

# *Is Slavery Legal ?*

© Shawn David Olfman 2018  
Olfman.com

Is it a dumb question to ask if slavery is legal ? Many people would say: 'Yes'. They would say that in North America slavery ended in 1865 when it was abolished in the United States. Those people might also say that at the present time in some third world countries there might be slaves. Most people also believe that in Canada and the States there is currently a human trafficking problem, but that it is not the same as the legal slavery which existed prior to 1865.

I suppose it all depends on who you are. If you are a person being held in a place you would like to leave, and being forced to do work you do not want to do, and being paid nothing or such a small amount that you would never be able to buy anything beyond a few of the cheapest bare necessities, and you can be forced to go somewhere else and obey some other person under the same conditions as you are currently living, then you would see no difference between modern slavery and the slavery of the past. On the other hand, if you are a free person who believes that you are living in a free society, with equal respect and equal treatment and equal justice and equal rights for all, then you would believe that while some people have a shitty deal in life, they are not really slaves in the old sense. You would be mistaken. On an individual basis, the only difference between a modern day slave and a slave of the 17<sup>th</sup> century to mid-19<sup>th</sup> century, is that then the slave was publicly acknowledged as a slave. Today, a person who is secretly kept in bondage is just as much a slave as were each of a multitude of people, who, in the past, were visibly kept in bondage.

**We in the Western World are currently living in the age of form over substance.** We are being convinced that as long as good and noble words are espoused then good and noble things are being done. Because we do not see people being sold at public auction or people in ragged clothes being led through the streets in chains, we are told that our government has ended slavery.

**We also live in an age where the trivial is hailed as the monumental and the monumental is ignored.** We live in an age where pretend monsters are battled by pretend heroes, and the real problems 'don't exist'. In 2017, the person whom the media portrayed as one of the worst of the pretend monsters is President Donald Trump; who is tweet battled by celebrity heroes on Twitter. Does that sound as stupid to you as it does to me ? (This is not a digression from the point of the paper, it will become relevant.) Many of the celebrity heroes who tweet battle the President of the United States or who had spoken out against him before he was elected had promised to leave the United States and move to Canada if Trump was elected. I have checked Canada, and more than a year after Trump was elected none of those celebrity heroes

have kept their promise and moved to Canada. Does that make them bad people or phonies; are they worse than Donald Trump for having lied about what they would do if he was elected; or were we supposed to know that their threats to leave America if Trump was elected were hyperbolic exaggeration ? Can you really be a hero if you don't do what you said you would do and then claim that you were 'just kidding' ? Can you really be a villain if you do things in such a way that you know they will fail, but because you had said you would do them you had to pretend to try to do them; but you only pretended to try to do them because you did them in a way that you knew would fail ?

Virtually every 'bad' thing President Trump tried to do has failed. Are he and his staff so dumb that they can't do the 'bad' things they wanted to do ? I do not believe that a person can be smart enough to become president and simultaneously too dumb to know that he is doing things in such a way that they will fail. However, a person can be smart enough to pretend that he is doing certain things, and set them up to fail, because he wanted to be seen as having tried to do them, but he did not want them to actually happen. A person cannot be smart enough to get a highly respected and high paying job as a presidential advisor, or to get to be a presidential advisor's university educated assistant, and also be too dumb to figure out how to get done what the president want's done.

When Hitler was elected, many people left Germany; when Stalin elected himself many people tried to leave Russia. Does that mean that Trump is not as bad as Hitler or Stalin because no-one left America when he was elected, and many more immigrants came to America to be ruled over by President Donald Trump?

Historically, every country that became ruled over by an evil despot had hordes of people trying to leave, and no-one trying to get in. In present day USA, ruled by Donald Trump, no-one is trying to leave, not even the people who said that they would leave if he got elected, and there are hordes of Foreigners trying to get in so that they can live in the country ruled by President Trump.

**The reality of what is happening does not match the evil claims made about Trump.** That does not mean that President Trump is good; what it means is that there is an intentional deception going on for purposes that have not been discovered. (The deception is that Trump presents himself as a villain, but the facts of which the media has informed the public demonstrate that he has accomplished very little villainy.)

Why, if Trump is a 'for real' villain, has he not accomplished any of the things he threatened to accomplish ? President Trump has certainly accomplished far less than Hitler accomplished in his

first year in office. Soon after taking office, The Donald (as he was known in the 1980's when he was a publicly popular tycoon) signed many decrees against immigrants, all of which were quickly set aside by unknown court judges. Can it really be that the true will of The President of the United States is subordinate to a judge appointed by an aid to a previous U.S. President ?

Can it really be that if The President of the United States wants to get something done, like invade another country, pardon a criminal, move a fleet of tens of thousands of military personnel, bomb cities in a country with which the U.S. is not at war, set up a prison in which people can be tortured and held without trial for decades; he can do all of that, but he can't get what he wants done regarding foreign immigrants ?

With lightening speed The Donald President set in motion a law to vanquish America's partly-beloved health care program, but alas it was President Trump's new health care law that was vanquished and the prior partly-beloved health care remained. With control of Congress and the Senate Emperor Trump should have had no trouble bringing about any changes he desired; yet in the first year of his reign his only accomplishments were middle school level Twitter exchanges with a few celebrities. A few years back, President Bush the younger, who was decried as being lazy and stupid, invaded two foreign countries, sent American fleets around the world to scare the shit out of any foreign leaders inclined to think that he may have gone too far, and got many laws passed that stuck. In his first year in office Hitler passed a law removing all Jewish People from government service; passed a law barring Jewish People from the bar (ie. banning Jewish People from being lawyers); passed a law revoking the citizenship of naturalized Jewish People; and passed a law which prevented Jewish People from holding any type of editorial post. In his first year in office Stalin did whatever he wanted, and there were no complaints (or at least none that lived on). **So why is it that President Trump can't get anything done; and why does he say such stupid things which always find their way onto the news, is he trying to remain a media villain ?**

**Do we live in the freest greatest era of all time**, where even the president of the United States is constrained by the 'will of the public' as expressed by the news media, or do we live in an era where the most powerful country on Earth is run by a Three Card Monte hustler who knows that if we are distracted by his belied antagonism we will never figure out which of his shuffled cards is the ace (ie. what is silently really happening that will affect the foreseeable future) ?

Sometimes what is done in the public eye is done intentionally to distract people from what is happening out of sight.

**We in the Western World do indeed live in the age of form over substance;** where as long as good and noble words are espoused then good and noble things must be being done. We live in an age where the trivial (such as tweeting a childish retort to a childish tweet by The President) is hailed as the monumental and the truly monumental ‘doesn’t exist’. Hence, of course slavery is illegal, because saying that it is illegal is the good and noble thing to say; and if there are slaves in India or China or Saudi Arabia or Mexico, that is very unfortunate, and possibly it is because they do not have laws like we do in Canada, or in the United States, or in the U.K., etc.

To find out if slavery is legal some questions need to be answered.

The first big question is: Why are Canada, the States, the U.K. etc., in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, enacting anti-slavery laws, if slavery has been illegal in Europe and North America for over 150 years ?

The second big question is: If anti-slavery laws can be enacted to make slavery illegal, **can slavery laws be enacted to make slavery legal ?**

I will first discuss the first big question.

**The facts of slavery becoming illegal in Europe, the U.K., Canada and the United States are:**

- In 1789 The French National Assembly, for France, enacted the Declaration of the Rights of Man. Its wording was good because it ended slavery, but its wording was beautiful because it did so in a single, simple clear and unambiguous sentence. Its first article stated very simply that:  
“Men are born and remain free and equal in rights.”
- In 1803 Denmark-Norway enacted law ending slavery.
- In 1820 Spain abolished the slave trade, except in Cuba.
- In 1834 The British Parliament passed the Abolition Act, which ended slavery throughout the entire British Empire (including Canada). (The British Parliament also gave monetary compensation to slave owners for the fact that the Abolition Act freed their slaves.)
- In 1848 France passed law which abolished slavery in all of her colonies.
- In 1863 The Netherlands abolished slavery in all Dutch colonies.
- In 1865 the United States of America passed the 13th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, making slavery illegal. Its wording was good because it ended slavery, but its wording was beautiful because it did so in a single, simple clear and unambiguous sentence. Its

wording was also beautiful because it made clear what should have been obvious, but is still not obvious to many people, which is that people convicted of a crime and sent to prison are thereby turned into slaves for the duration of their incarceration, and that form of slavery is necessary in a civilized country which uses prison as a punishment for crime.

The 13<sup>th</sup> amendment to the U.S. Constitution:

“Section 1.

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.

Section 2.

Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.”

- Then, in 1870 the United States finished the job of making slaves fully free by enacting the 15<sup>th</sup> amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

The 15<sup>th</sup> amendment to the U.S. Constitution:

“Section 1.

The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Section 2.

The Congress shall have the power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.”

---

Now that it has been demonstrated that slavery in Canada, the States and the U.K., etc., ended over 150 years ago, I repeat the question: Why are Canada, the States, the U.K., etc., in the 21<sup>st</sup> century enacting anti-slavery laws, if slavery has been illegal in Europe and North America for over 150 years ? I can think of a good answer to that question in the sense that it answers the question; but it is an unfortunate answer in the sense that it demonstrates that many (possibly all) of the world's countries have a hidden motive for wanting to keep slavery happening. Before discussing my answer I will give you some facts so that you can have a basis on which to judge my answer.

The reason which all free-world countries give for their enactment of 21<sup>st</sup> century anti-slavery laws is that with changing times circumstances have arisen under which a person could be a slave and yet not considered by the prior laws to be a slave, and therefore new laws were needed to wipe out modern forms of slavery. The corollary to that reason is that modern day Slavers take the form of human traffickers and the many different ways in which people are trafficked and the

many different purposes for which people are trafficked required new laws to allow the modern day human trafficker to be convicted of a crime, hence new laws were needed.

The above expressed reason and its corollary are poppycock; the laws against illegal immigration, kidnapping, assault, battery and extortion cover all situations in which slavery could exist. If person "A" provides money or goods or services (such as transportation or housing or food, etc.) to person "B", and person "B" signs a contract saying that they will live where person "A" tells them to live and will do whatever work person "A" tells them to do, until their debt to person "A" is paid; and person "B" then chooses to break that contract by seeking to leave where person "A" told them to live and by refusing to do the work which person "A" told them to do; if person "A" then tries to prevent person "B" from breaking the contract by leaving, that is kidnapping, which has been a crime for over a hundred years.

If person "A" tried to force person "B" to do work by means of force or threat of force, that is assault, battery or extortion, and they have been crimes for over a hundred years. There is no debtors' prison, and there has not been one for over a hundred years.

If person "B" breaks their contract of servitude with person "A", person "A's" only legal recourse (and it has been so for over a hundred years) would be to sue person "B" in civil court for monetary damages. That is it, period. Should person "A" win the law suit, then person "B" would owe a monetary debt to person "A", and if that debt together with person "B's" other debts, or based on person "B's" income, was so overwhelming that person "B" could not pay it off in the foreseeable future, the only penalty that person "B" could legally suffer would be to have to declare bankruptcy, which is something that happens to people and businesses on a regular basis. Even President Trump has had some of his businesses declare bankruptcy, and it has not hurt his lifestyle. Therefore, it is clear that for over 100 years no new laws have been needed to combat slavery; because slavery has been illegal ever since 1865; except in the case of people who have been sentenced to prison by a court of law, who must live in prison under slave conditions until their sentence is over or they get paroled.

Therefore, if person "A" cannot force person "B" to live where person "B" does not want to live without being subject to being charged and convicted of kidnapping or assault, battery or extortion; and person "A" cannot use force to make person "B" do work which person "B" does not want to do, without being charged and convicted of assault, battery or extortion; then person "A" could never keep person "B" as a slave. Why then, did the parliament of the United Kingdom enact the "Modern Slavery Act 2015" in 2015 ? Why in 2005 did the parliament of Canada enact Bill C-49 "An Act To Amend The Criminal Code (Trafficking in Persons)" ? Why did the United

States enact the “Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000” in 2000 ? There is more modern anti-slavery legislation in North America and the U.K. than that which I listed above; the legislation I have listed above are simply examples of it.

Why have the States, the U.K. and Canada, in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, enacted anti-slavery legislation if slavery became illegal in the U.S.A. in 1865 (The 13<sup>th</sup> amendment to the U.S. Constitution), and became illegal in the U.K. and Canada in 1834 (The Abolition Act) ?

You can find the entirety of the modern anti-slavery legislation which I have listed above on the Internet, just search for the titles I listed. You can also find other 21<sup>st</sup> century anti-slavery legislation on the Internet. At the end of this paper I have included excerpts from the above listed Canadian, American and British 21<sup>st</sup> century anti-slavery laws. I have not included the laws in their entirety, as that would literally be hundreds of pages, and as written above, they are easily located on the Internet. When you read the excerpts I have included, or if you choose to find the entirety of each piece of legislation online, you will see that on a quick reading they seem to be saying good things which could easily be put into practice to stop Slavers. However, when you read those pieces of legislation more carefully and **look for the loopholes** through which Slavers will escape prosecution, and if prosecuted will escape conviction (as demonstrated by the statistics showing how trivially few convictions are obtained) you will discover that those laws were designed to sound good but to be very ineffective at stopping slavery (ie. they were designed, as were Trumps anti-immigrant decrees and new health care law, **to fail**).

The 21<sup>st</sup> century anti-slavery legislation is ineffective because they make it easier for slavery to exist. All you have to do is look at the facts. Check out reliable online (ie. Internet) source on slavery, even check out the Canadian, American and British government slavery statistics, and you will discover that there is never a verifiable decrease in the amount of modern slaves which aforesaid governments acknowledge exist in their own countries.

I encourage you to go online and use the Internet to discover the statistics for yourself until you are satisfied that you have the most accurate answer that you are able to obtain. **The result of the statistics I discovered from multiple sources, including government websites and the United Nations indicate that:**

- As of the year 2010, 90% of the world’s countries had enacted modern day anti-slavery laws. However, between 2010 and 2012 40% of those countries reported that their slavery convictions were in the single digits, and another 15% did not have any convictions.

- In Canada, from 2005 to 2014 there were only 53 completed criminal court cases in which a violation of the Canadian 2005 new anti-slavery laws was the most serious offence with which the accused was charged. Of those 53 cases there were only 16 convictions.
- In the U.K. I could not find what appeared to be reliable statistics from after their 2015 legislation; however, under their prior 21<sup>st</sup> century anti-slavery legislation (introduced between 2003 and 2004) it appeared that in 2014 there were a total of only 76 charges laid and a total of only 31 convictions for all of England.
- In 2016, in the entire United States, there were only about 300 convictions in which a breach of the United State's 21<sup>st</sup> century anti-slavery laws was one of the charges against the accused, and in most of those case the person was not convicted under the 21<sup>st</sup> century anti-slavery laws, but was convinced under a criminal anti-prostitution law. In 2016, in the entire United States, there were less than 10 human trafficking-related convictions for people being made to work as slaves under America's 21<sup>st</sup> century anti-slavery laws.

The **2016 Global Report on Trafficking in Persons**, of the **United Nations** Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), at page 96 stated:

“The number of convictions in North America is high compared to the rest of the world. The United States reports around 150 - 200 convictions per year, while Mexico has between 60 and 100. In Canada, there are 10 to 15 convictions per year. Mexico and the United States reported increasing numbers of convictions over the 2012-2014 period. It appears that, on average, about half of the persons prosecuted receive first-instance convictions.”

What the above demonstrates is that the resources (money and people power) put into developing and carrying out investigations under the ridiculously complicated 21<sup>st</sup> century anti-slavery legislation has produced trivial results. When you have complex laws, which require massive amounts of people and technology resources to obtain sufficient evidence for a conviction; you get very few charges being laid and even fewer convictions. I know the foregoing and criminals know the foregoing.

Here's where my observations on President Trump become relevant. Ask yourself, is it really possible that a person who became a billionaire in the very competitive real estate development market, and who ran a successful T.V. series, and who out maneuvered politicians with decades of experience to get the Republican nomination to run for president, can be as stupid as Donald Trump presents himself to be ? Does he really have no control over his mouth, and it sayeth

whatever it wanteth to say without his brain being able to exert any control over it ? Or is The Donald President a huckster aggressively distracting the public with flimflam because there are secret things going down which that huckster is trying to keep the public from discovering.

I am not saying that Donald Trump has anything to do with the very little action happening to stop slavery. I am using him as an example of someone who does a great job of distraction; and telling you that when all attention is focused on his distractingly stupid and outrageous statements, you do not know what you are being distracted from. You do not know what the real plans are for America's (and the world's) future, because you are too busy being beguiled by Trump's flimflam.

Similarly, when you have governments enacting bafflingly complex laws, which include grandiose statements about their high and noble intentions, to make the public believe that they are intent on ending slavery; instead of putting their resources into catching the criminals (ie. the Slavers) and instead of putting their resources into prosecuting those Slavers under the laws of illegal immigration, kidnapping, assault, battery and extortion, which laws the Slavers are surely breaking if they are transporting, keeping or selling slaves; then you have governments that are using those noble sounding, but mind-numbingly complex new laws, to distract the public from the fact that they are intentionally not doing a good job of stopping slavery.

You cannot enslave a person in a country with the (1865) American 13<sup>th</sup> Amendment to the Constitution or in a country with the 1834 Abolition Act (which covered the U.K. and Canada), without breaking one or all of the very old laws against kidnapping, assault, battery and extortion, which laws the Slavers are surely breaking if they are transporting, keeping or selling slaves. The only thing that was accomplished by the very complicated and hard to convict under 21<sup>st</sup> century anti-slavery acts was to make it easier for slavery to continue in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, by making it harder to get enough evidence to get a charge laid and making it harder to get a conviction. **The facts on the lack of convictions speak for themselves.**

To the question of: 'Why are Canada, the States, the U.K., etc., in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, enacting anti-slavery laws, if slavery has been illegal in Europe and North America for over 150 years ?', my good answer is that there is hidden motive for wanting to keep slavery happening.

Read the excerpts of the above stated 21<sup>st</sup> century anti-slavery laws at the end of this paper, and if that does not convince you that those laws are massively overly complicated for the purpose of making it harder to charge and convict Slavers, then go online and search those laws and read them in their entirety; if after that you are still not convinced that my answer is correct, then you and I will have to respectfully disagree with each other.

Before getting to the second big question of: 'If anti-slavery laws can be enacted to make slavery illegal, can slavery laws be enacted to make slavery legal?'; I will put modern slavery in context of slavery throughout history.

Historically slavery was out in the open and legal. The ancient Egyptians, the ancient Greeks, the Romans, the Chinese, the Africans, the Native Americans, the Spanish, the French, the British and the Americans all had laws to allow a person who owned slaves to enforce that ownership in the courts of law of those countries of those times. (The Africans and Native Americans did not have courts of law as we know them to be, but they did have their own equivalents in that they had authority figures with the power to resolve disputes.) Historically, if a person was a slave there was no legal help to get freed, as the law's purpose, in that respect, would have been to keep a slave being a slave. Therefore, the slaves of the past could only dream of hope for rescue, as there was none, except illegal underground escape, which was a far more remote and tenuous possibility than having the law seek to find you and free you.

Today there are slaves, people who are illegally kept from leaving a place they want to leave, and who are usually forced to do work they do not want to do. Those people are slaves in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, no-one was more of a slave at any point in history.

There is also a range of what society calls slavery; and some people who are considered as slaves are not slaves in the historical sense. For example, some illegal immigrants come to a country and are put to work 10 hours a day for much less than the country's minimum wage, and they are given sub-standard (even horrible) living quarters. However, they are sometimes more content in that position than going back to their home country. There are instances in which those illegal immigrants would rather stay in their harsh and miserable conditions in their new country than go back to their even more miserable conditions in their country of birth. Those immigrants are being horribly mistreated, and there should be legal recourse for them, and the law should be seeking to find and help them; but they are not slaves in the same way that people were slaves 150 and more years ago.

People, usually women, who were deceived into becoming sex workers, but who are not held captive in that they can leave their living quarters on their own, are not slaves; because they could simply walk away. Society should offer those people a better possibility in life so that those of them who do not want to be sex workers could have a place to go where they could earn the necessities of a reasonable life without having to be a sex worker.

I have personal experience with limited options and I know that sometimes a person, while free in theory, is not free in fact, because there is sometimes only one option which seems viable. To put it in other terms, if you are a homeless person who does not know how to get welfare or who cannot get welfare, and someone offers you a shitty place to live with low quality food, on the condition that you work for 10 to 12 hours a day at \$1. per hour, that might seem better to you than being homeless. If you are a girl who is illegally in a foreign country, and you cannot contact your family who are back in your country of birth, and even if you could they'd have no way to get to you or to get you back to them; you might rather work as a house slave for the despicable people who tricked you into coming to work for them, or in the sex industry, rather than seek out the police and take your chances with what would happen to you. No matter who you are, if you are working and living in conditions which you know are far below the legal standard, but you cannot think of any way to get yourself into a place where you would be working and living at the legal standard, you might not like your life, but you might rather keep it than leave and take your chances; therefore, while you are not a slave in the historical sense, you are a slave by the fact that you are afraid to be free.

Being afraid to be free is not being a coward or being stupid; it is knowing that if you leave where you are and you cannot find help (and help cannot always be found) that you might end up in a worse situation; and so you stay, not out of cowardice or stupidity, but out of caution; and caution is not weak or stupid.

It is society's failure to provide opportunities for every person who wants to earn their way to a modest (but not impoverished) life that causes some people to prefer to stay in the life they ended up in rather than seek a better life. That, of course, does not excuse those people who are taking egregious advantage of other people.

How society could provide the opportunities for all people who want to earn their way to a modest (but not impoverished) life would be the subject of a very long paper and is not explained here.

The complete answer on how to end slavery would also be the subject of a very long paper and is not explained here. The essence of that answer is to penalize people who pay less than minimum wage with the penalties which the law provides for that offence. To charge and convict people who use force to make people do work and other things which they do not want to do, under the pre-existing laws of assault, battery and extortion. To penalize people who are trafficking illegal aliens (ie. illegally bringing them into the country) with the penalty which the law provides for under the pre-existing immigration legislation. To penalize people who beat their domestic workers with the penalty for assault and/or battery. To penalize people who hold others against

their will with the penalty for kidnapping; and on and on. The answer is to spend people power and resources on finding and punishing the Slavers for the crimes they must commit in order to be a slaver. If they are caught and prosecuted, and then sent to prison or fined enough that they lost money from their evil acts; and it happens to them relentlessly, and it is known that people doing wrong will be found and found again and all of the laws will be enforced and enforced again, soon Slavers will avoid doing their evil because it will not be profitable or they will be in prison.

Back over 150 years ago, in the days of legal slavery, Britain knew that after it passed its *Abolition Act* very little would change on its own; that people would not just honour the new law. What did Britain do to make sure that the *Abolition Act* was not just a paper promise to end slavery ? Britain sent out its Royal Navy, the real scourge of the seven seas back in the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries, to hunt down and force Slavers to obey the law. It was not the changing of the law that ended historical slavery, it was the relentless enforcing of the law that ended historical slavery.

**Similarly, no new anti-slavery or anti-human-trafficking laws were needed in the 21<sup>st</sup> century; what was needed and what is needed is the relentless enforcing of the pre-existing criminal laws and minimum wage laws and immigration law, which are being broken by Slavers because they cannot enslave people or traffic people without breaking them. The scourge of the 21<sup>st</sup> century seas is the American Navy. There are no 21<sup>st</sup> century slave ships, whatever form they take, that are going to refuse to stand down if an American (or British or French or German or Russian, etc.) Frigate, Corvette, Destroyer, Cruiser, AAS (Amphibious Assault Ship), Aircraft Carrier, Sub, or (this one's only a U.S.A. ship) Littoral Combat Ship tells them to stand and deliver. That would quickly end human trafficking that relied on ocean going vessels, which is a lot of it, because they ain't bringing them in economy class on the airlines. Regarding the law of the ocean, there is no law of the ocean because no country owns it. Regarding the laws of costal waters, what country or what court is going to have an issue with a slave ship being boarded and the slaves freed ? Regarding in continent human trafficking and slavery, restlessly enforcing the existing criminal laws and other laws would quickly bring it to a near end.**

**Slavers are evil people, they have no sympathy or empathy for other people's lives. To a Slaver a person is a cardboard box, the existence of which has no value beyond how it can be useful to the Slaver. It can be mercilessly used until it is destroyed, it can be left alone in a closet until it is taken out to be used, it can be sold or thrown out; it has no value to**

**the Slaver beyond its use to the Slaver. Criminals who lie, cheat, steal, rob, swindle, embezzle, are bad people who should feel the penalty of the law; other criminals are evil people. Slavers are evil people; whether they steal a person and sell that person into slavery, or they transport a stolen person to some other destination of slavery, or they keep slaves, they are knowingly and with full presence of mind and will, stealing the time out of that person's life; and that is evil. Therefore, if a person is a slaver, they deserve to be charged with every crime they have committed in the course of being a slaver (ie. kidnapping, assault, battery, extortion, breach of immigration law, breach of wage laws, breach of working conditions laws, etc.) and when convicted, to be given the maximum penalty which the law provides, because as they have no sympathy or empathy for other people's lives, their lives deserve no sympathy or empathy from the law. (Whether a slaver has taken a person by force, or they have deceived a person into going with them, if they will not return that person to from where they got them, when that person asks to be returned, they have stolen that person; theft by force or by deceit is still theft.)**

---

Regarding the second big question: If anti-slavery laws can be enacted to make slavery illegal, can slavery laws be enacted to make slavery legal ?

Take a look at some 20<sup>th</sup> century laws:

At the end of the 19th century and in the beginning of the 20th century some American states had anti-interracial marriage laws, anti-interracial sex laws and anti-interracial cohabitation laws. Some states had laws banning marriage between a person of African descent and any person not of African descent, and banning marriage between Native Americans and African Americans.

In 1935 Germany passed what are know as the Nuremberg Laws which, in part, stated that:

“1. A Reich citizen is a subject of the state who is of German or related blood, and proves by his conduct that he is willing and fit to faithfully serve the German people and Reich.

2. Reich citizenship is acquired through the granting of a Reich citizenship certificate.

3. The Reich citizen is the sole bearer of full political rights in accordance with the law.”

The point of the above law is that Jewish People and other people who were not considered to be of German or related blood, even if they were born in Germany and were therefore German

citizens, were from that point on NOT German citizens and therefore no longer had full rights. The point of that law was also that every German had to get a Reich citizenship certificate or they were not citizens of Germany.

Germany also passed other laws leading up their laws making Jewish People slaves who were forced to live in concentration camps (a place they did not want to live); and laws taking away all of their property without compensation; and laws forcing them to do work they did not want to do, until they were killed.

During the Second World War, in Canada and in the United States there were the forced internment laws for Japanese people, many of whom were citizens of the country which interned them. In Canada, forcing a Canadian of Japanese ancestry to live in a camp, which they could not leave, and taking away some of their other liberties, was slavery. In the United States, forcing an American of Japanese ancestry to live in a camp, which they could not leave, and taking away some of their other liberties, was slavery.

In Canada, up until 1960, the law forbid Aboriginals from voting unless they gave up their treaty rights and their status under the Indian Act.

Until 1996 Canada had what is commonly known as the Residential School Law, which made slaves out of school aged Aboriginals. They were forced to live in a place they did not want to live, they were forced to do work they did not want to do, they were forced to speak a language that was not their own, which many of them did not want to speak, and they were forced to change their religion.

There are other modern laws in Canada, the States, the U.K., etc. which demonstrate that if a government wants to enact laws which are clearly against the Constitution, and even which create slaves, the government will do so.

---

### **What can you do to help eradicate slavery ?**

Presently the Canadian and American governments want to be seen as trying to stop slavery. **Therefore, send your political leaders and political representatives a link to this paper, or a copy of this paper, and ask them to answer the following 5 questions:**

- How can a person enslave another person (ie. **force them** to stay in a place they want to leave **or force them** to do work they do not want to do) without breaking either:  
(i) the criminal law against kidnapping or (ii) the criminal law against assault or (iii) the criminal law against battery or (iv) the criminal law against extortion ?
  
- In your country, in the preceding year, in a situation where a charge under an anti-slavery law was not made and a charge under an anti-human-trafficking law was not made, in aggregate how many people were convicted of the crime of kidnapping, plus how many people were convicted of the crime of assault, plus how many people were convicted of the crime of battery, plus how many people were convicted of the crime of extortion ?
  
- In your country, in the preceding year, in a situation where a charge under an anti-slavery law was made OR a charge under an anti-human-trafficking law was made, in aggregate, in how many of those cases could the person have **instead** been charged with either the crime of kidnapping or the crime of assault or the crime of battery or the crime of extortion or with breaching pre-existing immigration law ?
  
- On a per charge basis, excluding over-head, but including the cost of all person power necessary to obtain the evidence, lay the charge and conduct the trial, what was the average cost per person convicted:  
(i) under an anti-slavery law where no conviction was also obtained under a crime that pre-existed that anti-slavery law ?  
(ii) under an anti-human-trafficking law where no conviction was also obtained under a crime that pre-existed that anti-human-trafficking law ?
  
- Where a charge under an anti-slavery law was not made and a charge under an anti-human-trafficking law was not made, on a per charge basis, excluding over-head, but including the cost of all person power necessary to obtain the evidence, lay the charge and conduct the trial what was the average cost per person convicted:  
(i) under a kidnapping law ?  
(ii) under a battery law ?  
(iii) under an assault law ?  
(iv) under an extortion law ?  
(v) under an immigration law ?

Then continue to contact your political leaders and political representatives until they send you **responsive** answers to each of the above 5 questions. Their answers will speak for themselves and they will know that you know they are not trying to stop slavery; which may cause them to actually do what is needed to stop slavery.

---

**As stated above, below are excerpts from:**

- (i) Britain's "Modern Slavery Act 2015";
- (ii) Canada's 2005 Bill C-49 "An Act To Amend The Criminal Code (Trafficking in Persons)"; and
- (iii) The United States' 2000 "Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000".

Before you read those excerpts consider the clear wording of The French National Assembly in 1789:

"Men are born and remain free and equal in rights."

And consider the clear wording of the 13<sup>th</sup> amendment to the U.S. Constitution:

"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."

Britain's 2015 anti-slavery legislation starts off sounding great, however, by the end of the first page you will discover that just to decide if a crime was committed a maze of other legislation has to be gone through. If you do read all of it, you will see that there is a great amount of subjectivity involved, and the strong possibility of many reasons why what the Slaver did, was not strictly speaking against the literal word of that anti-slavery act (if anyone can say with certainty what that literal word is).

In the Canadian Act, at the very beginning, to be an illegal trafficker it has to be 'for the purpose of exploitation'. What does that mean? Are large highly profitable corporations Slavers? Is it exploitation when the corporation's owners each make more money in one month than many of their employees will earn in their entire lifetime? (When total monthly income is calculated, for each of the owners, the foregoing is a literal fact for many large highly profitable corporations; just do the math. An employee earning \$50,000 per year times 40 years of labour = two million dollars. Many corporate owners and even executives make way over twenty-five million a year. However, even at \$25,000,000 a year, when you divide it by twelve months you get two million and eighty-three thousand dollars PER MONTH; which is more than the \$50,000 per year employee earned after forty years of working.) But I am certain that Canada's new anti-slavery act was not seeking to send Canada's richest people to prison as slavers. It is equally obvious from the preceding example that the phrase 'for the purpose of exploitation' is far too subjective to

be an effective standard by which to determine if someone is a slaver. That is just one of many examples of an almost impossible to enforce statement in Canada's new anti-slavery act. (For the record, I am not against business of any size, and I am not against profit, I am simply pointing out that subjective phrases such as: 'for the purpose of exploitation' do not belong in a criminal or quasi-criminal law because they do not have a specific meaning; and you cannot prove a crime has been committed when whether or not a breach has taken place will always be a matter of opinion.)

**That aforesaid phrase and a significant amount of the other wording in the Canadian Act makes it hard to lay charges and even harder to get convictions, as demonstrated by the trivial conviction rate.**

The American Act, which I have left for last, is a doozy of a doozy, which needs no hints from me for you to discover its ineffectiveness through its complexity.



# Modern Slavery Act 2015

## 2015 CHAPTER 30

An Act to make provision about slavery, servitude and forced or compulsory labour and about human trafficking, including provision for the protection of victims; to make provision for an Independent Anti-slavery Commissioner; and for connected purposes. [26th March 2015]

**B**E IT ENACTED by the Queen's most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows:—

### PART 1

#### OFFENCES

##### *Offences*

## 1 Slavery, servitude and forced or compulsory labour

(1) A person commits an offence if—

- (a) the person holds another person in slavery or servitude and the circumstances are such that the person knows or ought to know that the other person is held in slavery or servitude, or
- (b) the person requires another person to perform forced or compulsory labour and the circumstances are such that the person knows or ought

to know that the other person is being required to perform forced or compulsory labour.

- (2) In subsection (1) the references to holding a person in slavery or servitude or requiring a person to perform forced or compulsory labour are to be construed in accordance with Article 4 of the Human Rights Convention.
- (3) In determining whether a person is being held in slavery or servitude or required to perform forced or compulsory labour, regard may be had to all the circumstances.

- (4) For example, regard may be had –
  - (a) to any of the person's personal circumstances (such as the person being a child, the person's family relationships, and any mental or physical illness) which may make the person more vulnerable than other persons;
  - (b) to any work or services provided by the person, including work or services provided in circumstances which constitute exploitation within section 3(3) to (6).
- (5) The consent of a person (whether an adult or a child) to any of the acts alleged to constitute holding the person in slavery or servitude, or requiring the person to perform forced or compulsory labour, does not preclude a determination that the person is being held in slavery or servitude, or required to perform forced or compulsory labour.

## **2 Human trafficking**

- (1) A person commits an offence if the person arranges or facilitates the travel of another person ("V") with a view to V being exploited.
- (2) It is irrelevant whether V consents to the travel (whether V is an adult or a child).
- (3) A person may in particular arrange or facilitate V's travel by recruiting V, transporting or transferring V, harbouring or receiving V, or transferring or

exchanging control over V.

- (4) A person arranges or facilitates V's travel with a view to V being exploited only if—
- (a) the person intends to exploit V (in any part of the world) during or after the travel, or
  - (b) the person knows or ought to know that another person is likely to exploit V (in any part of the world) during or after the travel.
- (5) "Travel" means—
- (a) arriving in, or entering, any country,
  - (b) departing from any country,
  - (c) travelling within any country.
- (6) A person who is a UK national commits an offence under this section regardless of—
- (a) where the arranging or facilitating takes place, or
  - (b) where the travel takes place.
- (7) A person who is not a UK national commits an offence under this section if—
- (a) any part of the arranging or facilitating takes place in the United Kingdom, or
  - (b) the travel consists of arrival in or entry into, departure from, or travel within, the United Kingdom.

### 3 Meaning of exploitation

- (1) For the purposes of section 2 a person is exploited only if one or more of the following subsections apply in relation to the person.

---

*Slavery, servitude and forced or compulsory labour*

- (2) The person is the victim of behaviour—
- (a) which involves the commission of an offence under section 1, or
  - (b) which would involve the commission of an offence under that section if it took place in England and Wales.

*Sexual exploitation*

- (3) Something is done to or in respect of the person—
- (a) which involves the commission of an offence under—
    - (i) section 1(1)(a) of the Protection of Children Act 1978 (indecent photographs of children), or

- (ii) Part 1 of the Sexual Offences Act 2003 (sexual offences), as it has effect in England and Wales, or
- (b) which would involve the commission of such an offence if it were done in England and Wales.

*Removal of organs etc*

- (4) The person is encouraged, required or expected to do anything –
  - (a) which involves the commission, by him or her or another person, of an offence under section 32 or 33 of the Human Tissue Act 2004 (prohibition of commercial dealings in organs and restrictions on use of live donors) as it has effect in England and Wales, or
  - (b) which would involve the commission of such an offence, by him or her or another person, if it were done in England and Wales.

*Securing services etc by force, threats or deception*

- (5) The person is subjected to force, threats or deception designed to induce him or her –
  - (a) to provide services of any kind,
  - (b) to provide another person with benefits of any kind, or
  - (c) to enable another person to acquire benefits of any kind.

*Securing services etc from children and vulnerable persons*

- (6) Another person uses or attempts to use the person for a purpose within paragraph (a), (b) or (c) of subsection (5), having chosen him or her for that purpose on the grounds that –
  - (a) he or she is a child, is mentally or physically ill or disabled, or has a family relationship with a particular person, and
  - (b) an adult, or a person without the illness, disability, or family relationship, would be likely to refuse to be used for that purpose.

**4 Committing offence with intent to commit offence under section 2**

A person commits an offence under this section if the person commits any offence with the intention of committing an offence under section 2 (including an offence committed by aiding, abetting, counselling or procuring an offence under that section).



CANADA

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT  
BIBLIOTHÈQUE DU PARLEMENT

BILL C-49: AN ACT TO AMEND THE CRIMINAL CODE  
(TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS)\*

INTRODUCTION

Coming into force on 25 November 2005, Bill C-49 amends the *Criminal Code*<sup>(1)</sup> to specifically prohibit trafficking in persons in Canada. It is part of the government's commitment to the protection of vulnerable persons and ongoing strategy to combat human trafficking.

Previously, the *Criminal Code* contained no provisions to specifically prohibit trafficking in persons, although a number of offences – including kidnapping, uttering threats, and extortion – played a role in targeting this crime. In 2002, the *Immigration and Refugee Protection Act*<sup>(2)</sup> brought Canada's first anti-trafficking legislation into force. Section 118 prohibits bringing anyone into Canada by means of abduction, fraud, deception, or use or threat of force or coercion.

Bill C-49 adds to this legislation by going beyond the focus on immigration and making trafficking in persons a criminal offence. The bill contains three prohibitions. The first contains the global prohibition on trafficking in persons, defined as the recruitment, transport, transfer, receipt, concealment or harbouring of a person, or the exercise of control, direction or influence over the movements of a person, for the purpose of exploitation. The second prohibits a person from benefiting economically from trafficking. The third prohibits the withholding or destroying of identity, immigration, or travel documents to facilitate trafficking in persons.

---

**Shawn's note: The second and third prohibitions are each tied to the first prohibition, which must be 'for the purpose of exploitation'.**

Public Law 106-386  
106th Congress

An Act

Oct. 28, 2000  
[H.R. 3244]

To combat trafficking in persons, especially into the sex trade, slavery, and involuntary servitude, to reauthorize certain Federal programs to prevent violence against women, and for other purposes.

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the “Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000”.

**SEC. 2. ORGANIZATION OF ACT INTO DIVISIONS; TABLE OF CONTENTS.**

(a) **DIVISIONS.**—This Act is organized into three divisions, as follows:

- (1) **DIVISION A.**—Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000.
- (2) **DIVISION B.**—Violence Against Women Act of 2000.
- (3) **DIVISION C.**—Miscellaneous Provisions.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title.

Sec. 2. Organization of Act into divisions; table of contents.

**DIVISION A—TRAFFICKING VICTIMS PROTECTION ACT OF 2000**

Sec. 101. Short title.

Sec. 102. Purposes and findings.

Sec. 103. Definitions.

Sec. 104. Annual Country Reports on Human Rights Practices.

Sec. 105. Interagency Task Force To Monitor and Combat Trafficking.

Sec. 106. Prevention of trafficking.

Sec. 107. Protection and assistance for victims of trafficking.

Sec. 108. Minimum standards for the elimination of trafficking.

Sec. 109. Assistance to foreign countries to meet minimum standards.

Sec. 110. Actions against governments failing to meet minimum standards.

Sec. 111. Actions against significant traffickers in persons.

Sec. 112. Strengthening prosecution and punishment of traffickers.

Sec. 113. Authorizations of appropriations.

**DIVISION B—VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT OF 2000**

Sec. 1001. Short title.

Sec. 1002. Definitions.

Sec. 1003. Accountability and oversight.

**TITLE I—STRENGTHENING LAW ENFORCEMENT TO REDUCE VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN**

Sec. 1101. Full faith and credit enforcement of protection orders.

Sec. 1102. Role of courts.

Sec. 1103. Reauthorization of STOP grants.

Sec. 1104. Reauthorization of grants to encourage arrest policies.

Sec. 1105. Reauthorization of rural domestic violence and child abuse enforcement grants.

Sec. 1106. National stalker and domestic violence reduction.

Victims of  
Trafficking and  
Violence  
Protection Act of  
2000.  
22 USC 7101  
note.

- Sec. 1107. Amendments to domestic violence and stalking offenses.
- Sec. 1108. School and campus security.
- Sec. 1109. Dating violence.

#### TITLE II—STRENGTHENING SERVICES TO VICTIMS OF VIOLENCE

- Sec. 1201. Legal assistance for victims.
- Sec. 1202. Shelter services for battered women and children.
- Sec. 1203. Transitional housing assistance for victims of domestic violence.
- Sec. 1204. National domestic violence hotline.
- Sec. 1205. Federal victims counselors.
- Sec. 1206. Study of State laws regarding insurance discrimination against victims of violence against women.
- Sec. 1207. Study of workplace effects from violence against women.
- Sec. 1208. Study of unemployment compensation for victims of violence against women.
- Sec. 1209. Enhancing protections for older and disabled women from domestic violence and sexual assault.

#### TITLE III—LIMITING THE EFFECTS OF VIOLENCE ON CHILDREN

- Sec. 1301. Safe havens for children pilot program.
- Sec. 1302. Reauthorization of victims of child abuse programs.
- Sec. 1303. Report on effects of parental kidnapping laws in domestic violence cases.

#### TITLE IV—STRENGTHENING EDUCATION AND TRAINING TO COMBAT VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

- Sec. 1401. Rape prevention and education.
- Sec. 1402. Education and training to end violence against and abuse of women with disabilities.
- Sec. 1403. Community initiatives.
- Sec. 1404. Development of research agenda identified by the Violence Against Women Act of 1994.
- Sec. 1405. Standards, practice, and training for sexual assault forensic examinations.
- Sec. 1406. Education and training for judges and court personnel.
- Sec. 1407. Domestic Violence Task Force.

#### TITLE V—BATTERED IMMIGRANT WOMEN

- Sec. 1501. Short title.
- Sec. 1502. Findings and purposes.
- Sec. 1503. Improved access to immigration protections of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 for battered immigrant women.
- Sec. 1504. Improved access to cancellation of removal and suspension of deportation under the Violence Against Women Act of 1994.
- Sec. 1505. Offering equal access to immigration protections of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 for all qualified battered immigrant self-petitioners.
- Sec. 1506. Restoring immigration protections under the Violence Against Women Act of 1994.
- Sec. 1507. Remedying problems with implementation of the immigration provisions of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994.
- Sec. 1508. Technical correction to qualified alien definition for battered immigrants.
- Sec. 1509. Access to Cuban Adjustment Act for battered immigrant spouses and children.
- Sec. 1510. Access to the Nicaraguan Adjustment and Central American Relief Act for battered spouses and children.
- Sec. 1511. Access to the Haitian Refugee Fairness Act of 1998 for battered spouses and children.
- Sec. 1512. Access to services and legal representation for battered immigrants.
- Sec. 1513. Protection for certain crime victims including victims of crimes against women.

#### TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS

- Sec. 1601. Notice requirements for sexually violent offenders.
- Sec. 1602. Teen suicide prevention study.
- Sec. 1603. Decade of pain control and research.

Sec. 2001. Aimee's law.

Sec. 2002. Payment of anti-terrorism judgments.

Sec. 2003. Aid to victims of terrorism.

Sec. 2004. Twenty-first amendment enforcement.

114 STAT. 1466

PUBLIC LAW 106-386—OCT. 28, 2000

Trafficking  
Victims  
Protection Act of  
2000.

## DIVISION A—TRAFFICKING VICTIMS PROTECTION ACT OF 2000

22 USC 7101  
note.

### SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This division may be cited as the “Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000”.

22 USC 7101.

### SEC. 102. PURPOSES AND FINDINGS.

(a) **PURPOSES.**—The purposes of this division are to combat trafficking in persons, a contemporary manifestation of slavery whose victims are predominantly women and children, to ensure just and effective punishment of traffickers, and to protect their victims.

(b) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds that:

(1) As the 21st century begins, the degrading institution of slavery continues throughout the world. Trafficking in persons is a modern form of slavery, and it is the largest manifestation of slavery today. At least 700,000 persons annually, primarily women and children, are trafficked within or across international borders. Approximately 50,000 women and children are trafficked into the United States each year.

(2) Many of these persons are trafficked into the international sex trade, often by force, fraud, or coercion. The sex industry has rapidly expanded over the past several decades. It involves sexual exploitation of persons, predominantly women and girls, involving activities related to prostitution, pornography, sex tourism, and other commercial sexual services. The low status of women in many parts of the world has contributed to a burgeoning of the trafficking industry.

(3) Trafficking in persons is not limited to the sex industry. This growing transnational crime also includes forced labor and involves significant violations of labor, public health, and human rights standards worldwide.

(4) Traffickers primarily target women and girls, who are disproportionately affected by poverty, the lack of access to education, chronic unemployment, discrimination, and the lack of economic opportunities in countries of origin. Traffickers lure women and girls into their networks through false promises of decent working conditions at relatively good pay as nannies, maids, dancers, factory workers, restaurant workers, sales clerks, or models. Traffickers also buy children from poor families and sell them into prostitution or into various types of forced or bonded labor.

(5) Traffickers often transport victims from their home communities to unfamiliar destinations, including foreign countries away from family and friends, religious institutions, and other sources of protection and support, leaving the victims defenseless and vulnerable.

(6) Victims are often forced through physical violence to engage in sex acts or perform slavery-like labor. Such force includes rape and other forms of sexual abuse, torture, starvation, imprisonment, threats, psychological abuse, and coercion.

(7) Traffickers often make representations to their victims that physical harm may occur to them or others should the victim escape or attempt to escape. Such representations can

have the same coercive effects on victims as direct threats to inflict such harm.

(8) Trafficking in persons is increasingly perpetrated by organized, sophisticated criminal enterprises. Such trafficking is the fastest growing source of profits for organized criminal enterprises worldwide. Profits from the trafficking industry contribute to the expansion of organized crime in the United States and worldwide. Trafficking in persons is often aided by official corruption in countries of origin, transit, and destination, thereby threatening the rule of law.

(9) Trafficking includes all the elements of the crime of forcible rape when it involves the involuntary participation of another person in sex acts by means of fraud, force, or coercion.

(10) Trafficking also involves violations of other laws, including labor and immigration codes and laws against kidnapping, slavery, false imprisonment, assault, battery, pandering, fraud, and extortion.

(11) Trafficking exposes victims to serious health risks. Women and children trafficked in the sex industry are exposed to deadly diseases, including HIV and AIDS. Trafficking victims are sometimes worked or physically brutalized to death.

(12) Trafficking in persons substantially affects interstate and foreign commerce. Trafficking for such purposes as involuntary servitude, peonage, and other forms of forced labor has an impact on the nationwide employment network and labor market. Within the context of slavery, servitude, and labor or services which are obtained or maintained through coercive conduct that amounts to a condition of servitude, victims are subjected to a range of violations.

(13) Involuntary servitude statutes are intended to reach cases in which persons are held in a condition of servitude through nonviolent coercion. In *United States v. Kozminski*, 487 U.S. 931 (1988), the Supreme Court found that section 1584 of title 18, United States Code, should be narrowly interpreted, absent a definition of involuntary servitude by Congress. As a result, that section was interpreted to criminalize only

servitude that is brought about through use or threatened use of physical or legal coercion, and to exclude other conduct that can have the same purpose and effect.

(14) Existing legislation and law enforcement in the United States and other countries are inadequate to deter trafficking and bring traffickers to justice, failing to reflect the gravity of the offenses involved. No comprehensive law exists in the United States that penalizes the range of offenses involved in the trafficking scheme. Instead, even the most brutal instances of trafficking in the sex industry are often punished under laws that also apply to lesser offenses, so that traffickers typically escape deserved punishment.

(15) In the United States, the seriousness of this crime and its components is not reflected in current sentencing guidelines, resulting in weak penalties for convicted traffickers.

(16) In some countries, enforcement against traffickers is also hindered by official indifference, by corruption, and sometimes even by official participation in trafficking.