working in the oldest profession. Brothels, such as those found in Nevada, would check the age of the girls working within it and keep out minors. Self regulation would kick in and actually serve better to keep out the minors and let them be children.

A third argument is that prostitution should remain verboten because prostitutes often use the money to support drug habits. Really? Using one victimless crime to justify keeping a different one illegal?

The hardest argument to refute is the moral one, as the morality often comes from a Judeo-Christian source and is therefore difficult to argue with. However, it’s worth pointing out that while prostitution may be “wrong”, morality according to Judeo-Christian sources also indicates eating pork is “wrong”, working on the Sabbath is “wrong”, and using the Lord’s name in vain is “wrong” as well. As a Christian, these are clearly spelled out in the Bible. If morality plays into our decisions as to what should be legal and what shouldn’t, then shouldn’t these other things be deemed illegal as well?

The truth is that prostitution is the most ridiculous of the victimless crimes in many ways. Selling is perfectly legal through the nation. Sex is legal throughout the nation as well. However, the practice of selling sex somehow is completely illegal.

Some men argue that all guys pay for it. It may be three fancy dinners and a bouquet of flowers. It may be a trip to Hawaii. It may be a wedding ring. No matter the costs, these guys argue, men pay for it with something. There is probably some truth to that. And yet, this kind of practice is also perfectly legal.

Prostitution has the added benefit of already being legal in one place. Nevada, as alluded to before, has legalized prostitution and has for some time. The prostitutes are typically higher paid, better treated, and safer than their colleagues anywhere else in the nation. Some draw in incomes of over six figures allegedly, and they pay taxes on that income just as we do. It’s a job for them, just like being an accountant or a lawyer.

It just happens to be a job that’s illegal in 49 other states without good reason.
Chapter 14B.30 Prostitution-Free Zones

Note  (Replaced by Ordinance No. 179996, effective April 14, 2006)

14B.30.010 Prostitution-Free Zones.

A. For the purposes of this chapter, the following definitions apply:
   1. Arrest: to place a person under actual or constructive restraint or to take a person into custody
      for the purpose of charging that person with an offense.

   2. Essential needs: food, physical care, and medical attention.

   3. Reside: to occupy one’s principal dwelling; including transient occupancy in a hotel or motel.

   4. Travel: the movement on foot or within or upon a vehicle within a prostitution-free zone from
      one point to another without delay other than to obey traffic control devices.

B. Prostitution-free zones are those areas of the City as designated by the City Council under
   Chapter 14B.30 of this Code, which are areas where the number of arrests where there was
   probable cause to believe a person has committed any of the offenses enumerated in Section
   14B.30.030 for a twelve (12) month period within the eighteen (18) months preceding its
   designation is significantly higher than that for other similarly sized geographic areas of the City
   that are not located within a prostitution-free zone.

14B.30.020 Designation of Prostitution-Free Zones.

(Amended by Ordinance No. 180885, effective April 11, 2007.)

A. If the City Council designates an area meeting the criteria of Section 14B.30.010 of this Code
   to be a prostitution-free zone, Council shall do so by ordinance. The designation shall be valid for
   a period of three (3) years.

B. The office of the Chief of Police of the Portland Police Bureau is directed to report to City
   Council at least ninety (90) days before the end of the period referred to in section 14B.30.020 A.,
   as to whether there is a need to re-configure the prostitution-free zones enumerated in
   14B.30.070.

C. This Chapter, and the procedures and exercise of exclusion authority it contains, are valid until
D. The office of the Chief of Police of the Portland Police Bureau is directed to report to City Council at least ninety (90) days before the expiration of this Chapter as to whether there is a need to re-authorize this Chapter.

14B.30.030 Civil Exclusions.

A. A person is subject to exclusion under the process described in this chapter for a period of ninety (90) days from any public right of way and park within a prostitution-free zone designated in Code Chapter 14B.30 if that person has been arrested and either cited to appear in court for charging or lodged in jail for presentation to a magistrate for charging based upon probable cause to believe that the person has committed any of the following offenses within that prostitution-free zone, unless the offense was committed entirely within a private residence:
1. Attempted prostitution, in violation of ORS 161.405;
2. Prostitution, in violation of ORS 167.007;
3. Attempted promoting prostitution, in violation of ORS 161.405;
4. Promoting prostitution, in violation of ORS 167.012;
5. Attempted compelling prostitution, in violation of ORS 161.405;
6. Compelling prostitution, in violation of ORS 167.017;
7. Loitering to solicit prostitution, in violation of Portland City Code 14A.40.040; or

B. A one (1) year exclusion from any public right of way and park within a prostitution-free zone shall take effect upon the day after conviction for any of the offenses enumerated in Subsection A. of this Section if that offense was committed within that prostitution-free zone and the person was both given notice prior to the exclusion that the City would impose a one-year exclusion upon conviction and notified of the right of appeal and the process for initiating an appeal.

C. A person excluded from a prostitution-free zone under authority of this Section may not enter that prostitution-free zone except to travel to and from and be present at the events and locations listed below:

1. Attend a meeting with an attorney;
2. Attend a scheduled initial interview with a social service provider;
3. Comply with court-or corrections-ordered obligations;
4. Contact criminal justice personnel at a criminal justice facility;
5. Attend any administrative or judicial hearing relating to an appeal of:
   a. the person's notice of exclusion; or
   b. the denial, revocation, or amendment of the person's variance;
6. Travel through that prostitution-free zone on a Tri-Met vehicle;
7. Travel through that prostitution-free zone on the I-5, I-84, I-205 or I-405 freeways within its boundaries;
8. Reside in a dwelling or facility;

9. Satisfy, or attempt to satisfy an essential need by accessing a public or private place that provides an essential need or service when the essential need cannot reasonably be satisfied by the excluded person without entering the prostitution-free zone;

10. Obtain social services when:
   a. the excluded person is in need of social services;
   b. the social services are sought for reasons relating to the health or well-being of the excluded person; and
   c. the social services agency has written rules and regulations prohibiting the unlawful use and sale of controlled substances by their clients.

11. Obtain education by:
   a. Enrolling as a student at an educational facility; or
   b. Attending school at an educational facility.

12. Work as the owner, principal, agent or employee at a place of lawful employment;

13. Perform work directly related to lawful employment;

14. Be present at any place or event as specified by a variance issued by the Chief of Police or designee pursuant to 14B.30.060 B.

D. An exclusion is valid only if the person to be excluded received actual notice of the exclusion as required by 14B.30.050; including notice of the limitations of the exclusion contained in 14B.30.020.

14B.30.035 Violation of an exclusion - penalties.

A. It is unlawful for a person to enter or remain in a prostitution-free zone in violation of an exclusion imposed pursuant to this Code. For violation of this subsection, a court may impose a fine of no more than $500 or imprisonment of no more than 30 days, or both.

B. A person who enters or remains in a prostitution-free zone in violation of an exclusion issued pursuant to this Code is subject to arrest for Criminal Trespass (ORS 164.245).

14B.30.040 Issuance of Exclusion Notices.

The Chief of Police and/or designees are the persons in charge of the public rights of way and parks in the prostitution-free zones for purposes of issuing notices of exclusion in accordance with this Chapter.

14B.30.050 Procedure.

A. If a person is arrested and either cited to appear in court for charging or lodged in jail for presentation to a magistrate for charging based upon probable cause to believe that the person has committed any of the offenses enumerated in Subsection 14B.30.030 A. within a prostitution-free zone, the Chief of Police and/or designees may exclude that person from that prostitution-free zones. Every person excluded shall be provided a notice of exclusion and variances substantially similar to Exhibit C attached to Ordinance No.179996. Additions to the notice of exclusion that
increase the scope of the exclusion from that described in Exhibit C render the notice and the exclusion invalid.

**B.** At the time a person is issued a notice of exclusion from a prostitution-free zone, the Chief of Police and/or designees may discuss with the excluded person whether the person has a plausible need for a variance and may issue a variance pursuant to the process described in 14B.30.060 B.

**C.** The notice of exclusion shall be in writing and a copy delivered to the excluded person. The notice of exclusion shall include the following:
1. A description of the area designated as a prostitution-free zone in Section 14B.30.070 from which that person is excluded;
2. Information concerning the right to appeal the exclusion to the Code Hearings Officer as provided in Chapter 22.10 of this Code; and
3. Notice that conviction of the offense for which the person was arrested and excluded will result in a one-year exclusion and information concerning the right to appeal a conviction-based exclusion to the Code Hearings Officer as provided in Chapter 22.10 of this Code.

**14B.30.060 Appeal, Review and Variances.**

**A.** A ninety (90) day exclusion shall take effect at 12:01 on the 22nd calendar day following issuance of the notice of exclusion if the person issued the notice of exclusion has not filed an appeal as provided in this Chapter and a Code Hearings Officer has reviewed a police report documenting the exclusion notice and has found that the report presents credible evidence that supports probable cause to believe the person:
1. committed any of the offenses enumerated in Subsection A of Section 14B.30.030, and ;
2. received the notice required by 14B.30.050 A.

**B.** If a person issued a notice of exclusion files an appeal as provided in this chapter, imposition of a ninety (90) day exclusion shall be stayed pending a final, enforceable decision upholding the exclusion.

**C.** APPEAL. A person to whom a notice of exclusion is issued shall have a right to appeal as follows:
1. Appeals shall be made to the Code Hearings Officer of the City of Portland. Any hearings regarding such appeals shall be conducted in accordance with Chapter 22.10 of this Code.
2. Copies of documents in the City’s control which are intended to be used at the hearing shall be made available, upon request, to the appellant.
3. An appeal of a ninety (90) day notice of exclusion must be filed, in writing, by 5:00 p.m. of the fifteenth calendar day following issuance of the notice of exclusion.
4. An appeal of a one (1) year conviction-based exclusion must be filed, in writing, by 5:00 p.m. of the fifth business day following the date of conviction.
5. An appeal of:
a. a denial of a request for a variance; or
b. a denial of a request for an amendment to a variance; or
c. a revocation or amendment of a variance must be filed, in writing, by 5:00 p.m. of the fifth business day following the action regarding the variance.

6. A ninety (90) day exclusion shall not take effect during the time that an appeal of the ninety (90) day exclusion is pending.

7. A one (1) year conviction-based exclusion shall take effect at 12:01 a.m. on the calendar day following the date of conviction and, notwithstanding an appeal of the exclusion, shall remain in effect unless the Code Hearings Officer issues a contrary decision.

8. At the hearing on an appeal of a ninety (90) day exclusion, the City shall have the burden to show by a preponderance of the evidence that the appellant committed any of the offenses enumerated in Subsection 14B.30.030 A., and that the conduct supporting the exclusion occurred within a prostitution-free zone.

9. At the hearing on an appeal of a one (1) year conviction-based exclusion, the City shall have the burden to show by a preponderance of the evidence that the appellant was convicted of any of the offenses enumerated in Subsection 14B.30.030 A., and that the conduct supporting the conviction occurred within a prostitution-free zone.

10. At the hearing on an appeal of a denial of a request for a variance as provided in 14B.30.060 C.5.a., the City shall have the burden to show by a preponderance of the evidence that the denial was in accordance with this Section.

11. At the hearing on an appeal of a denial of a request for an amendment to a variance as provided in 14B.30.060 C.5.b., the City shall have the burden to show by a preponderance of the evidence that the amendment was in accordance with this section.

12. At the hearing on an appeal of a revocation or amendment of a variance as provided in 14B.30.060 C.5.c., the City shall have the burden to show by a preponderance of the evidence that any of the conditions enumerated in this Section supporting revocation or amendment existed at the time of revocation or amendment.

13. At the hearing on an appeal of a ninety (90) day exclusion, the following shall be prima facie evidence that the exclusion was based on probable cause to believe that the appellant committed any of the offenses enumerated in Subsection 14B.30.030 A.:
   a. A determination by a court having jurisdiction over the offense that forms the basis for the exclusion, that probable cause existed to arrest the person to whom the initial ninety (90) day notice of exclusion was issued for violation of any of the offenses enumerated in Subsection 14B.30.030 A.; or
   b. An accusatory instrument charging the person to whom a ninety (90) day notice of exclusion was issued, for violation of any of the offenses enumerated in Subsection 14B.30.030 A.

14. At the hearing on an appeal of a one (1) year conviction-based exclusion, a judgment of conviction for any of the offenses that formed the basis for the exclusion, as enumerated in Subsection 14B.30.030 A., shall be conclusive evidence that the described conduct occurred but, absent a finding of fact by the court of conviction, is not conclusive evidence that the conduct occurred in a prostitution-free zone.

D. VARIANCES. Variances modify an exclusion, and shall be granted, denied, amended, or revoked in accordance with the following provisions:

1. All variances shall be in writing and shall state the purpose for which they are granted and the period of time during which they are effective. A variance that does not describe its period of effectiveness is effective for the duration of the exclusion. A variance allows relief from an
exclusion only for travel to and from specified locations, activities or events, and presence at specified locations, activities and events within a prostitution-free zone.

2. All Police Bureau Precincts shall receive and process requests for Drug-Free or Prostitution-Free Zone variances during regular business hours if they are otherwise open to the public. This capability will be maintained at the main precinct station or at a sub-station.

3. Variance. The Chief of Police and/or designees may, for any reason, grant an excluded person a variance from an exclusion at any time during an exclusion period. Except as described in 14B.30.050 B., the Chief of Police and/or designees shall grant an appropriate variance to an excluded person who presents a plausible need to engage in any non-criminal activity that is not associated with the behavior supporting the person’s exclusion. A variance granted under this Subsection allows travel within the prostitution-free zone only in accordance with the terms specified in the variance. The Chief of Police or designees will ask a person requesting a variance to provide and update an address through which the person can be reached for the duration of the variance in the event the City determines there is a need to amend or revoke the variance.

E. REVOCATION OR AMENDMENT OF VARIANCES. Variances may be revoked or amended for the following reasons and in the following manner:
1. The excluded person provided false information in order to obtain the variance;

2. There is probable cause to believe the person has committed any of the offenses enumerated in Subsection 14B.30.030 A. in the prostitution-free zone subsequent to the issuance of the variance;

3. If the circumstances giving rise to the issuance of the variance no longer support a continuation of the variance or a term thereof;

4. If the person has new circumstances that would support amending the variance; or

5. A revocation or amendment of a variance becomes effective at 5:00 p.m. of the fifth business day following mailing of notice of the action to the excluded person at the address provided pursuant to 14B.30.060 B.1. unless the excluded person appeals the determination by following the procedures in 14B.30.060 A.5.c.

14B.30.070 Listing of Prostitution-Free Zones.

The following descriptions shall comprise the boundaries of the prostitution-free zones listed, and the prostitution-free zones shall include the entire area on and within the listed boundaries.

A. West Prostitution-Free Zone: Beginning at a point on the northeast corner of N.W. 14th Avenue as it intersects with N.W. Johnson Street; thence westerly along the north curb line of N.W. Johnson until it intersects with the west curb line of N.W. 23rd Avenue; thence southerly along the west curb line of N.W. 23rd Avenue as it crosses West Burnside Street and becomes S.W. Vista Avenue; thence southerly in a straight line to a point that is 500 feet from the intersection of the south curb line of West Burnside Street and the west curb line of S.W. Vista Avenue; thence easterly following a line that is at all times parallel to and 500 feet from the south curb line of West Burnside Street until it intersects with the east curb line of N.W. 14th Avenue; thence northerly along the east curb line of N.W. 14th Avenue continuing along to the point of the beginning.

B. East Prostitution-Free Zone: Beginning at a point at the intersection of the west curb line of N.E. 82nd and the north curb line of N.E. Skidmore; thence westerly along the north curb line of N.E. Skidmore to a point 1000 feet from the point of beginning; thence southerly following a line
that is at all times parallel to and 1000 feet from the west curb line of N.E. 82nd Avenue as it crosses E. Burnside Street and becomes S.E. 82nd Avenue; thence southerly following a line that is at all times parallel to and 1000 feet from the west curb line of S.E. 82nd Avenue to a point that is 1000 feet to the west of the southwest corner of S.E. Crystal Springs Boulevard; thence easterly along the south curb line of S.E. Crystal Springs Boulevard to a point that is 1000 feet to the east of the southeast corner of S.E. Crystal Springs Boulevard; thence northerly following a line that is at all times parallel to and 1000 feet from the east curb line of S.E. 82nd Avenue as it crosses E. Burnside Street and becomes N.E. 82nd Avenue; thence northerly following a line that is at all times parallel to and 1000 feet from the east curb line of N.E. 82nd Avenue to a point that is 500 feet to the south of the south curb line of N.E. Sandy Boulevard; thence easterly following a line that is at all times parallel to and 500 feet from the south curb line of N.E. Sandy Boulevard until it intersects with the west curb line of N.E. 92nd Avenue; thence northerly along the west curb line of N.E. 92nd Avenue until it intersects with the north curb line of N.E. Sandy Boulevard; thence easterly along the north curb line of N.E. Sandy Boulevard to a point that is 200 feet to the east of the centerline of N.E. 92nd Avenue; thence southerly along a line that is at all times parallel to and 200 feet to the east from the centerline of N.E. 92nd Avenue to a point that is 500 feet from the south curb line of N.E. Sandy Boulevard; thence easterly following a line that is at all times parallel to and 500 feet from the south curb line of N.E. Sandy Boulevard to the east curb line of N.E. 122nd Avenue; thence northerly along the east curb line of N.E. 122nd Avenue to a point 500 feet north of the north curb line of N.E. Sandy Boulevard; thence westerly following a line that is at all times parallel to and 500 feet from the north curb line of N.E. Sandy Boulevard until it intersects with the west curb line of N.E. 82nd; thence southerly along the west curb line of N.E. 82nd to the point of beginning.
### Appendix E. State Human Trafficking Statutes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Bill Number</th>
<th>Date Passed</th>
<th>Date signed into law/ Effective Date</th>
<th>Anti-Demand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>HB 432</td>
<td>4/29/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>SB 12</td>
<td></td>
<td>7/1/2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>SB 1372</td>
<td></td>
<td>8/12/2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>HB 2238</td>
<td>5/7/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>HB 2979</td>
<td></td>
<td>8/11/2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>HB 2979</td>
<td></td>
<td>8/11/2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>AB 22</td>
<td></td>
<td>9/21/2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>ACR 33</td>
<td></td>
<td>9/22/2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>SB 180</td>
<td></td>
<td>9/21/2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>ACR 28</td>
<td></td>
<td>9/21/2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>AB 1278</td>
<td></td>
<td>8/4/2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>AB 2810</td>
<td></td>
<td>9/18/2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Bill Number</td>
<td>Date Passed</td>
<td>Date signed into law/Effective Date</td>
<td>Anti-Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>AB 1002</td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>AB 16</td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>AB 17</td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td>10/11/2009 (CWP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>AB 559</td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td>10/11/2009 (CWP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>AB 988</td>
<td>vetoed by governor 10/11/09</td>
<td>10/11/09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>SB 557</td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td>1/1/2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>SB 657</td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>SB 207</td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td>7/1/2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>HB 1123</td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td>5/21/2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>SB 140</td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td>4/21/2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>SB 153</td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td>7/1/2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>HB 5358</td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td>11/1/2004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>SB 1500</td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td>10/1/2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>HB 5542</td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td>5/10/2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>HB 5030</td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td>5/24/2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>SB 153</td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td>5/24/2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Bill Number</td>
<td>Date Passed</td>
<td>Date signed into law/Effective Date</td>
<td>Anti-Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>SB 185</td>
<td>7/10/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>HS 1</td>
<td>7/1/2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>B18 151</td>
<td>12/10/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>B18 70</td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>SB 1962</td>
<td>10/1/2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>SB 250</td>
<td>10/1/2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>HB 7181</td>
<td>7/1/2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>SB 1442</td>
<td>6/17/2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>SB 168</td>
<td>6/1/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>SB 529</td>
<td>7/1/2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>SB 69</td>
<td>5/5/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>HB 582</td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>SB 91</td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>HR 162</td>
<td>4/12/2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>SR 144</td>
<td>4/13/2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>HB 2772</td>
<td>6/29/2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>HB 2051</td>
<td>7/1/2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>SB 2045</td>
<td>not signed by gov. yet, projected effect date of 07/1/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>HB 69</td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>HB 70</td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Bill Number</td>
<td>Date Passed</td>
<td>Date signed into law/Effective Date</td>
<td>Anti-Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>HB 536</td>
<td>7/1/2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>HR 18</td>
<td>(look up)</td>
<td>4/1/2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>HB 1469</td>
<td></td>
<td>1/1/2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>HB 1299</td>
<td></td>
<td>7/3/2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>HB 3962</td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>SB 2007</td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>SB 2028</td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>HB 1155</td>
<td>1/1/2006</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>HB 1386</td>
<td>7/1/2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>SF 2219</td>
<td>(look up)</td>
<td>7/1/2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>HF 2286</td>
<td></td>
<td>3/15/2010,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>HSB 74</td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>SB 72</td>
<td>7/1/2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>SB 434</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>SB 353</td>
<td>4/19/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>HB 2468</td>
<td>4/6/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>HB 2435</td>
<td>4/15/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>SB 43</td>
<td></td>
<td>6/26/2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>HB 56</td>
<td>8/15/2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Bill Number</td>
<td>Date Passed</td>
<td>Date signed into law/Effective Date</td>
<td>Anti-Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>LD 461</td>
<td></td>
<td>4/24/2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>HB 542</td>
<td></td>
<td>4/14/2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>SB 261</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>SB 542</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass</td>
<td>HB 1328</td>
<td></td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass</td>
<td>HB 3926</td>
<td></td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass</td>
<td>SB 58</td>
<td></td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass</td>
<td>53A of chapter 272</td>
<td></td>
<td>X*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>prost. code</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>HB 5747</td>
<td></td>
<td>8/24/2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>HF 1</td>
<td>8/1/2005</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>SF 1514</td>
<td>Companion Bill HF 1505</td>
<td>HF 1505 - 5/12/2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>HF 1163</td>
<td></td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>HF 1461</td>
<td></td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>HF 1475</td>
<td></td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>HF 1514</td>
<td></td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>HF 1518</td>
<td></td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>HF 1636</td>
<td></td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>HF 1637</td>
<td></td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>HF 1768</td>
<td></td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>HF 1810</td>
<td></td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Bill Number</td>
<td>Date Passed</td>
<td>Date signed into law/Effective Date</td>
<td>Anti-Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>HF 431</td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>HF 731</td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>SF 1019</td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>SF 1048</td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>SF 1050</td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>SF 1101</td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>SF 1120</td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>SF 1212</td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>SF 1264</td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>SF 1271</td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>SF 2042</td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>HB 381</td>
<td></td>
<td>7/1/2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>HB 1487</td>
<td></td>
<td>8/28/2004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>LB 1086</td>
<td>(Look up in Lexus)</td>
<td>7/14/2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>AB 383</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/1/2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Bill Number</td>
<td>Date Passed</td>
<td>Date signed into law/ Effective Date</td>
<td>Anti-Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>AB 2730</td>
<td></td>
<td>4/26/2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>A 1983</td>
<td></td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>A 3456</td>
<td></td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>S 296</td>
<td></td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>S 297</td>
<td></td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>SB 71</td>
<td></td>
<td>7/1/2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>SB 5902</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/1/2007</td>
<td>Companion to S 4429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>A 7670</td>
<td></td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>A 2598</td>
<td></td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>A 3202</td>
<td></td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>A 6404</td>
<td></td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>A 6476</td>
<td></td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>A 6477</td>
<td></td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>A 6535</td>
<td></td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>A 7126</td>
<td></td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>A 802</td>
<td></td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>A 803</td>
<td></td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>AB 182</td>
<td></td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>S 1510</td>
<td></td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>S 1986</td>
<td></td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>S 2205</td>
<td></td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Bill Number</td>
<td>Date Passed</td>
<td>Date signed into law/Effective Date</td>
<td>Anti-Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>S 4429</td>
<td></td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>HB 1896</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/1/2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>SB 1079</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/1/2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>S 353</td>
<td></td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>HB 280</td>
<td></td>
<td>4/7/2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>HB 1021</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/9/2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>SB 956</td>
<td>3/10/2009, 4/06/2009</td>
<td>AWAITING GOV. SIG.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>HB 1840</td>
<td></td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>SB 578</td>
<td></td>
<td>6/26/2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>HB 3623</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn</td>
<td>HB 1112</td>
<td></td>
<td>1/9/2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn</td>
<td>SR 253</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn</td>
<td>HB 304</td>
<td></td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Is.</td>
<td>H 5044</td>
<td></td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Is.</td>
<td>H 5254</td>
<td></td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Is.</td>
<td>H 5350</td>
<td></td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Is.</td>
<td>H 5661</td>
<td></td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Is.</td>
<td>S 596</td>
<td></td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Bill Number</td>
<td>Date Passed</td>
<td>Date signed into law/ Effective Date</td>
<td>Anti-Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Is.</td>
<td>S 605</td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Carolina</td>
<td>HB 3060</td>
<td>5/2/2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Dakota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>HB 71</td>
<td>7/1/2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>HB 2096</td>
<td>9/1/2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>HB 1121</td>
<td>6/15/2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>SB 1288</td>
<td>6/15/2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>SB 1287</td>
<td>9/1/2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>HB 339</td>
<td>3/18/2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>HB 230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>SB 272</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>HB 2923</td>
<td></td>
<td>7/1/2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>HB 1113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>HJ 97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>HB 1175</td>
<td>7/27/2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>HB 2381</td>
<td>6/13/2002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Bill Number</td>
<td>Date Passed</td>
<td>Date signed into law/Effective Date</td>
<td>Anti-Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>SB 6339</td>
<td></td>
<td>4/2/2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>SB 6330</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>SB 6332</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>SB 6476</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>SJM 8009</td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>SB 292</td>
<td></td>
<td>3/19/2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>SB 292</td>
<td></td>
<td>3/19/2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
** Territories **

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Territory</th>
<th>Bill Number</th>
<th>Date Passed</th>
<th>Date signed into law/Effective Date</th>
<th>Anti-Demand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Samoa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Marianas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>31 (COR)</td>
<td></td>
<td>PENDING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micronesia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Massachusetts law against knowingly patronizing a trafficked person for prostitution states in Section 8:

Whoever violates **section 53A of chapter 272 (prostitution code)** knowing or having reason to know that the person engaging in sexual conduct for a fee or other thing of value is a human trafficking victim shall be punished by imprisonment in state prison for not less than 3 years nor more than 5 years and by a fine of $2,000, or if the human trafficking victim is a child, shall be punished by imprisonment in state prison for not less than 5 years nor more than 10 years and by a fine of $2,000.
Appendix F: Selected Organizations and Agencies Addressing Sexual Exploitation

Apne App: Women Worldwide

www.apneapp.org

Apne Aap works to empower the women and children of India’s red-light districts to escape sex trafficking. By providing them with education, healthcare and job skills, they hope to break the cycle of poverty and discrimination that forces women into prostitution. Recognizing buying sex is a societal problem, they work with governments worldwide to end the stigmatization of those trapped in prostitution and criminalize those who exploit them. Among their objectives:

- Support community-based initiatives of those trapped by the sex-industry.
- Mitigate the circumstances of those caught in prostitution.
- Develop leadership among the affected to end sex-trafficking
- Prevent inter-generational prostitution.
- Build linkages between grassroots activism and policy makers on issues related to ending-sex-trafficking.
- Create awareness in society regarding discrimination against women and girls, particularly on issues related to sex-trafficking, prostitution, sex, sexuality and violence against women and girls.

Demand Reduction: In 2009, Apne App published a handbook specifically designed for anyone working with law enforcement to combat sex trafficking by confronting the demand for prostituted women and children, especially girls. It hopes to provide tools to law-enforcement officials to increase conviction against traffickers, thereby making it harder for the sex-trafficking industry to operate. As well, founder Ruchira Gupta appeals to member states to apply a human rights based approach to identification, victim protection and support that is embedded in the UN Protocol and put addressing the demand for trafficking, exploitation of victims and abuse of a person’s vulnerability at the centre of the amended laws. Apne Aap conferences feature trafficking survivors repeatedly stating they want the demand for trafficked sex and labour to be addressed.

A Future, Not A Past


Spearheaded by the Juvenile Justice Fund, A Future, Not A Past is a statewide campaign to stop the prostitution of girls in Georgia by building a barrier between children and those who seek to harm them through commercial sexual exploitation. The campaign is tirelessly addressing the issue through a four-tiered strategy of research, prevention, intervention and education. In addition, A Future, Not A Past aims to make the prostitution of children less profitable for pimps and more costly and embarrassing for johns who seek out children for sex.
AMEND: Ending the Cycle of Violence

Http://www.amendinc.org
AMEND is a nonprofit organization working to end domestic violence by providing counseling to men who have been abusive, advocacy and support to their partners and children, and education to the community. AMEND’s mission is to help men stop their violence and break the cycle of abuse so that they and their partners, children, and families may live in safe and peaceful homes. AMEND’s philosophy of treatment centers around responsibility: Men are responsible for what they feel, how they act, and the consequences of their actions.

Anti-Trafficking Alliance (ATA):
http://www.atalliance.org.uk;
info@atalliance.org.uk
The Anti-Trafficking Alliance (ATA) empowers survivors of forced abduction and sexual slavery, builds the capacity of grassroots NGOs working on issues of abduction and sexual slavery, and prevents forced abduction and trafficking into sexual slavery. ATA has: advocated and lobbied governments at the national and international levels to put trafficking on the political agenda; worked to improve legal and administrative frameworks; improved community alert systems and border controls; researched the issue and raise public awareness, and worked with the media to raise awareness and sensitization campaigns to advance the cause of the prosecution of traffickers, as well as those who facilitate it. 
Demand Reduction: ATA targets the role of men as buyers of sexual services and as agents in anti-trafficking work.

Arresting Prostitutes is Legal Exploitation (APLE)
http://www.aplehawaii.org/
Arresting Prostitutes is Legal Exploitation works to advance the cause of reforming Hawaii’s prostitution laws arguing that such laws are ineffectual at preventing prostitution and in fact, make addressing the harms of prostitution more difficult.

Beverly LaHaye Institute
http://www.beverlylahayeinstitute.org/bli/bli-trafficking.asp
Concerned Women for America (CWA) is the nation's largest public policy women's organization with a rich 30-year history of helping our members across the country bring Biblical principles into all levels of public policy. They focus on six core issues: the family, the sanctity of human life, religious liberty, education, pornography and national sovereignty. Part of the mission is geared specifically toward eradicating sex trafficking and the porn industry. The website posts articles, interviews, court rulings and other information about the negative impacts of the commercial sex industry.

Bilateral Safety Corridor Coalition
http://www.bscccoalition.org/
Bilateral Safety Corridor Coalition (BSCC) is an alliance of over 60 government and nonprofit agencies in the United States and Latin America that is convened in and along the U.S.-Mexico
Border Region to combat slavery and human trafficking. BSCC’s purpose is to bilaterally prevent and intervene in the commercial and sexual exploitation of men, women and children while advocating for all exploited persons. Through the collaborative efforts of coalition members, BSCC administers a variety of projects and services for victims, law enforcement, and the community.

**CALL + RESPONSE**


CALL+ RESPONSE is a feature documentary film that goes deep undercover where slavery is thriving from the child brothels of Cambodia to the slave brick kilns of rural India.

**Chicago Alliance Against Sexual Exploitation (CAASE)**

[http://www.caase.org](http://www.caase.org)

773.867.1082

CAASE has a unique model that attempts to address demand on multiple fronts: from use of the civil court system to policy and advocacy work to prevention and awareness-raising initiatives. CAASE seeks legal repercussions against perpetrators of sexual harm; advocates for policies and legislation that hold sexual exploiters accountable; creates and implements prevention initiatives; and develops resources that empower individuals and communities to take actions against sexual exploiters. Along with Prostitution Research and Education (PRE), and the Chicago Coalition for the Homeless (CCH) launched a research initiative in Chicago to investigate the cognitive and behavioral patterns of men who purchase sex. In addition, CAASE disseminates anti-trafficking research from throughout the state of Illinois with an emphasis on Chicago. **Demand Reduction**: CAASE developed *Empowering Young Men toward Ending Sexual Exploitation*, the first curriculum in the country that directly addresses demand deterrence for commercial sexual exploitation and human trafficking with young men. It contains four sessions, and specifically targets young men in high school. As well, CAASE was a driving force behind the End Demand, Illinois (EDI) policy and legislative campaign directed at increasing the ability of the criminal system to focus their efforts on the demand for prostitution, while simultaneously increasing services for girls and women at risk for, suffering in, or attempting to escape from prostitution.

**Citizens Against Pornography**

[http://citizensap.org/about](http://citizensap.org/about)

Citizens Against Pornography (CAP) is committed to fighting the plague of pornography and its degenerating effect on society, families, parents, and kids. Using targeted efforts in Education, Legislation, and Technology to fight this battle. Citizens Against Pornography comprises a multidisciplinary group of professionals who are committed to: (1) raising awareness about the harms of pornography, (2) protecting standards of decency in our communities and (3) fortifying homes and families against the destructive and pervasive influence of pornography. This non-profit organization works collaboratively with schools, government, businesses, like-minded organizations and religious leaders of various faiths to enact innovative and timely solutions to the growing problem of Internet pornography.
Citizens Against Trafficking

http://www.citizensagainsttrafficking.org
http://www.citizensagainsttrafficking.org/About.html

Citizens Against Trafficking is a broad based coalition formed in 2009 to combat all forms of human trafficking. CAT advocates for effective public policy and law to combat human trafficking. CAT played a major role in 2009 to pass the prostitution bill and to advocate for the inclusion of "forced labor" in the human trafficking law in Rhode Island. CAT believes prostitution is inherently harmful and fuels the demand for sex trafficking. CAT believes decriminalized prostitution in Rhode Island enabled the expansion of the sex industry, an industry vulnerable to trafficking. **Demand Reduction:** CAT believes that human trafficking is a market. CAT is committed to addressing demand.

Coalition to Abolish Slavery and Trafficking (CAST)

http://www.castla.org

213.365.1906

The CAST works exclusively with trafficked persons by offering social services, legal services, and training and advocacy programs. In addition, CAST partners with law enforcement and government agencies to ensure criminal prosecution of traffickers. **Demand Reduction:** CAST has an anti-trafficking task force in the United States that administers and conducts an educational program through a nationwide training program targeting non-government organizations, law enforcement, and government agencies.

Coalition Against Trafficking in Women

http://www.catwinternational.org/

The Coalition Against Trafficking in Women (CATW) is a non-governmental organization that promotes women's human rights. It works internationally to combat sexual exploitation in all its forms, especially prostitution and trafficking in women and children, in particular girls. Founded in 1988, CATW was the first international non-governmental organization to focus on human trafficking, especially sex trafficking of women and girls. CATW is composed of regional networks and of affiliated individuals and groups. It serves as an umbrella that coordinates and takes direction from its regional organizations and networks in its work against sexual exploitation and in support of women's human rights. CATW brings international attention to all forms of sexual exploitation, including prostitution, pornography, sex tourism, and mail order bride selling. Working with national and international policy makers, women's rights and human rights advocates, and the United Nations, it promotes the fundamental human right of women and children, in particular, girls, to be free from sexual exploitation. **Demand Reduction:** CATW has been a vocal international leader in the effort to establish and enforce laws against men buying sex. They advocate a model decriminalizing the women in prostitution, and criminalizing the men who buy women and children and anyone who promotes sexual exploitation, particularly pimps, procurers and traffickers.
The Code: We Protect Children from Sex Tourism
www.thecode.org

The problem of commercial sexual exploitation of children and its connection with the tourism trade is extremely complex. While the tourism industry is not accused for encouraging this unwanted phenomenon, it has been asked to collaborate and to react against the use of its networks and establishments for this purpose. All tourism companies who suspect or are aware that they are being used as vehicles to carry potential sex offenders are indirectly responsible for their acts at the destinations. The tourism professionals' networks, their knowledge and high skills in interacting with the customers can make a difference at the destinations in the way the child-tourism phenomenon is prevented and combated. As the tourism industry provides travelers with transport, accommodation and services, those working within the tourism industry have unique possibilities to observe, increase awareness of and report on the commercial sexual exploitation of children. Committing to the implementation of this Code of Conduct, demonstrates that a company puts values and ethics above marginal profits, by actively promoting a socially responsible, child-wise tourism.

Suppliers of tourism services adopting the code commit themselves to implement the following six criteria:

1. To establish an ethical policy regarding commercial sexual exploitation of children.
2. To train the personnel in the country of origin and travel destinations.
3. To introduce a clause in contracts with suppliers, stating a common repudiation of commercial sexual exploitation of children.
4. To provide information to travelers by means of catalogues, brochures, in-flight films, ticket-slips, home pages, etc.
5. To provide information to local "key persons" at the destinations.
6. To report annually.

Demi & Ashton Foundation
http://www.demiandashton.org/

Demi & Ashton Foundation (DNA) aims to eliminate child sex slavery worldwide by raising awareness, changing cultural stereotypes, and rehabilitating survivors. DNA has been vocal in its support of holding the buyers of commercial sex accountable as the main cause of the commercial sexual exploitation and sexual slavery of children.

End Child Prostitution in Asian Tourism (ECPAT)
http://www.ecpat.net/El/index.asp

End Child Prostitution in Asian Tourism (ECPAT) is a global network of organizations and individuals working together to eliminate child prostitution, child pornography and the trafficking of children for sexual purposes. ECPAT seeks to encourage the world community to ensure that children everywhere enjoy their fundamental rights free and secure from all forms of commercial sexual exploitation. Based on a child-rights approach, ECPAT supports programs that address the root causes of child trafficking, develop measures for improved implementation of laws against child trafficking, and provide quality assistance to child victims. ECPAT also works with law enforcement on training activities for personnel at different levels (police officers, prosecutors, judges etc.), coordinates the information from the ECPAT global network to help identify traffickers and offers linkages to ensure assistance and support for child victims. ECPAT projects to prevent trafficking include situational analysis studies; awareness raising campaigns targeting communities, potential
victims and the public to address overall demand; education for children and vocational training and income generating opportunities for older vulnerable adolescents or victims of trafficking; establishment of children support groups and other child and youth led awareness and advocacy initiatives; and the creation of help-lines that provide information to potential migrants (children and adults) about the risks connected with migration.

**Demand Reduction:** ECPAT advocates for the adoption of effective anti-trafficking legislation that criminalizes the traffickers rather than the victims. A March 2010 policy analysis by the Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University recommends a strategy for EPACT-Cambodia on how to address local demand for commercial sex. Including:

- Advocating for a shift in how NGOs, the Cambodian government and others think about the commercial sexual exploitation.
- Work with local government agencies to include a local demand focus on existing programs and activities that address trafficking.
- Create partnerships with local key stakeholders to implement comprehensive programming on local demand that focus on only on the local buyers but also the enabling environments.

**End Demand, IL**


End Demand, IL will advocate for the creation of resources and tools for law enforcement to hold perpetrators accountable, deter further exploitation and increase options for prostituted and trafficked women and girls. EDI's extensive organizing and community education efforts will shift public perceptions of the sex trade industry and prostitution so that "pimping" is no longer glamorized and the stigma for the women involved in prostitution is reduced. EDI's work will result in the adoption of sound public policies and practices that focus law enforcement efforts on protecting victims of the sex industry and prosecuting traffickers, pimps and other enterprises that profit from the exploitation of women and girls in the sex trade. Furthermore, the work will create an infrastructure of care for those involved in prostitution, and will encourage Illinois residents to not tolerate the patronizing of sex trade venues and the buying of sex in their communities.

**Free the Slaves**


Free the Slaves liberates slaves around the world, helps them rebuild their lives and researches real world solutions to eradicate slavery forever. **Demand Reduction:** Free the Slaves, along with the Croft Institute for International Studies, authored a report to the National Institute of Justice, “Trafficking in Persons in the United States” with recommendations (including demand reduction strategies) for the U.S. Department of Justice and other relevant agencies in prosecuting traffickers.

**GEMS, Girls Educational & Mentoring Services (GEMS)**

[http://www.gems-girls.org/about](http://www.gems-girls.org/about)

Girls Educational & Mentoring Services (GEMS) is the only organization in New York State specifically designed to serve girls and young women who have experienced commercial sexual
exploitation and domestic trafficking. GEMS is committed to ending commercial sexual exploitation and domestic trafficking of children by changing individual lives, transforming public perception, and revolutionizing the systems and policies that impact sexually exploited youth.

**Humanity United**

http://www.humanityunited.org

650.587.2000

Humanity United is an independent grant-making organization committed to building a world where modern-day slavery and mass atrocities are no longer possible by investing in the power of ideas and individuals. Humanity United invests in for-profit ventures, non-profit organizations, and public agencies that advance Humanity United’s mission.

**The Human Trafficking Project**

http://traffickingproject.blogspot.com/

The Human Trafficking Project (HTP) is a New York-based non-profit organization that utilizes art and technology to raise awareness of modern day slavery, connect those working to combat the issue and support trafficking survivors.

**Hunt Alternatives Fund, Demand Abolition Program**

http://www.huntalternatives.org

202.403.2000

Operating out of Cambridge, Massachusetts, Hunt Alternatives Fund is focusing on strengthening youth arts organizations in eastern Massachusetts, supporting leaders of social movements across the country, advocating for the full inclusion of all stakeholders in peace and security processes around the world, combating the demand for modern-day slavery, and inspiring women to political leadership.

**Demand Reduction:** The Demand Abolition Program addresses demand for modern-day slavery by conducting and disseminating research, convening key stakeholders to share best practices, and educating policymakers. Among their activities:

- Conducted, collected, and disseminated research on demand-reduction best practices at the local, national, and international levels;

- Brought together key actors within and outside of the modern abolitionist movement to energize allies and focus attention to the buyers of sex; and

- Educated policymakers about the links between sex trafficking and prostitution and encouraged the implementation of laws, policies, and programs that curb demand for the commercial sex trade.
International Association of Human Trafficking Investigators

http://iahti.org
727.504.7203

IAHTI is a not-for profit, 501(c)(3) association that was founded in 2009. The founders of the association realized in their own investigations that there was no centralized database containing non-governmental organization (NGO) contacts, task force investigator contact information and task force locations throughout the world. Therefore, IAHTI was founded to provide a secure centralized database that human trafficking investigators could utilize to share case information in addition to obtaining contact information of investigators and NGOs worldwide. IAHTI hopes to provide a centralized database for all members to access so that they can obtain the necessary information to conduct successful investigations, prosecutions and placement for the victims that they rescue during these investigations. In addition, the association will provide a limited number of grants to members so that they can attend human trafficking training classes.

KlaasKids Foundation

http://www.klaaskids.org/pg-prog.htm
http://www.klaaskids.org/pg-hi-report.htm

The foundation was founded in 1994 with the mission to stop violence against children. The KlaasKids Foundation believes that they can go far toward fulfilling their mission by distilling the best knowledge and information through a societal approach that extends from the President’s Cabinet Table to the family’s kitchen table. They hope to win the war for our children’s future by acknowledging that crimes against children deserve a high priority on our national and personal agenda’s. Then, by forming and promoting partnerships with concerned citizens, the private sector, organizations, law enforcement and legislators we take responsibility to become part of the solution to fighting crime and we can take pride in proactive accomplishments. Demand Reduction: KlassKids Foundation publishes a human trafficking newsletter, that often addresses the demand for commercial sex. In February 2009, they launched an initiative to coincide with the NFL super bowl to address the demand for prostitution. Multiple reverse stings and web-based reverse stings resulted in the arrest of Tampa, FL area johns.

Libertad Latina

www.libertadlatina.org

LibertadLatina.org is a non-profit project that works to end the sexual exploitation of all women and children in the Americas. With a focus on building effective defenses against the many forms of criminal impunity that threaten the lives of Indigenous & Latina women & children wherever they may be. Their work aims to challenge today’s ‘gender hostile living environment’ that especially impacts the lives of women and children of color. LibertadLatina.org is the largest source of human rights advocacy information available (with over 500 factual documents) on the Internet in regard to Latina and indigenous women and children’s exploitation issues. They continue to expand that important mission.
Mentors In Violence Prevention (MVP)
http://www.sportinsociety.org/ypd/mvp.php
The mission of MVP is to raise awareness about the level of men’s violence against women, challenge the thinking of mainstream society, open dialogue between men and women, and inspire leadership by empowering people with concrete options to effect change. Utilizing a unique bystander approach to prevention, the MVP program views student-athletes and student leaders not as potential perpetrators or victims, but as empowered bystanders who can confront abusive peers. This emphasis reduces the defensiveness men often feel and the helplessness women often feel when discussing issues of men’s violence against women.

National Center for Missing & Exploited Children
www.missingkids.com
The National Center for Missing & Exploited Children’s (NCMEC) mission is to help prevent child abduction and sexual exploitation; help find missing children; and assist victims of child abduction and sexual exploitation, their families, and the professionals who serve them. NCMEC was established in 1984 to provide services nationwide for families and professionals in the prevention of abducted, endangered, and sexually exploited children.

New York Anti-Trafficking Coalition
http://www.stophumantraffickingny.org/
The New York State Anti-Trafficking Coalition is a group of organizations that have joined forces to increase public awareness of human trafficking in the community, enact anti-trafficking laws, improve law enforcement response and increase social services to help women and girls escape trafficking.

NoVo Foundation
http://www.novofoundation.org
NoVo Foundation seeks to foster a transformation in global society from a culture of domination and exploitation to collaboration and partnership, empowering women and girls as the primary agents of change.

Polaris Project
http://www.polarisproject.org
http://nhtrc.polarisproject.org/
202.745.1001
As one of the largest anti-trafficking organizations based in the United States and Japan, the Polaris Project operates the National Human Trafficking Resource Center (the central national hotline on trafficking), identifies victims, provides social services and transitional housing to victims, advocates for a stronger State and Federal anti-trafficking legislation, and engages community members in local and National grassroots efforts.

Demand Reduction: The National Human Trafficking Resource Center develops new and cutting-edge anti-trafficking strategies focused on regional suppression of anti-trafficking networks through
analyses of State criminal codes with respect to prosecuting human trafficking and proposed State, as well as Federal, anti-trafficking legislation. A senior staff member of Polaris presents in Washington, D.C.’s John School program.

The Project to End Human Trafficking (PEHT)
http://www.endhumantrafficking.org
jredfield@endhumantrafficking.org
PEHT is a non-profit organization that engages in anti-trafficking coalition building, educational outreach, direct service to victims, and collaboration with other national and international organizations in the global fight against human trafficking. PEHT raised awareness about the risks of sex trafficking and sex tourism specific to women and children in Costa Rica. In Zambia, a Prevention Project was developed that consists of awareness raising in rural areas regarding the risk of human trafficking. Anti-trafficking materials, including workshop tools and educative pamphlets, are passed to the local social service organizations. PEHT also facilitated community building among those organizations uniquely situated to play a role in lowering the risk of trafficking of Zambian citizens. **Demand Reduction:** A brief report on the website addresses anti-slavery movement facilitation in the community and elaborates on the “supply and demand” nature of trafficking. On the demand side, PEHT focuses on education about today’s slavery in general. In addition, information about how to identify human trafficking victims and how to best prepare communities to respond to survivor needs. PEHT’s “demand side” interventions tend to be employed in regions with more advanced market economies. One model used for addressing the demand is to tap into resources available through the use of volunteers.

Project Pathfinder
http://www.projectpathfinder.org/index.asp?page_seq=27
Project Pathfinder envisions a world free of sexual violence and abuse. Their mission is to provide psychotherapy, consultation, research, training, and education in a way that prevents sexual violence and abuse, protects community interests, and improves the lives of clients, families, and the community at large. **Demand Reduction:** Project Pathfinder offers a unique and individualized intervention program for men who use prostitutes. The program offers:
- Strategies for changing behavior
- Examination of emotional and relational contributing factors and consequences
- Self-assessment tools
- Accurate information about the damage that prostitution causes to women and society

The program is designed to help men choose more useful coping styles, and to identify behavioral issues that can be addressed through additional therapy and referrals. The program begins with an introduction and initial assessment session, and consists of six weekly group sessions. The sessions are led by an experienced group therapist and include lectures, reading and writing assignments, multi-media teaching tools, and group discussion.
Prostitution Research and Education

http://www.prostitutionresearch.com/about.html

Prostitution Research & Education (PRE) is a 501(c) 3 nonprofit organization that conducts research on prostitution, pornography and trafficking, and offers education and consultation to researchers, survivors, the public and policymakers. PRE’s goal is to abolish the institution of prostitution while at the same time advocating for alternatives to trafficking and prostitution - including emotional and physical healthcare for women in prostitution. PRE has been one of the pioneers in the effort to focus on consumer-level demand: They write that the roots of prostitution are in men’s assumptions that they are entitled to buy women for sex, and in racism, and women’s poverty. PRE was founded in 1995 by Dr. Melissa Farley, a research and clinical psychologist. PRE has provides research data and consulting to agencies around the world offering services to women escaping prostitution. PRE collaborates with other organizations in our research and educational projects whenever possible. Some of their current projects include:

- A video about indoor prostitution.
- A national arts festival.
- Research internships and volunteer opportunities.
- A study of acts of torture against women perpetrated against prostitution and pornography.
- Development of clinical guidelines for offering services and psychotherapy to people who have been prostituted or trafficked.

Demand Reduction: PRE has been one of the key leaders in conducting research and advocacy related to combating demand. They are currently engaged in an extensive cross-cultural study of men who buy women and children for sex. They recently published a report on men who buy sex in the United Kingdom, and collaborated with researchers and NGOs to produce a similar study on demand in Chicago.

Salvation Army: Combating Human Trafficking

http://www.salvationarmyusa.org/trafficking

Salvation Army combats human trafficking through several programs: 1) the National Anti-Trafficking Council, comprising of Salvation Army officers and employees, 2) The Salvation Army’s Trafficking Outreach Program and Intervention Techniques (STOP-IT), 3) Wellspring, 4) Arizona League to End Regional Trafficking (ALERT), 5) Network of Emergency Trafficking Services (NETS), 6) Partnership to Rescue Our Minors from Sexual Exploitation (PROMISE) and 7) Hawaii American Samoa Anti-Trafficking Services (HAATS); 8) Initiative Against Sexual Trafficking (IAST). Programs include:

1) The National Anti-Trafficking Council promotes, support, and makes recommendations regarding the education of the Salvation Army on human trafficking matters. The goals include identifying trafficked victims in the United States, increased prevention of new incidents of human trafficking in the United States, and restoration of rescued survivors of human trafficking.

2) The Salvation Army’s Trafficking Outreach Program and Intervention Techniques (STOP-IT) attempts to identify trafficking victims and conducts community outreach, public awareness programs, provides training and technical assistance for those offering recovery services to trafficking survivors.

3) Wellspring program provides support, education, and advocacy for women, men, and children affected by sex trafficking and prostitution (including group therapy, case management, individual
and family therapy, limited material assistance, monthly outings, transportation and referrals). Also, Wellspring cares for and supports children of prostituted people.

4) Arizona League to End Regional Trafficking (ALERT) is a collaborative effort to combat human trafficking across the state by providing shelter, clothing, and food to trafficking victims found in Arizona.

5) Network of Emergency Trafficking Services (NETS): This program partners with the United States Department of Justice to provide direct services to victims of human trafficking in Anchorage, Denver, Las Vegas, and El Paso.

6) Hawaii American Samoa Anti-Trafficking Services (HAATS) program is funded by the United States Department of Justice for the coordination of services to all victims of human trafficking in Hawaii, American Samoa, and Saipan.

7) Partnership to Rescue Our Minors from Sexual Exploitation (PROMISE) eliminates commercial sexual exploitation of children in the United States by advocating for Federal legislation and at the local level, promoting a comprehensive and collaborative approach that focuses on prevention, intervention, rehabilitation, and public awareness/education in combating commercial sexual exploitation of children.

8) Initiative Against Sexual Trafficking (IAST) is an abolition movement for the eradication of sexual traffickers, the protection of survivors, and the prosecution of traffickers and exploiters.

Shared Hope International

http://www.sharedhope.org
http://www.sharedhope.org/what/enddemand3.asp
1.866.437.5433

Shared Hope International operates the anti-trafficking Predator Project through collaboration among local law enforcements, government officials and with the public by disclosure of information. This project is focused on exposing sexual predators and exposing marketplaces of victimization around the world. Its activities include profiling and punishing those who prey on and profit from exploiting women and children.

Shared Hope International develops public awareness campaigns to raise awareness of sex trafficking and how it relates to demand, researches information for law enforcement about how predators work in order to help dismantle trafficking operations around the world, and partnering with local non-government organizations to boost the capacity to assist victims of sex trafficking. Highlights:

- Conducted underground investigations in more than 14 countries;
- Captured footage of over 100 hours of interviews with predators and their victims;
- Presented evidence to both government and non-government officials in more than 10 countries around the world; and
- Assisted in increasing prosecution laws and providing greater services for victims in more than 6 countries.

Shelley Lubben: American Missionary; Pink Cross Foundation


Founder Shelley Lubben is a former pornography performer who fights against the pornography industry which affects most of the world in a destructive way. She works to educate people throughout the world about the abusive and illegally operating porn industry as well as inspire the
world to stop viewing pornography and stop contributing to the destruction of men and women who are being abused daily in the pornography industry. Ms. Lubben also founded the Pink Cross Foundation, a faith-based public charity dedicated to reaching out to adult industry workers offering emotional, financial and transitional support. They largely focus on reaching out to the adult film industry offering support to porn stars. Pink Cross Foundation also reaches out to those struggling with pornography offering education and resources to recover.

**Demand Reduction:** Shelley Lubben targets males who purchase porn, to inform them that it is a harmful rather than glamorous industry. The website publishes statistics on STDs and abuse within the industry as a deterrent for men purchasing porn.

**Standing Against Global Exploitation (The SAGE Project)**

http://www.sagef.org

415.905.5050

SAGE involves a longstanding and effective collaboration between law enforcement, public health, social services, and private agencies utilizing preventive approaches with solutions to combat demand for prostitution and trafficking focusing upon restorative justice for the victims.

**Demand Reduction:** SAGE runs noteworthy programs that address demand: Early Intervention Prostitution Program (EIPP) and First Offender Prostitution Program (FOPP). The FOPP is a collaborative effort between the San Francisco District Attorney’s Office, the San Francisco Police Department, the San Francisco Health Department, local merchants, and the mental health community. FOPP serves clients who have been incarcerated or first-time offenders who are arrested for prostitution-related offenses. The program includes a john school, an early intervention program for women trying to exit prostitution, and services to aid women exit prostitution. FOPP clients have access to individual case management, groups, legal advocacy, and referrals to health, education, legal, housing, trauma, and substance abuse recovery resources.

**Stand Up Guys**

www.standupguys.org

The mission of Stand Up Guys is to end violence against women and children and to promote gender equality, safety and justice in our Community. They accomplish this mission through prevention education, community projects and by holding events and activities that raise awareness.

**Umoja Training**

http://umojatraining.com/index.html

Umoja helps people gain personal insight and develop the skills necessary to work productively and live harmoniously with others. Several basic themes emerge in Umoja's trainings and classes, creating similar formats and processes, despite differences in topics and audience.

**Demand Reduction:** Since 2000, Umoja has provided a 10-week class to reduce recidivism among men caught soliciting sex from a prostitute (“Johns”). Umoja’s curriculum allows its facilitators to guide class participants to critically evaluate their behavior and its sources and identify appropriate changes. Classes are interactive, with participants encouraged to share perspectives on how the topics relate to them personally.
Participants also complete homework assignments each week, which are discussed at the beginning of every class, to encourage introspection and change. Each class begins with a “feelings check-in”, which helps participants assess their reactions to life events, understand how those feelings impact their behavior, and develop skills to communicate them appropriately with others. The class operates under a set of ground rules, which all participants agree to follow.

Veronica’s Voice

www.veronicasvoice.org

Veronica’s Voice is Kansas City’s only recovery program dedicated solely to victims of prostitution and commercial sexual exploitation. The overall goal of Veronica’s Voice is to offer compassionate and non-judgmental counseling and services through peer, survivor-ran services. Veronica’s Voice offers individuals who are sexually exploited an opportunity to be educated and empowered to take back their lives.

Demand Reduction: The Veronica’s Voice Offenders Accountability Re-Education or "John School" is an intensive, one-day, educational class. The approach brings about intervention for the demand side of prostitution. Attendees are voluntary as well as court ordered. This is the only program that is fee based at Veronica’s Voice. The fees for this program, which are paid by the "customer/john", go directly back into Veronica’s Voice and are used for all services and programs they provide to the commercially sexually exploited. Veronica's Voice OAR program evolved from the San Francisco First Offender Prostitution Program (FOPP).

Women of Power Alumni Association

http://www.womenofpoweraa.org/index.htm

The Women of Power (WOPAA) Alumni Association and Support Group is a non-profit organization established in 2002. WOPAA is a group of female ex-offenders who have attained successful transition from the Cook County Sheriff’s Department of Women’s Justice Services. WOPAA members are working towards self sufficiency through collaborative efforts with support from DWJS staff. The Women of Power Alumni Association and Support Group is a safe place where women ex-offenders can talk frankly about the struggles faced in maintaining recovery and moving forward after any type of incarceration. Long term goals of the group include holding annual education workshops, health fairs, financial literacy programs, and cultural awareness events. WOPAA envisions finding concrete mechanisms that include having an active role in establishing safe supportive environments as women reintegrate into communities.

Blogs and Community-Led “Watchdog” Efforts Focusing on Demand

Pigtown John Watch

http://pigtownjohnwatch.blogspot.com/

Pigtown John Watch is a “watchdog” blog that maintains reports of prostitution incidents and johns sightings submitted by their users.

Demand Reduction: Pigtown John Watch addresses the demand aspect of prostitution by publicizing johns on the blog.
Trick the Johns—No More Prostitution!

http://trickthejohns.50webs.com/

Trick the Johns—No More Prostitution is a community-led “watchdog” effort comprised of members who “live near Main Street” who are “disgusted by the flagrant sale of sex in our community.”

Demand Reduction: The members photograph, document, and report every instance of prostitution and document on their Web site, as well as report the incidents to the police and the city.

Government Agencies Addressing Sexual Exploitation

Child Exploitation and Obscenity Section, United States Department of Justice

http://www.justice.gov/criminal/ceos/trafficking.html

CEOS prosecutes violations of federal law related to producing, distributing, receiving, or possessing child pornography, transporting women or children interstate for the purpose of engaging in criminal sexual activity, traveling interstate or internationally to sexually abuse children, and international parental kidnapping. Additionally, CEOS attorneys provide advice on child victim witness issues, and develop and refine proposals for prosecution policies, legislation, government practices and agency regulations in the areas of sexual exploitation of minors, child support, and obscenity for the federal prosecutors and relevant federal law enforcement personnel. CEOS also conducts and participates in training of federal, state, local and international prosecutors, investigators and judges in the areas of child exploitation and trafficking of women and children.

Demand Reduction: CEOS, together with the United States Attorney's Offices in 14 areas where commercial sexual exploitation of children has been identified as a problem, is currently working with the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children on an initiative to investigate and prosecute those who would commercially exploit our children.

Innocence Lost National Initiative, U.S. Federal Bureau of Investigation

http://www.fbi.gov/innolost/innolost.htm

In the five years since its inception in 2003, the Initiative has resulted in the development of 34 dedicated task forces throughout the U.S. involving federal, state and local law enforcement agencies working in tandem with U.S. Attorney's Offices. To date, these groups rescued nearly 900 children. Investigations have successfully led to the conviction of more than 500 pimps, madams, and their associates who exploit children through prostitution.

Demand Reduction: Investigations have successfully led to the conviction of more than 500 pimps, madams, and their associates who exploit children through prostitution.
Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, United States Department of State

http://www.state.gov/g/tip/

The Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons combats trafficking in persons through diplomatic efforts, research and programs aimed at the prevention of trafficking in persons, the protection of victims, and the prosecution of human traffickers. The United States Department of State publishes an annual Trafficking in Person Report, which is intended to raise awareness and spur foreign governments to take action to counter all forms of trafficking in persons. The Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons provides the tools to combat trafficking in persons and assists in the coordination of anti-trafficking efforts both worldwide and domestically.

United Nations Global Initiative to Fight Human Trafficking

http://www.ungift.org/

The United Nations Global Initiative to Fight Human Trafficking (UN.GIFT) aims to mobilize state and non-state actors to eradicate human trafficking by reducing both the vulnerability of potential victims and the demand for exploitation in all its forms; ensuring adequate protection and support to those who fall victim; and supporting the efficient prosecution of the criminals involved, while respecting the fundamental human rights of all persons. In carrying out its mission, UN.GIFT will increase the knowledge and awareness on human trafficking; promote effective rights-based responses; build capacity of state and non-state actors; and foster partnerships for joint action against human trafficking. Parliaments and parliamentarians, comprising the legislative arm of the United Nations, work to create the political and legislative environment for the successful development and implementation of anti-trafficking initiatives, including paving the path to reforming laws to bring domestic legislation into compliance with international standards and ensuring that the offence of trafficking is created in domestic criminal law. In addition, parliamentarians ensure that the crime of trafficking is precisely defined in the national law and detailed guidance is provided as to its various punishment elements. Parliamentarians also play a role in prosecution efforts of traffickers at the international level.
<p>| Appendix G | U.S. Cities and Counties Employing Specific Anti-Demand Tactics |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City or County</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Reverse Stings</th>
<th>Web Reverse Stings</th>
<th>Shame</th>
<th>Vehicle Seizure</th>
<th>SOAP Orders</th>
<th>Public Educ.</th>
<th>John School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anchorage</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmer</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasilla</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anniston</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin County</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daphne</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decatur</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dothan</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foley</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulf Shores</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntsville</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prichard</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuscaloosa</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bella Vista</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benton County</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Smith</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Rock</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowell</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Little Rock</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulaski County</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogers</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siloam Springs</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springdale</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandler</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maricopa County</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesa</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescott</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda County</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaheim</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antioch</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakersfield</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banning</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barstow</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellflower</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly Hills</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buena Park</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buena Vista</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City or County</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Reverse Stings</td>
<td>Web Reverse Stings</td>
<td>Shame</td>
<td>Vehicle Seizure</td>
<td>SOAP Orders</td>
<td>Public Educ.</td>
<td>John School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concord</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corona</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Mesa</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desert Hot Springs</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downey</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Cajon</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eureka</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freemont</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fullerton</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanford</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawthorne</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemet</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollywood</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington Beach</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indio</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inglewood</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kern County</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Elsinore</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodi</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modesto</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montclair</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moreno Valley</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange County</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmdale</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo Alto</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasadena</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasanton</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Cordova</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside County</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseville</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City or County</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Reverse Stings</td>
<td>Web Reverse Stings</td>
<td>Shame</td>
<td>Vehicle Seizure</td>
<td>SOAP Orders</td>
<td>Public Educ.</td>
<td>John School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento County</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Lorenzo</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Rafael</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Ana</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma County</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulare</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tustin</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacaville</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vallejo</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Sacramento</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whittier</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams County</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurora</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Springs</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont County</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgeport</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartford</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meriden</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naugatuck</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Haven</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New London</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffield</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterbury</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willimantic</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dover</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Castle County</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean View</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmington</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City or County</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Reverse Stings</td>
<td>Web Reverse Stings</td>
<td>Shame</td>
<td>Vehicle Seizure</td>
<td>SOAP Orders</td>
<td>Public Educ.</td>
<td>John School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic Beach</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boca Raton</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonita Springs</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boynton Beach</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradenton</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brevard County</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooksville</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearwater</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clewiston</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocoa</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collier County</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coral Gables</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daytona Beach</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delray Beach</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escambia County</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forsyth County</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Lauderdale</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Myers</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Walton Beach</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gainesville</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough County</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollywood</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kissimmee</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Worth</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeland</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lealman</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manatee County</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami Beach</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Port Richey</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newberry</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocala</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okaloosa County</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange County</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palatka</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Bay</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Beach County</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama City</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinellas County</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant City</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poinciana</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polk County</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port St. Lucie</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanford</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarasota</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminole County</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City or County</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Reverse Stings</td>
<td>Web Reverse Stings</td>
<td>Shame</td>
<td>Vehicle Seizure</td>
<td>SOAP Orders</td>
<td>Public Educ.</td>
<td>John School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Augustine</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Petersburg</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tallahassee</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Palm Beach</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter Haven</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zephyrhills</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunswick</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton County</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia County</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombus</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dougherty County</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gainesville</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwinnett County</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macon</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norcross</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savannah</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honolulu</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lahaina</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lihue</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wailuku</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Rapids</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Bluffs</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davenport</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des Moines</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa City</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sioux City</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Des Moines</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho Falls</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alton</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurora</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calumet City</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champaign</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Heights</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cicero</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook County</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danville</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DuPage County</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granite City</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joliet</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake County</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City or County</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Reverse Stings</td>
<td>Web Reverse Stings</td>
<td>Shame</td>
<td>Vehicle Seizure</td>
<td>SOAP Orders</td>
<td>Public Educ.</td>
<td>John School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leyden Township</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peoria</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockford</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schaumburg</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Charles</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone Park</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elkhart</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Wayne</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammond</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muncie</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bend</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson County</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenexa</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merriam</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overland Park</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawnee</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topeka</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyandotte County</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling Green</td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington</td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harlan</td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexington</td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baton Rouge</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bossier City</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Baton Rouge Parish</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenner</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafayette</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ouachita Parish</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shreveport</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Tammany Parish</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Feliciana Parish</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgewater</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brockton</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Bridgewater</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall River</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City or County</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Reverse Stings</td>
<td>Web Reverse Stings</td>
<td>Shame</td>
<td>Vehicle Seizure</td>
<td>SOAP Orders</td>
<td>Public Educ.</td>
<td>John School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitchburg</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framingham</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampden County</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haverhill</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holyoke</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leominster</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowell</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ludlow</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milford</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natick</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Bedford</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsfield</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth County</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockland</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seekonk</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taunton</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Bridgewater</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weymouth</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annapolis</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Arundel County</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore County</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easton</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elkridge</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick County</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard County</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessup</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurel</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexington Park</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland City</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery County</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Laurel</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salisbury</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savage</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary’s County</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battle Creek</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton Township</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flint</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genesee County</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City or County</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Reverse Stings</td>
<td>Web Reverse Stings</td>
<td>Shame</td>
<td>Vehicle Seizure</td>
<td>SOAP Orders</td>
<td>Public Educ.</td>
<td>John School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Rapids</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houghton</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalamazoo</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lansing</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Clemens</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontiac</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washtenaw County</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne County</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westland</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ypsilanti</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Lake</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnsville</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakota County</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodge County</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duluth</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasson</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mantorville</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moorhead</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cass County</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay County</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson County</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platte City</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platte County</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulfport</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hattiesburg</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pascagoula</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waynesboro</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billings</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asheville</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth City</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayetteville</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gastonia</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldsboro</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greensboro</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilford County</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendersonville</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City or County</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Reverse Stings</td>
<td>Web Reverse Stings</td>
<td>Shame</td>
<td>Vehicle Seizure</td>
<td>SOAP Orders</td>
<td>Public Educ.</td>
<td>John School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hickory</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Point</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lumberton</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hanover County</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randleman</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond County</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockingham</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocky Mount</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waynesville</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmington</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winston-Salem</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cass County</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fargo</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omaha</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedford</td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston</td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashua</td>
<td>NH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asbury Park</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic City</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgeton</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvington</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakehurst</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millville</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paterson</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trenton</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernon</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vineland</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reno</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Shore</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellport</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binghamton</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronx County</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broome County</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coram</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmsford</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City or County</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Reverse Stings</td>
<td>Web Reverse Stings</td>
<td>Shame</td>
<td>Vehicle Seizure</td>
<td>SOAP Orders</td>
<td>Public Educ.</td>
<td>John School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erie County</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenburgh</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hempstead</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islandia</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastic</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Vernon</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nassau</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nassau County</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newburgh</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niagra Falls</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Amityville</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange County</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peekskill</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putnam County</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens County</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverhead</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rye</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rye Brook</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schenectady</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Valley</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staten Island</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk County</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troy</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulster County</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utica</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Babylon</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West New York</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westchester County</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Plains</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyandanch</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashtabula</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Ash</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler County</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City or County</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Reverse Stings</td>
<td>Web Reverse Stings</td>
<td>Shame</td>
<td>Vehicle Seizure</td>
<td>SOAP Orders</td>
<td>Public Educ.</td>
<td>John School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middletown</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painesville</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravenna</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steubenville</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wauseon</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zanesville</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broken Arrow</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma City</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulsa</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsboro</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln City</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medford</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salem</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigard</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aliquippa</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allentown</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaver Falls</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bensalem Township</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookville</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coatesville</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easton</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrisburg</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKeensport</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Castle</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scranton</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniontown</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkes-Barre</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Falls</td>
<td>RI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middletown</td>
<td>RI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawtucket</td>
<td>RI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>RI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwick</td>
<td>RI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woonsocket</td>
<td>RI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City or County</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Reverse Stings</td>
<td>Web Reverse Stings</td>
<td>Shame</td>
<td>Vehicle Seizure</td>
<td>SOAP Orders</td>
<td>Public Educ.</td>
<td>John School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aiken County</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlington County</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenville</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenville County</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greer</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartsville</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horry County</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loris</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauldin</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrtle Beach</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Charleston</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Fort Myers</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richland County</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seneca</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spartanburg County</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springdale</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumter</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid City</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chattanooga</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee County</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cookeville</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallatin</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsport</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knoxville</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abilene</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaumont</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brownsville</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conroe</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corpus Christi</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas County</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickinson</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Worth</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galveston</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harlingen</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris County</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City or County</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Reverse Stings</td>
<td>Reverse Stings</td>
<td>Shame</td>
<td>Vehicle Seizure</td>
<td>SOAP Orders</td>
<td>Public Educ.</td>
<td>John School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irving</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killeen</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laredo</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longview</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lubbock</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lufkin</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAllen</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odessa</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Arthur</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texarkana</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas City</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis County</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waco</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layton</td>
<td>UT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midvale</td>
<td>UT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogden</td>
<td>UT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orem</td>
<td>UT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provo</td>
<td>UT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
<td>UT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake County</td>
<td>UT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy</td>
<td>UT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. George</td>
<td>UT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlottesville</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesapeake</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesterfield County</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfax</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loudon County</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynchburg</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Vernon</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newport News</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petersburg</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roanoke</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Beach</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellingham</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bremerton</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des Moines</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonds</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everett</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Way</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City or County</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Reverse Stings</td>
<td>Web Reverse Stings</td>
<td>Shame</td>
<td>Vehicle Seizure</td>
<td>SOAP Orders</td>
<td>Public Educ.</td>
<td>John School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fife</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King County</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Forest Park</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis County</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynnwood</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasco</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce County</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renton</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SeaTac</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snohomish County</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacoma</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tukwila</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yakima</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howards Grove</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Delton</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racine</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin Dells</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beckley</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanawha County</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weirton</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheeling</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casper</td>
<td>WY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>