

Conspiracy Against Rights, Who Knew?

Aracely Y., Advocate and C.A.G.E. leadership member, is a proponent against government entrapment and can be reached at info@CAGE.fyi.

Among various other charges in several cases, former U.S. President Donald Trump was recently indicted for violating federal law 18 U.S.C. §241, Conspiracy Against Rights, a law that prevents anybody who works or has worked in our government from depriving others of their rights. Since law enforcement and prosecutors in our country have been doing this for many years and continue to do so, many Americans may wonder why there is no accountability for depriving citizens of their constitutional due process rights.

My 22-year-old son is one of the thousands of men who was entrapped on the website Craigslist in the fraudulently inaccurate aim of saving and protecting children from online predators. Anyone with a son should be worried about him being targeted and used to manufacture a fake child predator case against him. These stings are not new... they've gone by many names throughout the years: the Lavender Scare, the Red Scare, The Devil's Music, the Satanic Panic, the War on Drugs, the War on Terror, the Salem Witch Trials.

All of these examples were results of moral panics that violated privacy and criminalized otherwise lawful behavior. My son was engaging in lawful behavior when he responded to an adult ad, placed by another adult on an adult site, for a "casual encounter, no strings attached" relationship. Relationship experts explain "no strings attached" as a relationship "in which two people carry on a purely physical connection with one another," clearly with the intent of being sexually intimate. (<https://www.brides.com/what-does-no-strings-attached-mean-1021886#The%20Cons>)

Much like homosexuality, regardless of public opinion demonizing such sexual preference or behavior as wrong or immoral, these personal relationship preferences are not unlawful; furthermore, it is not the government's right to pry into people's lawful, private, sexual practices. The "casual encounters" section of Craigslist was specifically placed there for individuals who prefer sex with no strings attached, which "often involves sex with a total stranger whom you might have only met in the last hour."

(<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/you-it/201512/3-kinds-casual-sex-explained>)

The ads police sting operations placed were specifically soliciting men for this, but the fact remains that law enforcement wasn't enforcing laws but rather moral prerogatives, targeting my son and many others to create fake cases to generate state and federal funding for their departments.

The very definition of entrapment is the action of tricking someone into committing a crime in order to secure their prosecution. Yet law enforcement and prosecutors continue to deny that the act of posting as an adult to solicit men for casual sex and then claiming to be a minor afterward is not considered entrapment as it does not fit their narrative. The moral outrage of the headline "man propositions underage girl" incites the public into their moral panic, thereby not merely disregarding the method, but justifying and validating such deceitful tactics.

The logical conclusion that such behavior on an adult site is the sole behavior of other consenting adults is wholly ignored. When one considers that such actions are not reflective of the wants and desires of any 13-year-old, then one is forced to conclude that any claim of being underage is misrepresentation. In light of such facts, the other individual must then be

an adult man or woman engaging in legal adult role-play; they are a person who enjoys or gets some gratification from pretending to be a young teen who desperately wants to do this. Continuing with the knowledge that one is talking to a legal adult, these men showed up to find out who this other person was and what this was really about. Law enforcement's catch was they had to force the man to agree to sex with their fictitious person before they would agree to meet. The qualifications of entrapment don't get much simpler than that. And yet these men were not allowed to use an entrapment defense to defend themselves in these falsely created cases.

In 2015, the Second Circuit Court of Appeals ruled that prosecutors who mislead grand juries aren't protected by qualified immunity and can be sued. The participation of prosecutors in any of these fake cases to secure an indictment required the continued misrepresentation of the "facts" to a grand jury. The public and jurors were fed the fairy tale that these men contacted a minor online and then solicited that pretend minor online for sex, when the reality is these men contacted law enforcement who first represented themselves as an adult, then pretended to be a minor and solicited these men for sex. Law enforcement and prosecutors conspired to deprive these men of their due process rights by lying to grand and trial juries and denying that these were cases of entrapment in order to secure indictments and convictions.

Our constitution and federal law clearly protect U.S. citizens from such miscarriages of justice, and police officers and prosecutors who entrapped and prosecuted the men who responded to their ads are in violation of 18 U.S.C. §241 (Conspiracy Against Rights). Furthermore, based on the 2015 Second Circuit ruling, prosecutors who secured indictments from these cases engaged in prosecutorial misconduct by presenting misleading information and are not protected by qualified immunity. When will the public recognize that this moral panic is a political device devised by law enforcement and furthered by prosecutors to obtain taxpayer dollars? And when will the public demand that prosecutors who do this start being held accountable for these wrongful actions and convictions?