SOMETIMES IT IS BETTER NOT TO BE UNIQUE: THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE VIEW ON INTERCOUNTRY ADOPTION AND CHILD TRAFFICKING AND WHY IT SHOULD CHANGE
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I. INTRODUCTION

Thousands of children are brought to the United States through the intercountry adoption process every year. Most of these children are orphans with no homes, no families, and no legitimate expectations of a normal life in their home countries. Though adoption seemingly offers a chance at a happier life, some children are victims of nefarious human trafficking schemes, driven by sub-par adoption agencies and unethical individuals. Many illicit intercountry adoptions, which should amount to trafficking, are never prosecuted as human trafficking even when those adoptions are tied to the United States.

The Intercountry Adoption Act of 2000 and other U.S. laws have already established hurdles high enough to ensure that most adoption agencies employ ethical practices, primarily through regulation of adoption agencies and thorough background checks and home studies for prospective parents. Still, those who want to engage in illicit behavior are likely to do so despite these high
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1. Intercountry adoption is also often referred to as “international adoption,” however, among experts in the area and legal professionals familiar with the practice, it is more common and appropriate to use the term “intercountry adoption.”


3. The United States only prosecutes trafficking related to forced sex or labor. Illegal adoptions that contain all the elements relevant international law would recognize as sufficient for a charge of trafficking are not prosecuted as trafficking in the United States, absent forced sex or labor.


5. See STUCK (Globox Media 2013) (following the adoptions of four children in three different countries as they progress through the adoption system and explaining that The Hague Convention has created regulations that, while well intentioned, are overly restrictive and are having a crippling effect on adoptions); Kelly Ensslin, Fixing the International Adoption Mess, GLOBALPOST (May 20, 2012), http://www.globalpost.com/dispatches/globalpost-blogs/commentary/fixed-the-international-adoption-mess (discussing how regulations may have actually gone too far since some Vietnamese children that were approved for adoption as early as 2008 were not actually brought into the U.S. until 2012).
hurdles. Inadequate prosecution of lawbreakers only exacerbates the potential for misbehavior and does a great disservice to the stringent regulations already in place. Adequate prosecution of unscrupulous individuals and agencies that engage in trafficking, on the other hand, would enhance the credibility of the system and deter unethical behavior.6 This note is a call for “a policy solution to a heinous crime”, and a push for prosecution to “free[] the victims and punish[] their tormentors.”

This note looks at the basic international and domestic definitions of trafficking and applies them to intercountry adoptions. It uses definitions found in the UN Trafficking Protocol8 and The Hague Convention Guide to Good Practice9 to highlight the need for the US government to broaden its current narrow definition of trafficking in accordance with these international guidelines.

Under U.S. government policy, intercountry adoptions do not constitute trafficking unless the adoption contains an element of prostitution or forced labor.10 Although the U.S. State Department acknowledges it is “unique”11 in taking this position, it maintains this narrow interpretation to the detriment of honest individuals and agencies, and to the benefit of the unethical. Despite ample evidence surrounding persons who promote intercountry adoptions that amount to trafficking, after extensive research an instance of an intercountry adoption related trafficking prosecution could not be identified.12 When individuals were prosecuted for non-trafficking crimes in connection with illicit intercountry adoptions, they almost uniformly received lighter sentences than the sentences that sex or labor traffickers received. Instead, they received light sentences with little or no jail time and modest or no fines.

This note investigates two nearly unbelievable cases of individuals and

---

6. See generally, Anthony A. Braga, Getting Deterrence Right? Evaluation Evidence and Complementary Crime Control Mechanisms, 11 CRIMINOLOGY & PUBLIC POLICY 201 (explaining that deterrence does work, particularly when focused, and debating how to appropriately focus deterrence efforts so that the population most likely to commit a certain crime is deterred through police investigations, prosecutions, and other enforcement activities).


11. Id.

12. Research was conducted through the Pound Pup Database, Wikipedia lists of adoption scandals, internet searches, U.S. websites and documents, and research of hundreds of newspaper and scholarly articles without finding a single instance of an individual being charged with a trafficking offense, much less prosecuted, in a trafficking via intercountry adoption scenario.
agencies accused of engaging in fraudulent behavior with respect to intercountry adoptions. One case involves a former hula dancer who became one of the largest facilitators of adoptions from Cambodia, most of which were illegal.\(^{13}\) The other details the misdeeds of a Utah-based adoption agency operating in Samoa.\(^{14}\) These two heartbreaking cases highlight the need for prosecution of child traffickers. Unfortunately, neither case led to any charges of, let alone convictions for, human trafficking.

In the U.S., the bulk of the necessary legal framework already exists to prosecute intercountry adoptions that amount to trafficking as human trafficking. But only by recognizing the salience of established international trafficking definitions and prohibitions in the context of illicit intercountry adoptions can the U.S. begin to combat this evil.

II. OVERVIEW

Human trafficking via intercountry adoption occurs at varying rates in many countries throughout the world.\(^{15}\) Intercountry adoptions that amount to trafficking can occur in either the “receiving state” (where the child will be residing permanently after the adoption) or the “state of origin” (the child’s home state prior to adoption). It is likely that intercountry adoptions that amount to trafficking are more prevalent in states of origin, although states of origin do not have a monopoly on trafficking.\(^{16}\) Comprehensive and accurate research is scarce due to the illegality of trafficking, but most such trafficking occurs when children are brought from impoverished countries to more affluent Western countries.\(^{17}\) Intercountry adoptions amounting to trafficking can occur in a variety of ways: a child may be sold by parents, kidnapped from boarding schools or orphanages, taken from the streets, separated from family under false pretenses, or otherwise trafficked into the intercountry adoption system.\(^{18}\) A nurse may tell a woman who has just given birth that the child died and then the nurse may turn the child over to an orphanage or adoption agency for a finder’s fee.\(^{19}\) In another instance, a mother may merely believe that she is only “loaning” her child to foreign parents without relinquishing her own rights.\(^{20}\)

---

13. Desiree Smolin & David Kruchkow, Why the Bad Stories Must be Told, THE ADOPTION AGENCY CHECKLIST (May 7, 2005), http://archive.is/u55Z (The Adoption Agency Checklist website is not currently functional, but this archived copy is accessible).


16. See generally Co-operation Between Central Authorities, supra note 171. (discussing problems of trafficking and other illicit adoptions with a focus on states of origin, implying that inadequate protections are given to children in states of origin).

17. See id.

18. For a detailed description of common child trafficking scenarios see id. at 118–24.

19. E.J. Graff, Call it Trafficking, THE AMERICAN PROSPECT (Jan 3, 2013), http://prospect.org/article/call-it-trafficking. Graff also introduces scenarios of paying families to send their youngest children to the U.S., ostensibly for educational purposes, and simply stealing a child off the streets of a busy developing city.

20. See Jorge L. Carro, Regulation of Intercountry Adoption: Can the Abuses Come to an End?, 18
Many parties to the Hague Convention have been trying, through internal and international means, to prevent human trafficking via intercountry adoptions, but recent reports indicate that there is still work to be done. Unfortunately, it is difficult to accurately predict how often trafficking is occurring because of its illicit nature and variances across countries in how their adoption systems operate. Nonetheless, some attempts have been made to chronicle illicit intercountry adoptions. Yet an authoritative and comprehensive analysis of even one country, let alone all countries, is hard to find. Australia, one of the leaders in this area, recently dealt with several incidents of child trafficking from India that were connected to intercountry adoptions. However, ultimately the Australian Attorney-General’s Department was forced to launch an investigation while Indian officials indicted an Indian regulatory official for his role in the trafficking. Nonetheless, “the Australian system is vulnerable to trafficking in children through illicit intercountry adoptions, despite taking greater measures than the U.S. has taken to prevent trafficking.” Such measures have included an increase in cooperation between the Commonwealth and the Australian States, revised citizenship legalization for adoptees, the formation of consulting groups, and the development of a strategic plan.

Sometimes perpetrators of illicit intercountry adoptions, including adoptions that amount to trafficking, may be brought before a competent tribunal, as occurred with an Indian official and his employees who were indicted in India for trafficking in connection with the Australian cases. However, not all instances of trafficking are prosecuted, whether as trafficking or otherwise.

---

21. See HAGUE CONFERENCE ON PRIVATE INTERNATIONAL LAW, supra note 9, at 33 (noting just three of many examples, Belgium, Chile, and Lithuania, where paying money to unlawfully facilitate an adoption is punishable by several years in prison and citing Interpol as stating that “the establishment of strict international civil and administrative procedures would make it much more difficult for people to use intercountry adoption procedures as a means of trafficking in children, or as a cover for moving children from one country to another”).

22. See, e.g., Anastasia Moloney, Baby-snatching for Illegal Adoption Hits the Headlines in Guatemala, THOMPSON REUTERS FOUNDATION (Oct. 4, 2013), http://www.trust.org/item/20131004103251-6uga0/ (reporting on a resurgence of infant snatching in Guatemala and laws being put in place to try and prevent the crime).


24. SIOBHAN CLAIR, CHILD TRAFFICKING AND AUSTRALIA’S INTERCOUNTRY ADOPTION SYSTEM 4 (2012) available at http://www.law.uq.edu.au/documents/humantraffic/child-trafficking/Child-trafficking-and-Australias-intercountry-adoption-System.pdf. The report does not make clear how many incidents were investigated nor how many instances of trafficking are thought to have occurred, but from 2009-10012 only 12 children were brought into Australia from India through intercountry adoption.

25. Id. at 6.

26. Id. at 2. Australia was also faced with a scandal revolving around adoptions from Ethiopia, which it tried to contain. Id. at 3.

27. Id. at 19.

28. Id. at 6.

III. CASE STUDIES

Through an investigation into two recent and relevant cases, the inadequacies of current methods for prosecuting intercountry adoptions that should amount to trafficking become apparent. The first case is one of a Hawaii and Seattle based operation that brought hundreds of children out of Cambodia for placement in the U.S.\(^{30}\) The second case involves a Utah-based agency that used a myriad of different tactics to entice Samoan families to relinquish their children for adoption to families in the U.S.\(^{31}\) Despite having all the requisite elements of trafficking (recruitment, transportation, transfer, harbouring, or receipt of a child for the purpose of exploitation, including money or other compensation to facilitate illegal adoption\(^{32}\)), neither case was prosecuted as trafficking.

A. Cambodia

In 2002 Hollywood star Angelina Jolie adopted her baby son Maddox from Cambodia.\(^{33}\) Two years later Lauryn Galindo, a former hula dancer and the woman who helped Jolie with her adoption, was indicted, charged, and pled guilty to visa fraud for her role in illegal adoptions.\(^{34}\) Galindo’s guilty plea came on the heels of her sister also pleading guilty to visa fraud and money laundering in connection with illegal adoptions.\(^{35}\) Of the nearly 800 adoptions facilitated by Galindo, it is estimated that most were fraudulent.\(^{36}\) Some of the children may have had forged or fraudulent papers, others may have been purchased from their families for nominal amounts, and others may have been victims of various nefarious schemes to take them away from their families and put them in the arms of adoptive parents with larger pocketbooks.\(^{37}\) No matter the methods used, it appears that many children were transferred or recruited “for the purposes of exploitation.”\(^{38}\) They were trafficked.\(^{39}\)
Along with her sister, Galindo was indicted for a slew of illegal activities. Reportedly, court documents allege that Galindo, on several occasions, urged prospective parents to retain documentation for children that had become ill or died and then transfer those documents to a healthy child, thus switching the identities of the adopted child. In one reported instance, Galindo knowingly lied to prospective parents when she said that the child they were to adopt was an orphan. In fact, the child’s birth mother had been encouraged to relinquish her rights to the child at the request of a person affiliated with Galindo. Galindo completed the child’s visa paperwork and claimed that the child was an orphan and the parents were unknown despite having written down in a medical record that the child’s mother was alive. The parents were asked to pay $3,500 directly to the orphanage, in addition to the money already paid for adoption service fees, and the adoption was completed.

In another instance, a prospective parent went to Cambodia to pick up a five-month-old. The parent decided not to go through with the adoption, but at the urging of Galindo completed the paperwork required for the adoption. Then Galindo took the child to Hawaii and placed him with a different adoptive parent.

In 1999, certain individuals in Cambodia began to suspect that Galindo’s adoption practices were not aboveboard. The Foreign Minister of Cambodia accused her of bribery and demanded an investigation. But three years later, Galindo, who was well liked by the Cambodian Prime Minister, received a medal for “national reconstruction.” Yet, Galindo later admitted that she gave over half of the average adoption service fee paid by prospective parents to Cambodian officials. She reportedly felt that it was “OK to give tips.” In her plea agreement, Galindo also admitted that one of the co-conspirators of her

compensation” count as exploitation. Galindo was receiving compensation for her services as an adoption facilitator. This compensation alone, whether or not it was above what would be normal for an adoption service provider, is enough to meet the exploitation portion of the trafficking definition because the adoptions she was facilitating were illegal.

39. Id. at art. 3(a). See Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, supra note 8, at art. 3(a) (defining trafficking in persons).


41. Id.
42. Id.
43. Id.
44. Id.
45. Id.
46. Id.
47. Id.
48. Id.
49. Id.
50. Id.
51. Id.
53. Id.
criminal enterprises was a Cambodian public official.54

Galindo was never charged with trafficking; instead she was allowed to enter a guilty plea to charges of conspiracy to commit visa fraud, conspiracy to commit money laundering, and structuring of financial transactions.55 The maximum cumulative penalty for these crimes is 30 years in prison and hundreds of thousands of dollars in fines56 Galindo was sentenced to 18 months in jail, three years of supervised release, 300 hours of community service, and a $300 assessment;57 an undoubtedly lenient sentence compared to those sentenced for trafficking.58 Some of the staff members at the orphanage Galindo partnered with were charged in Cambodia with trafficking, although the charges were later dropped.59

B. Samoa

What’s the worst thing that could happen as you walk through a teeming marketplace? A zealous shopper may take the mango you had been eyeing; a shrewd businessman may con you into buying a worthless product; a furtive pickpocket may make off with your wallet. In Samoa before 2007, employees and associates of Focus on Children targeted shoppers in the marketplace with a much darker scheme in mind.60 After identifying women as targets, Focus on Children would approach them in their villages to persuade them to give up their children.61 Some women were referred, by other innocent victims, to Focus on the Children’s scheme and gave up their children.62 Still others fell victim to presentations or discussions with village leaders designed to influence families to surrender their children to this American adoption agency.63

Seven individuals and the adoption agency were indicted in 2007 for illicit activities in Samoa and the United States relating to illegal adoptions.64 The indictment details eight specific instances of criminal behavior.65 Each instance contains overt acts—including transfer, transport, or receipt of children-designed

55.  Id. at 2.
56.  Id. at 3–4.
59.  Bainbridge, supra note 40. The reason for Cambodian authorities dropping the charges is unknown; however, the charges were dropped “so quietly that not even the lawyer” for the mothers of the trafficked children knew about it.
60.  Indictment in United States v. Focus on Children, supra note 31, at 8.
61.  Id.
62.  Id.
63.  Id.
64.  Id. at 1.
65.  Id. at 14–24.
to exploit the children for money or other compensation in furtherance of an illegal adoption; in other words, trafficking.66

In one occurrence, Focus on Children approached the birth parents of two young Samoan children and persuaded them to place their children in the Focus on Children “program.”67 The parents were told that they would see their children when they turned five and that at the age of 18 the children would return to reside permanently with their birth parents.68 Focus on Children referred these two young children to prospective adoptive parents and lied about the children’s circumstances.69 The prospective family was told that the children were in foster care and that the birth mother was poor and unable to care for these two children, who were the youngest of her seven children.70 In fact, the children were still living with their birth parents at the time, were being well cared for, and were the only children the parents had.71 The prospective parents repeatedly expressed interest in going to Samoa to pick up the two children.72 Focus on Children denied their request, citing a recent hurricane as the impetus for advising against travel to Samoa, and instead had the family pick up the children in New Zealand.73 At one point, the family questioned the legality of the adoption and asked if everything was legitimate.74 Focus on Children associates told them that everything was legal and the adoptive parents brought children they believed to be orphans to their new home in the U.S.75

Focus on Children also ran a “nanny home” in Samoa.76 Children were brought there after their parents had been convinced to allow the children to be given up for adoption (mainly through misrepresentations about the permanency of the adoption and false promises).77 In 2004, two siblings were place by their parents in the nanny home, even though their parents had not relinquished them.78 The birth parents periodically visited their children in the nanny home, during which visits they discovered that the children were not being fed enough and had sores on their little bodies.79 Almost a year after allowing Focus on Children to remove their children to the nanny home, the birth parents took one of the children to the hospital.80 The child was “very malnourished, dehydrated, and had a chronic ulcer on her left foot which had not been treated.”81 Two days after her arrival at the hospital, the child died.82
Even after the death of their child, the family was hounded by Focus on Children to relinquish their other child. They wisely refused.

Shortly after these events, an American family adopted three other children; more victims of Focus on Children’s adoption scheme. The birth parents of these three children had been approached by Focus on Children and told that the children would be placed in a program run by The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (Mormon Church) designed to educate Samoan children. Focus on Children deceitfully informed the birth parents that their children would frequently return to Samoa and that they would obtain dual citizenship. The birth parents eventually signed an agreement relinquishing the children, however, the document was in English and the birth parents were unaware of the blatant falsehoods contained within it. Two sets of adoptive parents adopted children from this sibling group. Focus on Children told one adoptive family that travel to Samoa to pick up their two children was ill advised because of recent bad publicity surrounding the death of the child that had been in the nanny home. The adoptive parents were also encouraged not to mention this death to State Department officials when filing paperwork to complete the adoptions. As the family was preparing to leave New Zealand for the United States, the two children attempted to run away in hopes of returning to their birth family in Samoa.

One adopted child “cried herself to sleep” for weeks after arriving in the U.S. The 4-year-old girl said things that made her adopted father suspect that something was wrong and that the story he had been told about the young girl by Focus on Children was inaccurate, to say the least.

Focus on Children and seven of its employees, or associates, were charged with conspiracy to commit alien smuggling and visa fraud, conspiracy to commit money laundering, bringing in illegal aliens to the U.S., various aiding and abetting charges, and other similar charges. They were not charged with trafficking. The agency itself was sentenced to remain inactive until the Samoan case was fully resolved and to pay an assessment of $400. The five U.S. employees entered a plea agreement that allowed for many of the charges to be
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91. Id.
92. Id. at 23–24.
94. Id.
95. Indictment in United States v. Focus on Children, supra note 31, at 1–2.
96. Id.
dismissed and were sentenced to five years probation, ordered to pay assessments ranging from $10 to $50, and make contributions to a trust fund to help adoptive families and birth families caught in this scheme maintain communications.\textsuperscript{98} No one received jail time and no fines were imposed.\textsuperscript{99} Two co-conspirators in the scheme are Samoan nationals residing in Samoa and have not, yet, faced charges in the U.S. They cannot be removed without consent of the Samoan government due to the lack of an extradition treaty with the U.S.\textsuperscript{100}

\textbf{IV. THE DEFINITION OF TRAFFICKING WITH RESPECT TO INTERCOUNTRY ADOPTIONS}

Deciding on a definition of trafficking is extremely difficult, especially in the sphere of intercountry adoptions. U.S. statutes dealing with intercountry adoption offer little guidance on a definition for trafficking.\textsuperscript{101} The Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (TVPA) only proffers a definition for “severe” forms of trafficking, implying that there are non-severe forms as well, but without defining them.\textsuperscript{102} Furthermore, different international instruments contain different wording establishing the basis for a charge of trafficking.\textsuperscript{103} Also, within intercountry adoption circles, terms such as “illicit adoption” or “wrongful adoption” are often used, which may or may not contain elements of trafficking.

The TVPA contains only a definition for “severe forms of trafficking”, which is limited to “sex trafficking in which a commercial sex act is induced . . . “ by certain means or the individual induced “to perform such act has not attained 18 years of age”, or trafficking “of a person for labor or services . . . “ through listed means.\textsuperscript{104} Throughout the TVPA the focus is primarily on sex trafficking and labor trafficking, although in several places it is noted that children may be victims of trafficking.\textsuperscript{105} The purpose of the act is “to combat trafficking in persons . . . ensure just and effective punishment of traffickers, and to protect their victims.”\textsuperscript{106} The purpose and definitions do not explicitly limit themselves to sex and labor trafficking, despite those being of primary concern in the


\textsuperscript{99} Id.


\textsuperscript{102} See 22 U.S.C. § 7102 (2006) (defining severe forms of trafficking as certain forms of labor or sex trafficking).

\textsuperscript{103} Compare Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children, Supplemetning the United Nations Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime art. 3(a), Nov. 15, 2000, S. TREATY DOC. NO. 108-16, 2237 U.N.T.S. 319 [hereinafter UN Trafficking Protocol] (not discussing trafficking in the intercountry adoption context, but not foreclosing its existence) with HAGUE CONFERENCE ON PRIVATE INTERNATIONAL LAW, supra note 10 (stating that illicit intercountry adoptions should be prevented, but leaving a definition of trafficking to its Guide to Good Practice).

\textsuperscript{104} Id.

\textsuperscript{105} Id.

The Intercountry Adoption Act of 2000 (IAA) does not mention trafficking in the context of intercountry adoptions. The act aims to prevent “abuses” of those involved in intercountry adoptions, but fails to specify what those abuses are. Despite not defining or referencing trafficking, the act does impose penalties for those who through fraud or misrepresentation engage in unscrupulous adoption practices.

The UN Trafficking Protocol, the main international instrument concerning human trafficking, defines trafficking as the “recruitment, transportation, transfer, harbouring or receipt of persons” through a variety of methods, including fraud, “for the purpose of exploitation.” For children to be victims of trafficking, however, no fraud, deceit, coercion, or other mean needs to be employed as long as there was “recruitment, transportation, transfer, harbouring or receipt of a child for the purpose of exploitation.” Every intercountry adoption involves either one or, in almost every instance, more of the first required elements: recruitment, transportation, transfer, harbouring, or receipt. The real question then becomes one of whether the purpose of the first element was for exploitation. Thus, it is imperative to understand what “exploitation” is. But, the UN Trafficking Protocol’s definition of “exploitation” is comprised of a non-comprehensive list that does not include illicit intercountry adoptions.

V. THE STATE DEPARTMENT’S POSITION

In the United States, intercountry adoptions that amount to trafficking (as defined by The Hague Convention Guide to Good Practice) are not prosecuted as human trafficking. The official view of the State Department is that “fraudulent intercountry adoptions are sometimes mislabeled as child trafficking.” It admits that among the 90 Hague Convention states, the U.S. is

107. Id.
109. See id.
110. See 42 U.S.C. § 14944 (2006). The penalties range from $50,000 fine for the first civil violation, to $250,000 fine with a maximum prison sentence of 5 years imprisonment in the case of a criminal penalty. Id.
111. UN Trafficking Protocol, supra note 103 (“‘Trafficking in persons’ shall mean the recruitment, transportation, transfer, harbouring or receipt of persons, by means of the threat or use of force or other forms of coercion, of abduction, of fraud, of deception, of the abuse of power or of a position of vulnerability or of the giving or receiving of payments or benefits to achieve the consent of a person having control over another person, for the purpose of exploitation. Exploitation shall include, at a minimum, the exploitation of the prostitution of others or other forms of sexual exploitation, forced labour or services, slavery or practices similar to slavery, servitude or the removal of organs”).
112. Id. at art. 3(c).
113. See id. at art. 3(a).
“unique” in taking this position.\textsuperscript{116} The State Department holds that, at a general level, trafficking in persons “may” include a profit motive, but that illegal adoptions that do not also have an intention for the child to become subject to forced labor or commercial sexual exploitation are not cases of trafficking.\textsuperscript{117} The distinction, thus, rests on the definition of exploitation. The State Department has chosen to accept a highly technical definition of exploitation that is restricted to “practice[s] similar to slavery” in the intercountry adoption context.\textsuperscript{118} For the State Department, absent such practices, trafficking has not occurred.\textsuperscript{119}

The Department claims that experts on intercountry adoption “understand the distinction” between trafficking and mere fraudulent intercountry adoption.\textsuperscript{120} Although the State Department recognizes that The Hague Convention establishes the prevention of trafficking as one of its main goals, it nonetheless does not accept the proposition that “child-buying” or other forms of trafficking for money or compensation in furtherance of an illegal adoption are trafficking because such actions do not comply with the technical definition\textsuperscript{121} If child-buying is combined with forced labor or prostitution then child trafficking has occurred, but the mere fact that a profit motive is present or exploitation, as understood by The Hague Conference on Private International Law,\textsuperscript{122} occurs does not constitute child trafficking.\textsuperscript{123} Part of the rationale for this contradiction with the Convention is the fact that intercountry adoption normally has a benevolent purpose; providing a loving home for children.\textsuperscript{124}

The Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (TVPA)\textsuperscript{125} also informs the State Department’s conclusion that fraudulent intercountry adoptions are not trafficking absent “compelled service.”\textsuperscript{126} The State Department claims that the definition of trafficking found in the TVPA is confined to conditions of “enslavement.”\textsuperscript{127} The TVPA found that traffickers “buy children” for prostitution or forced labor, traffickers “transport victims from their home communities to unfamiliar destinations”, trafficking “involves violations of other

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{116} Id. at 3–4.
\item \textsuperscript{117} Id. at 3.
\item \textsuperscript{119} Id.
\item \textsuperscript{120} FRAUDULENT INTERCOUNTRY ADOPTION, supra note 115 at 4.
\item \textsuperscript{121} Id.
\item \textsuperscript{122} See HAGUE CONFERENCE ON PRIVATE INTERNATIONAL LAW, supra note 114 at 33 (asserting that exploitation, the second necessary element of trafficking, occurs if there is a profit motive in furthering an illegal adoption, whether the profit be money or other compensation).
\item \textsuperscript{123} FRAUDULENT INTERCOUNTRY ADOPTION, supra note 115, at 3.
\item \textsuperscript{124} See id. at 2–3 (including a section titled “The Intent of Intercountry Adoption is to Place a Child in a Loving Home”).
\item \textsuperscript{125} 22 U.S.C. § 7101 (2012).
\item \textsuperscript{126} See FRAUDULENT INTERCOUNTRY ADOPTION, supra note 115 at 2.
\item \textsuperscript{127} Id.
\end{itemize}
laws” including “kidnapping” and “fraud”, and that “trafficking is a serious offense.”\textsuperscript{128} The TVPA also agrees with “the international community . . . that trafficking in persons involves grave violations of human rights and is a matter of pressing international concern.”\textsuperscript{129} But, the TVPA only contains a definition for “severe forms of trafficking” and never explicitly claims that trafficking is only possible when there is compelled service.\textsuperscript{130}

No case of an illicit intercountry adoption being prosecuted as a trafficking case has been found.\textsuperscript{131} Given the position of the State Department and its role in helping conduct investigations that would lead to prosecutions by the Department of Justice, this should not be surprising.\textsuperscript{132}

VI. INADEQUATE PROSECUTION

Nevertheless, intercountry adoptions that may amount to trafficking do sometimes receive the attention of federal authorities, but are prosecuted as something other than a trafficking offense.\textsuperscript{133} When they are prosecuted, intercountry adoptions that appear to satisfy the elements of trafficking are often charged as tax violations, fraud, immigration violations, or other similar criminal offenses.\textsuperscript{134} Sometimes federal authorities choose not to prosecute and interested parties go after traffickers—those who recruited, transferred, transported, harboured, or received exploited children—through civil lawsuits.\textsuperscript{135} These civil suits may provide some consequences for an unethical adoption agency,\textsuperscript{136} but a civil suit cannot establish the existence of trafficking any more than a criminal

\textsuperscript{129}. Id.
\textsuperscript{131}. Research was conducted through the Pound Pup Database, Wikipedia lists of adoption scandals, internet searches, U.S. government websites and documents, and research of hundreds of newspaper and scholarly articles without finding a single instance of an individual being charged, with a trafficking offense, much less prosecuted, in an intercountry adoptions scenario that amounted to trafficking.
\textsuperscript{132}. See \textit{FRAUDULENT INTERCOUNTRY ADOPTION}, supra note 115 at 3 (explaining the “unique” position of the U.S. that illicit intercountry adoptions that exploit children are not instances of trafficking unless the purpose of the exploitation is for prostitution or forced labor).
\textsuperscript{133}. See \textit{Child Trafficking Cases}, \textsc{Pound Pup Legacy}, http://poundpuplegacy.org/child_trafficking_cases (last visited Oct. 16, 2013). An analysis of the resources available revealed that approximately 21% of cases that appeared to have the requisite elements of child trafficking received court attention in the U.S.
\textsuperscript{134}. See e.g., Indictment, United States v. Focus on Children, No. 1:07-cr-00019 (D. Utah Feb. 28, 2007) (charging the defendants with crimes ranging from conspiracy to commit alien smuggling to laundering of monetary instruments).
\textsuperscript{135}. See e.g., Complaint, Boe v. Christian World Adoption, Inc., No. 2:10-cv-00181-FCD-CMK (E.D. Cal. Jan. 22, 2010) (alleging wrongful adoption, breach of contract, and other claims against an adoption agency that allegedly brought children ineligible for adoption from Ethiopia to the U.S. for placement with the plaintiffs, by paying the father to relinquish his parental rights and telling the children they were only coming to the U.S. for an educational exchange).
\textsuperscript{136}. See \textsc{CHRISTIAN WORLD ADOPTION} (Aug. 18, 2013), http://web.archive.org/web/20130818075853/http://www.cwa.org/ (accessed using the Wayback Machine archive) (telling its visitors that the agency has undergone struggles in recent years and thus has had to file for Chapter 7 bankruptcy. The now-defunct site did not specifically reference the 2010 lawsuit, but it can be inferred from the language of the message that the lawsuit is at least partially responsible for the difficulties of the agency).
indictment that does not include trafficking as a charge. Illegal adoptions may often be punished through mechanisms like the described civil suits and criminal prosecutions; however, without such adoption-related trafficking being labeled and prosecuted as human trafficking myriad undesirable consequences are created.

VII. A BETTER VIEW

The Hague Convention on Intercountry Adoption declares that “no one shall derive improper financial or other gain from an activity related to an intercountry adoption.”137 The Preamble and Article 1 condemn trafficking in children and urge for “safeguards” to be enacted to prevent child trafficking.138 For children to be victims of trafficking there must be “recruitment, transportation, transfer, harbouring, or receipt of a child for the purposes of exploitation.”139 A useful starting point is to read “exploitation” from the Protocol140 as including “financial or other gain” as described in The Hague Convention.141 Indeed, The Hague Guide to Good Practice defines trafficking as “the payment of money or other compensation to facilitate the illegal movement of children for the purposes of illegal adoption or other forms of exploitation.”142 Thus, it is feasible to consider “the payment of money or other compensation” in furtherance of an illegal adoption as a form of exploitation.

Reading The Hague Guide to Good Practice in conjunction with the UN Trafficking Protocol to derive a definition that denotes “recruitment, transportation, transfer, harbouring, or receipt of a child for the purposes of exploitation,”143 with exploitation including “the payment of money or other compensation to facilitate the illegal movement of children for the purposes of illegal adoption or other forms of exploitation,”144 is “compatible with a common sense approach and general understanding of the word ‘trafficking.’”145 This

138. See id. at art. 1.
140. Id.
144. See HAGUE CONFERENCE ON PRIVATE INTERNATIONAL LAW, supra note 142 at 33.
Sometimes it is better not to be unique

Definition of trafficking with respect to intercountry adoptions, or something close to it, is widely accepted by other countries.\(^\text{146}\) The Australian government, for example, has even gone so far as “to accept that child trafficking may occur through the adoption system, even where no exploitation is present.”\(^\text{147}\)

The State Department acknowledges that the TVPA is implementing legislation for the UN Trafficking Protocol.\(^\text{148}\) Indeed the Department recognizes that the Protocol “mandates the criminalization of human trafficking” and that, although the promises of the Protocol are not yet fulfilled, the U.S. wants to “lead by example” in the areas of human trafficking “protection, prevention, and prosecution.”\(^\text{149}\) However, the State Department has become fixated on the “ill-fitting” assumption that trafficking is “predominantly . . . for the purpose of sexual” or labor exploitation.\(^\text{150}\) Other, admittedly imperfect, countries trying to improve their own adoption systems have criticized this view as being too narrow.\(^\text{151}\) In short, the State Department’s willingness to be “unique”, while admirable to a certain extent, is considerably misguided.\(^\text{152}\)

As shown, the Trafficking Protocol says relatively little about intercountry adoption, although it does create a lower bar for trafficking when children are victims.\(^\text{153}\) The Hague Convention, to which the U.S. is also a party and strong supporter,\(^\text{154}\) through its Guide to Good Practice takes the framework of the Trafficking Protocol and applies it to intercountry adoptions by defining trafficking-and-Australias-intercountry-adoption-System.pdf.

\(^{146}\) It is because of this definition that the State Department concedes that it is “unique” among its peers when it comes to assessing illegal adoptions and trafficking. See Fraudulent Intercountry Adoption, supra note 115.

\(^{147}\) Siobhan Clair, supra note 145, at 14.

\(^{148}\) CdeBaca, supra note 7.The speaker refers to the UN Trafficking Protocol by one of its other nicknames, “The Palermo Protocol.” Id.

\(^{149}\) Id.

\(^{150}\) See Siobhan Clair, supra note 145, at 4 (explaining that Australia has also unfortunately fallen into thinking of trafficking in predetermined ways, mainly revolving around sexual exploitation).

\(^{151}\) See id. at 14 (discussing the 2010 Trafficking in Persons Report and the reliance on the Interpretative Notes to the Convention Against Transnational Organised Crime as narrow and insufficient in an era of illegal adoptions that amount to trafficking).

\(^{152}\) Fraudulent Intercountry Adoption, supra note 115 at 4. The State Department even recognizes that many African countries officially refer to fraudulent intercountry adoption as child trafficking and that a Minnesota based adoption agency was accused of child trafficking by Ethiopian officials for placing children without parental consent, an action that would not be considered trafficking under the view of the State Department. See also 22 C.F.R. § 96.35, 96.39, 96.45, & 96.46 (2006) (requiring adoption agencies to prevent trafficking and only work with providers, both foreign and domestic, that do not engage in trafficking). Despite federal regulations that specifically say adoption agencies should not engage in trafficking via intercountry adoptions, the State Department has taken a position that trafficking in the intercountry adoption context is a nullity.


exploitation in the adoption context. Hypocritically, the U.S. thinks it can be a leader in combatting human trafficking despite not recognizing the definition of trafficking proffered—and accepted by every Hague member except the U.S.—by the Hague Convention in accordance with the Trafficking Protocol.

Likewise, other international instruments call for appropriate punishment of intercountry adoptions that amount to trafficking. The Convention on the Rights of the Child calls for “all appropriate measures” to prevent “improper financial gain” in intercountry adoptions and the same protections for children adopted from overseas as domestic adoptions. Similarly, a 1986 General Assembly Resolution and precursor to the Convention on the Rights of the Child, urges states to enact laws that would prohibit “illicit placement of children.” Admittedly, the Convention on the Rights of the Child is not binding on the U.S., except to the extent it has become customary international law. Yet, the international community has made it clear that the protection of children involved in the intercountry adoption process is paramount and should be met with laws sufficient to deter and prohibit illicit adoptions and related trafficking.

In a press release following sentencing in the Focus on Children case, the State Department proudly acknowledged its “tireless” efforts in assisting with the investigation and prosecution of the individuals involved in the incident. Considering the extent of collaboration between the State Department and other agencies and offices involved in the prosecution of intercountry adoption traffickers, it would not be surprising to find that the official view of the State Department has permeated the offices of all involved in these cases and become de facto the position of the U.S. government. The end result is that intercountry adoption offenses that amount to trafficking are demoted to an immigration or tax offense and often those involved in the nefarious act receive little or no jail time, despite the harm caused to their victims. The lack of harsh

155. HAGUE CONFERENCE ON PRIVATE INTERNATIONAL LAW, supra note 114 at 33.
156. See id. (defining exploitation to include paying of money or other compensation in furtherance of an illegal adoption).
159. See id. (calling for the establishment of policies and laws to prohibit illicit actions in relation to intercountry adoption).
161. See FRAUDULENT INTERCOUNTRY ADOPTION, supra note 115 at 4 (explaining the unique position of the U.S. in not perceiving intercountry adoptions that amount to trafficking as a form of trafficking). The Departments of Justice, Homeland Security, and Health and Human Services all have offices devoted to anti-trafficking efforts, yet no articulation of whether intercountry adoptions could involve trafficking in the absence of sex or labor trafficking was found in the documents of these departments.
162. After the sentencing of individuals involved in the Focus on Children case some adoptive parents wanted to see the individuals responsible put in jail while, supposedly, none of the birth parents wished to see these people behind bars. See Press Statement, US Dep’t of State, supra note 160 (announcing that some adoptive parents wanted to see the perpetrators incarcerated and others showed no interest in incarceration); News Release, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Defendants sentenced in Samoan adoption scam: Government sought “forward looking” resolution for Samoan, U.S. families (Feb. 25, 2009), available at http://www.ice.gov/news/releases/
punishment, particularly in egregious cases such as those illustrated, does not coincide with the stated goals of “ending, to the extent possible, the rampant fraud taking place in intercountry adoptions, and punishing [perpetrators] for their criminal conduct.”

The most renowned treaty on intercountry adoptions, The Hague Convention, specifically addresses illegal adoptions and calls for their prosecution. Both the preamble and Article 1 speak of the importance of preventing child trafficking. Despite not defining trafficking in its text, the Convention does prohibit “improper financial or other gain” arising from intercountry adoption and activities related to such adoptions. Trafficking is later defined in the Guide to Good Practice to include “the payment of money or other compensation to facilitate the illegal movement of children for the purposes of illegal adoption or other forms of exploitation.” The U.S. implementation of The Hague Convention, theoretically, encompasses this definition by explicitly stating that the U.S. is committed to extending the same protections as the Convention. Yet, the State Department has chosen to follow a much narrower and more technical definition of trafficking in the intercountry adoption context.

The Hague Convention further requires that states take “all appropriate measures” to deter intercountry adoptions being exploited for improper gain. Such deterrence is recommended because “criminal sanctions [are] seen as a strong safeguard in preventing” illegal adoptions, which would include adoption trafficking. If criminals know that the harsh penalties the U.S. federal courts impose on sex and labor traffickers could also apply to them as intercountry adoption traffickers it is plausible that their behavior may be chilled. According to Bureau of Justice Statistics for 2001-2005, 85% of convicted traffickers (which include traffickers who plead guilty) received prison sentences. The median prison sentence was nearly six years.
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165. Id. at art. 1.
166. Id. at art. 32.
167. HAGUE CONFERENCE ON PRIVATE INTERNATIONAL LAW, supra note 114 at 33.
169. FRAUDULENT INTERCOUNTRY ADOPTION, supra note 115 at 1, 3.
174. See id. (establishing the median prison sentence as 70 months).
related trafficking cases (which are not prosecuted as trafficking) do not seem to involve similarly harsh sentences.

For children to be victims of trafficking there must be “recruitment, transportation, transfer, harbouring or receipt of a child for the purposes of exploitation.” Such exploitation can include the “payment of money or other compensation” in furtherance of an illegal adoption. In the context of the cases illustrated and myriad others, this definition of trafficking is met. Yet, despite being a party to the very convention that defines trafficking in such a way that illegal adoption containing the requisite elements of trafficking (such as the two cases described earlier) would fall under its auspices, the United States refuses in theory and in practice to yield to this definition.

However, trafficking is exactly what is occurring. Children are being sold or relinquished to adoption agencies and individuals without the proper consent of the birth parents or sometimes with consent obtained through false means. Unscrupulous agencies often engage in the recruiting of children for adoption programs with the purpose being to exploit the children for, normally financial, gain. At other times children are transported or transferred (from Cambodia to Hawaii, or Samoa to New Zealand, for example), or harboured (in nanny homes or orphanages), or received (such as being bought from birth parents) for monetary gains or other purposes of exploitation. Any one of these activities is sufficient in isolation to constitute a charge of trafficking, as it has been defined in the UN Trafficking Protocol. Nonetheless, often a string of trafficking activities are combined in one larger scheme, which includes multiple discreet instances of trafficking. And still, the United States chooses not to prosecute these crimes as trafficking.

Often, adoption-related trafficking is accompanied by other illicit practices such as misrepresentations to biological parents, falsified documents, or

176. HAGUE CONFERENCE ON PRIVATE INTERNATIONAL LAW, supra note 114 at 33.
177. See FRAUDULENT INTERCOUNTRY ADOPTION, supra note 115 at 4 (maintaining that fraudulent adoptions do not constitute trafficking, except possibly in cases implicating sex and labor trafficking as well); Indictment at 1, United States v. Focus on Children, No. 1:07-cr-00019 (D. Utah Feb. 28, 2007) (listing several charges, none of which were for trafficking); Bill Bainbridge, US Adoption Agent Guilty of Visa Fraud, THE PHNOM PENH POST, Dec. 19, 2003, available at http://www.phnompenhpost.com/national/us-adoption-agent-guilty-visa-fraud (reporting on the indictment of Lauryn Galindo, in which there was not a single charge of trafficking).
179. See id. (reporting that the agency accused of buying Ethiopian children brought in almost $6 million in 2008).
181. See e.g., Indictment, United States v. Focus on Children, No. 1:07-cr-00019 (D. Utah Feb. 28, 2007) (illustrating that every element of trafficking was met in multiple instances in the scheme, although only one instance would have been necessary for a trafficking charge).
abduction. Because of the step-by-step nature of intercountry adoptions, it is possible for the individuals concerned in the receiving state to follow all laws and good practices in the course of an adoption and have the adoptions still be premised on trafficking or another illicit practice.

One rationale for not prosecuting adoption-related trafficking as human trafficking has to do with the view that intercountry adoption is benevolent in its purpose. Yet, many of the pretenses used to traffic individuals into the labor market or prostitution are similar or the same as those used in intercountry adoptions that amount to trafficking and often these pretenses appear to the exploited person as altruistic. Parents or family members of persons trafficked for prostitution, labor, or illegal adoption may all be told that their family member will be visiting a Western country for education, for example. Or, children may be plucked from the street to be sold into sweatshops, brothels, or orphanages. Thus, this State Department rationale should not be an excuse for a failure to prosecute trafficking in whatever forms it might appear.

One of the benefits of prosecuting illegal adoptions containing the elements of trafficking as human trafficking, instead of lesser crimes, is that it provides a firm deterrent to such conduct. The Hague Convention, in particular, seems to favor harsh punishment to deter criminality inasmuch as it is an “appropriate measure” to prevent exploitation and trafficking. No longer should traffickers be able to “escape deserved punishment.” Not only will new adoption agencies be wary of engaging in illicit trafficking activities if they know that jail time and harsh fines are likely, but upright adoption agencies will be the beneficiaries of greater legitimacy for the profession, and corruption will decrease, helping purify the adoption process for all involved.

Other benefits will likely accrue to those involved in the adoption process if intercountry adoptions amounting to trafficking are prosecuted as trafficking. Although most adoptees gain U.S. citizenship through the adoption process, it is conceivable that prosecuting adoption relating trafficking may yield immigration benefits to certain children who were victims of the trafficking; benefits that would be unavailable without such a prosecution including trafficking
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182. See id. at 1 (explaining that illicit practices can include many things, one among them being trafficking).
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184. FRAUDULENT INTERCOUNTRY ADOPTION, supra note 115, at 2–3.
186. See e.g., SIOBHAN CLAIR, supra note 145, at 4 (describing how “pretty children” in India would be taken from the streets by gangs to be sold to orphanages that would then put them up for adoption).
187. See Co-operation Between Central Authorities, supra note 171, at 8 (stating that being informed of “criminal sanctions is seen as a strong safeguard in preventing” illicit intercountry adoption).
188. Convention on Protection of Children and Co-operation in Respect of Intercountry Adoption, supra note 137. at art. 8.
charges. And, instances of children being trafficked into the U.S. will decrease overall (because of deterrence and an increased awareness among adopting families), helping to eliminate the heartbreaking decisions that adoptive parents face when they find out that their beautiful new child has loving birth parents that are willing and capable of caring for the child.

Even domestic issues may be positively affected by a change in how intercountry adoptions that amount to trafficking are prosecuted. Although it is not yet clear how the situation will be handled, the recent Reuters exposé on re-homing could be an opportunity to extrapolate from intercountry adoptions and charge re-homers with trafficking. In this way, the instruction to handle domestic and international instances of trafficking in a similar manner would provide for increased deterrence, immigration benefits, and other benefits for victims of adoption trafficking with a U.S. tie.

The Department of State needs to recognize the error of its “unique” position and encourage the prosecution of intercountry adoption as trafficking. The Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (TVPA) incorporates the UN Trafficking Protocol into domestic law. Unfortunately it contains only a definition for “severe” trafficking, and may not be an adequate instrument for the prosecution of intercountry adoptions that amount to trafficking. The implication, however, is that non-severe forms of trafficking exist and could be prosecuted under the TVPA. Although the TVPA may not be the best vehicle for the prosecution of trafficking, it is a domestic embodiment of the UN Trafficking Protocol and could allow for a broader interpretation of what trafficking is. The Intercountry Adoption Act (IAA) may provide an additional

190. This situation is likely to come up in the context of a child who did not have his adoption finalized before reaching the age of 18 and is not a U.S. citizen and potentially out of status. In the event the child can aid in the prosecution of the traffickers he may become eligible for relief through the T visa program. See Victims of Human Trafficking: T Nonimmigrant Status, U.S. CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION SERVICES (Oct. 3, 2011), http://www.uscis.gov/humanitarian/victims-human-trafficking-t-nonimmigrant-status (outlining the requirements for obtaining a T visa).


193. See Convention on the Rights of the Child supra note 157. at art. 21 (calling for intercountry adoptions to receive “safeguards and standards equivalent to those existing in the case of national adoption”).

194. FRAUDULENT INTERCOUNTRY ADOPTION, supra note 115 at 4.


197. Id. Judicial interpretation of the statute to include other forms of trafficking is available and could be justifiable with the endorsement of the Department of State and other federal agencies.

198. 22 U.S.C. § 7101 (2012). In reading the purposes and findings section of the law it is apparent that the U.S. is concerned with trafficking and the dearth of laws that criminalized it prior to the Act. Trafficking is often referred to in the sex and labor context, but other more general contexts and
hook for charges of trafficking since it does provide for criminal penalties for those who violate the Act. \(199\) Administratively, trafficking via intercountry adoption could be addressed in the same way trafficking involving forced labor or prostitution is.\(200\)

To allow adoption-related trafficking to continue to be prosecuted as lesser crimes does a great disservice to the “holistic approach” to trafficking that government officials are urged to take.\(201\) Ignorance may no longer be an excuse for strip club owners looking the other way or for growers to allow coercion and threats to dictate their use of forced labor,\(202\) but not only is ignorance still an excuse when it comes to intercountry adoptions that amount to trafficking,\(203\) knowingly engaging in intercountry adoptions that amount to trafficking is still not enough to be prosecuted for trafficking.\(204\)

Although a rose by any other name may still smell as sweet,\(205\) trafficking should not be allowed to masquerade behind the masks of lesser crimes. Victims cannot receive justice and perpetrators cannot be fully deterred if trafficking is not called trafficking when it occurs.

**VIII. CONCLUSION**

Most adoption agencies and individuals are undoubtedly working ethically and diligently to protect children and families and ensure that adoptions are conducted in the best interests of the child.\(206\) Unfortunately, not everyone involved in the intercountry adoption process is willing to adhere to the strict standards that have been put in place. Sometimes, this means that children fall victim to nefarious schemes and the heinous crime of trafficking.\(207\) Currently, the United States does not prosecute illicit intercountry adoptions containing all the requisite elements of trafficking as human trafficking.\(208\) Instead, even when
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issues are discussed in this section. Using the language of this section and the definition of the UN Trafficking Protocol it could be possible to punish intercountry adoptions that amount to trafficking as trafficking.

199. 42 U.S.C. § 14944 (2006) (providing criminal penalties ranging from $50,000 to $250,000 with a maximum possible prison sentence of 5 years).

200. The charges currently used under the TVPA could also be used for intercountry adoptions that amount to trafficking and the sentencing guidelines used in sex and labor trafficking cases could be applied to the sentencing of intercountry adoption traffickers.


202. *Id*.

203. This paper does not wish to be thought of as advocating for the punishment of adoptive parents who, in good-faith, embark on the long and challenging journey of intercountry adoption. Nor, would one want adoption agencies that are already diligently following burdensome regulations and doing their best to remain true to ethical adoption practices to be prosecuted for being duped by an unscrupulous orphanage.

204. *See* FRAUDULENT INTERCOUNTRY ADOPTION, *supra* note 115 at 1 (maintaining that fraudulent intercountry adoptions are not trafficking).

205. *See* WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE, ROMEO AND JULIET act 2, sc. 2 (“What's in a name? That which we call a rose [b]y any other name would smell as sweet.”).


207. For detailed examples of instances of intercountry adoptions that amount to trafficking see Child Trafficking Cases, POUND PUP LEGACY., http://poundpuplegacy.org/child_tafficking_cases (last visited Oct. 16, 2013).

all the necessary elements are present, intercountry adoptions that amount to trafficking are prosecuted as a lesser crime. Often, they are prosecuted as an immigration or tax violation.209

Any time a child is “recruit[ed], transport[ed], transfer[ed], harbour[ed], or recei[ved] . . . for the purposes of exploitation” trafficking has occurred.210 The United States needs to be willing to recognize that intercountry adoptions containing these elements are cases of human trafficking.

The State Department needs to change its policy and realize that being “unique” when it comes to prosecution of intercountry adoptions that should amount to trafficking is not a good thing.211 The U.S. Department of State can begin by retracting its cable refusing to recognize trafficking in intercountry adoptions absent forced labor or prostitution and send out a new cable recognizing that the international and American standard is to consider fraudulent intercountry adoptions containing the UN Trafficking Protocol and Hague Convention elements of trafficking as a form of trafficking. Since the Department of State interacts closely with other federal agencies when cases of illegal adoptions arise, it is conceivable that one small policy change at the State Department can have a significant and positive impact on how adoption-related trafficking is perceived and prosecuted.212

When trafficking occurs, including in the context of intercountry adoptions, it needs to be prosecuted as trafficking to “[free] the victims and [punish] their tormentors.”213 The Department of State encouraged feedback from its posts on the cable entitled “Fraudulent Intercountry Adoption Does Not Constitue Trafficking in Persons” and hopefully the Department is willing to also accept this feedback and reconsider the consequences of not prosecuting intercountry adoptions that amount to trafficking as human trafficking.214

209.  See e.g., Indictment at 1, United States v. Focus on Children, No. 1:07-cr-00019 (D. Utah Feb. 28, 2007) (charging the defendants with crimes ranging from conspiracy to commit alien smuggling to laundering of monetary instruments).


211.  FRAUDULENT INTERCOUNTRY ADOPTION, supra note 115 at 3.

212.  See Press Statement, supra note 160 (explaining the close relationship of the Department of State, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services to resolve this specific case and pointing out that the Department of State conducted “more than 100 interviews and travel[ed] thousands of miles” to help the investigation and prosecution).
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214.  FRAUDULENT INTERCOUNTRY ADOPTION, supra note 115 at 1.