



Registry Matters Podcast

Episode 203

Recorded 11-20-21

Registry Matters is an independent production. The opinions and ideas here are that of the hosts and do not reflect the opinions of any other organization. If you have problems with these thoughts, fyp.

Andy 00:17

Recording live from FYP Studios, east and west. Transmitting across the internet. This is episode 202- 203 of Registry Matters. Oh, gosh, I have stuff written in the document. 203 of Registry Matters. Larry, happy Saturday night. Good evening to you. How are things out west?

Larry 00:33

Awesome. We've had some beautiful, chilly, fall days. We actually had our first freeze officially at the Albuquerque International Sunport. You know, they always record the official stats at the airport

Andy 00:51

yes, that's the only place that matters, right?

Larry 00:54

That's correct. And we went below freezing a couple nights back. And I'll tell the story next episode about how I'm teaching my furnace a lesson. But we don't have time. We've got so much to do tonight.

Andy 01:07

Wait, can you give me the short version because after the showerhead, after bringing fans, I got to know how you're teaching your furnace a lesson.

Larry 01:18

Well, it didn't start up last winter. So I decided that I wasn't going to have it repaired. I use alternate heat sources and it didn't start this winter. And I'm going to teach it a lesson. It'll start when I need it to.

Andy 01:31

Oh, okay, so since it doesn't start, you have made alternate arrangements. So you have like space heaters that will fall over and burn your house down? (Larry: Correct.) Okay, perfect. I don't see anything wrong with this. What could possibly go wrong, Larry?

Larry 01:50

It's even better than that. I use the gas burners on my stove. And you know, if you let me explain this to people: if you use the burners for your stove like if you were to put a turkey and cook it for six hours. It absorbs the fumes, and you know it cleanses the air somehow. But if you turn that stove on for five hours without a turkey in it, it will kill you almost within the first three hours if you're using it as a heat source. (Andy: I was gonna check in chat. Carbon monoxide poisoning. Totally. All day long.) Yes, but see, that same thing. You could have two pots on the stove and you could be cooking. You could cook beans for five hours. And that won't poison you. But if you don't have a pot on the stove, absorbing that carbon monoxide, it will kill you instantly.

Andy 02:38

Okay, man. Well so heating lessons from Larry. Tell me what's up the agenda for tonight please.

Larry 02:47

We have an awesome interview planned with our guests from an organization. What is it called? Lady? What is her blog?

Andy 02:56

Her blog is Lady Justice Myth. It's Kathleen from LadyJusticeMyth.Blog.

Larry 02:59

We have an extensive interview about government entrapment. We have a couple of questions and think we might even have a comment. And we have a case out of Connecticut that we're going to talk about

Andy 03:17

Outfrickinstanding. So let's dive right in. I'm going to turn on the screen rotator so that people following at home can see what's on the screen. Last week, you know what I screwed up and I didn't have a video except for I did have it for the interview. So at least that was good. Um, but this comes to us and says I was surprised and grateful to see that you mentioned me in your podcast. I'm not sure that you quite got my point. I do agree with you that everything can't be doom and gloom. And that levity is probably a welcome and necessary balm to a lot of us. You have no idea about the sarcasm and snark that goes on here in prison. Oh, yes, we do. But even in last podcast number 200, Congratulations, by the way. Look at the subjects you deal with. The whole political environment, how PFRs might as well forget about reforms under this administration and how the AWA is written in stone, and no one will go anywhere near modifying it. On all of these points, I wholeheartedly agree with you 100%. I was saying nothing would happen for PFRs under Biden since before he got elected. In fact, I was saying there would be zero prison reform of any kind in the Merrick Garland Department of Justice. If anything, there will be backsliding and that's becoming obvious as the administration is seriously now considered bringing the people released on COVID compassionate release from the BOP back to prison. Over 5000 of them, even when only about 1% have violated the terms of confinement. The rest had reestablished themselves in the community, in their work and in their families. To be clear, these are not PFRs. I believe very few PFRs were released by the BOP under COVID compassionate release, but I can get you those numbers easily. Interesting, Larry, I bet you're going to have a counter argument to the position that this individual is taken.

Larry 05:12

I'd say in response to that is a very long letter, we don't have the time to read the entire thing. But those were releases that were done at a time of extraordinary circumstances. And, as I have pointed out, oftentimes, there are dueling cursors going in politics. So we're rolling into 2022. It sounds like he's coming from the position that this administration has no desire to do any reforms in the criminal justice. I'm not ready to pronounce that. I look at the evidence. And I look at the evidence very carefully. I look at his career as he served in the Senate, and I look at the Vice President's

career, and I think we can all agree that she was no reformer. And I've said that previously. She would have to morph into something she's never been, if she were to promote reform. But even if this President were to want to do reform, he's got the other side of the aisle that is not so inclined. And you can look back at the first step act, it was the other side of the aisle that stood in the way of having a broader reform under the first step act. It was the other side of the aisle that kept PFRs from getting into relief. I can't change history, I can merely tell you what it is. And it was a group of senators, led by Arkansas Tom Cotton, I believe there were eight of them, all from the R-column, that didn't want the reform. This administration will not be facing reelection in 2022. But the entire house of representatives will be and 1/3 of the Senate will be. That's the reality of the politics. So if you don't like that reality, then maybe you should propose another system of government. But they're not going to be bold with criminal justice with the other side of the aisle going to be bashing them continuously. And probably on this issue of the prisoners that have been let go. I would not put that past becoming a campaign issue. Does anybody remember the name Willie Horton? Does anybody remember who sensationalize Willie Horton, in 1988? It was the other side of the aisle that did that. About it was a furlough program that existed in the state of Massachusetts. So like to say, I think he's coming from the side of this administration is crap. I'm not ready to pronounce that. But I can tell you the political reality is that they're not going to be doing anything bold on criminal justice in 2022. Just not gonna happen.

Andy 07:53

They were trying to do all kinds of bold things with infrastructure stuff. And that sort of took a nosedive.

Larry 07:59

It did indeed take a nosedive. And it's laughable to me, because I watch another podcast, where there's always people talking about how social security needs to be expanded and benefits need to be increased, and they're looking for their extra \$200 a month. Well, the money is just not there to do that. The other side of the aisle would never approve of a dramatic increase in Social Security benefits because they would say that we don't have the money. And these expanded, I mean, some of the things that are in the build back better. I don't fully understand some of the things I agree with that are in the build back better. But you have to pay for these things, folks. There's no revenue, we're already running a huge deficit, which is declining precipitously from what it was in the previous administration.

Andy 08:48

Larry, I gotta tell you, I was listening to, I want to say, I don't remember what it was. It was something I was listening to today. And I heard the comment made by a listener. And they, or somebody that they interviewed on the street, and he said, well, to have tax cuts, they're great. But if they go along with increased spending, that's bad. I was like, wait a minute, that's backwards. How do you do that? We are going to reduce the income flow, but we're going to increase the outflow too?

Larry 09:19

well, that's what they do. That's the snake oil they've sold for 100 years, for since about the 1930s. But what they what they do is they say that when you cut the rates of taxes, the economy will

just spring to life that you've never seen. And there'll be a gushing, gushing of revenue. And there is. When taxes are normally high, there is in fact some economic generation of new activity. But our taxes in the US are very low already. So you have a diminishing return from cutting taxes in this country because we're half the tax rate of our peer nations that we like to identify with. So we don't have that luxury of cutting taxes that we had during Eisenhower's 90% rate, and when Reagan came in, we were still in the top rated 70%. We're not there anymore. But yes, they say if you cut taxes, there's gonna be a gushing of new revenue so we can pay for the lost revenue, and the new spending and that's what they've been doing for a long time. That's why they always balloon the deficit, which is not the topic of where we're supposed to be going.

Andy 10:22

Alright, let's go over to this next one. Boy, I hope I do this one justice. Larry and Andy of the Registry Matters podcast. This came in to the FYP global headquarters on November 8. I'm currently serving 17 and a half years on a CP case. I have over two and a half years left on my sentence, and I'm doing my time in the SHU, special housing unit, Yazoo City medium federal complex. The reason I am in the SHU is because I cannot walk in general population due to my case being hot as most medium Federal Prison people with SO PFR offences cannot walk. Several books have been published talking about this topic right now, I have been in the SHU for four months. As of right now, I have been given three incident reports for refusing a direct order for not going to general population. In response to these write ups, they have taken away my commissary privilege and my phone privilege. And I know this is a continuing issue with inmates like myself self who are PFRs. My question is, how can they write me up for simply trying to protect myself by remaining in the SHU for protective custody? Thank you for all that y'all do. Okay, I bet you the answer to this is pretty much they can do it until they're told to stop.

Larry 11:49

I'm not an expert on prison classification, in terms of all the factors. I know some of them, I've been in committee discussions about prison classification. He's talking about Federal Bureau of Prisons. But the way they try to do it in our state is they do give you the opportunity to discuss with the classification officer about why you would need special housing combination, because of your safety. There can be a variety of things that can impact your safety. But the bottom line is, it's really not your decision. I mean, it really is because you can always do something to get yourself thrown in the hole, which is what he does by disobeying orders. But the prison administration classifies the inmates and they put them where they think they belong based on their scoring sheets and all the factors that they consider. And only thing I know he could do is file an appeal of his classification. Having no experience in the BOP, I don't know what the outcome of that would be.

Andy 12:47

Someone in chat who did fed time, if I'm not mistaken, says technically you have to go out to the general population and get threatened. Snitch on the person that threatened you, and then they'll accept your PC request. I don't know if that's the right advice. But that's someone that did some time.

Larry 13:04

Well, when you make that request... see, I've always had a problem with PC because they don't distinguish, or at least they don't seem to distinguish how they treat you in terms of loss of privilege based on this letter. If you're being protected because they cannot keep you safe in the regular population, for the life of me, I don't understand why we would punish you for that. On the other hand, if you're being a disciplinary problem, and you're throwing coffee, or feces or whatever, or doing things in front of a female officer that you shouldn't be doing and you're disruptive to the orderly administration of the Correctional Facility, then you do deserve to have some loss of privileges. So I don't understand. And no one is explained to me to my satisfaction why you treat the person who needs protection the same loss of privileges, versus the person who is being disorderly to the institution. Some of the wardens and some of the mail people that that screen our mail, why don't you shoot us a line and explain that to us?

Andy 14:04

Larry, like you made a point to say that you're doing something in front of a female officer, are you saying that these people don't do these things in front of male officers? Are you being very gender biased right now?

Larry 14:16

Well, I haven't heard a lot of male officers complain about it. I don't think I've ever heard of a male officer, but I have heard women officers complain about they don't want to see that. And my experience has been that the people that do that generally don't have anything anyone would want to see.

Andy 14:30

I'm with you. I was trying to add to the previous commenter's snark and sarcasm stuff and pile on top of that and see if we can get more hate mail. Joining us now everyone is Kathleen Hambrick. Have I pronounced that right? (Kathleen: Yeah.) Okay, good. We don't normally use last name. So I would just say hey, it's Kathleen, but you can see it right there on your screen. It says Kathleen. You have a blog called LadyJusticeMyth.Blog. And I met you, you say you were at the last one. I don't believe that you were at the last one. But you were at the previous Houston conference and that's where we met.

Kathleen 15:10

Yes. Araceli and I were at the 2019 together. And then the last one, of course was virtual. You did the whole thing. You've told me all about it. And then I was at this last one and presented.

Andy 15:23

You did. And that's where I was, like, super impressed with you and thought that we should have you on. Tell me quickly about what LadyJusticeMyth.Blog is. And then also, what is your affiliation with CAGE And what is CAGE?

Kathleen 15:37

Citizens Against Government entrapment. Yep. So the blog, after my son was convicted of attempted rape of a child, I went into a drunken stupor for a month. And when I shook my cobwebs free, I needed an outlet for my grief. And so I started writing. And part of that was that when this was happening to him, I had looked online, and I didn't see anything about stings. There were there

was nothing online about stings at all. Other than Oh, yeah, let's get these dirt bags. So part of mine was to let others know our journey, and to speak it because I hadn't found anyone else speaking it. But additionally, and most importantly, it was my therapy. And Lord knows I needed it then. As the years went on, and different events occurred, there were three families that banded together. All three sons had been 20 when stung in the state of Washington and imprisoned up there. And those three families eventually formed the basis or the core of CAGE. CAGE has been in existence officially for about a year, a little over a year. So we're pretty new. And we have about 60 members from across the country with a focus on the state of Washington. That's what started my journey and those of the other core members.

Andy 17:05

I would assume that they're probably doing this. Larry, feel free. I'm assuming they're doing this type of operation everywhere. And we'll get into the details of what this operation is. But they're doing this everywhere, aren't they?

Kathleen 17:16

Yes, absolutely. They're not always the same. Some places have different rules. But anyway, we'll get into that.

Andy 17:27

Yeah, we'll get into that. Um, I guess a point of contention on like, we'll just throw this in there out of the gate. Says, under the false narrative of protecting children, our government creates criminals, where there were none before. Sons, nephews, grandsons, and friends are simply going online to meet adults. What they don't know is that behind the curtain of the internet is an adult police officer who sends pictures of an adult, and at some point, mentions they are a minor. Doesn't law enforcement use a similar tactic as other criminal investigations occur?

Kathleen 17:59

Oh, are you talking about stings for other...? Yes. So there are stings for other crimes. They originated...I don't actually; I was thinking this would be a great thing to try to research and find out what the first thing was. I don't know. But I do know that they were really big in the drug era, which started the United States whole incarceration phenomenon. But the drug era, they used to try to get stings. They would like, set it up and have a guy come out to buy whatever, and then bust him. But so really, the big fine line here for me is that the person going out to buy drugs is breaking the law. Okay. As opposed to someone going online to an adult site, clicking the button saying they're an adult and starting to talk dirty with other people who are there who have clicked the button who said they're an adult. So, you know, to me, it's really evolved into, they're trying to appease the public into feeling safe, as you mentioned in the opening, by just grabbing anybody and labeling them and throwing them in prison, whether they deserved it or not.

Andy 19:05

Yeah. The way that you've described the story with your son, I am on the fence ultimately, like, I don't know why police would go off and do this. But there are certain actions that our people take that... just stop. But anyhow we'll continue. Um, yes. At the conference, you made a statement about something. And generally, almost categorically I will say, I don't believe in

government conspiracies. And you say that this is a government conspiracy. But it's not against the law to attempt to arrange a sexual rendezvous with an underage person. So why do you... what is your whole spiel about this being a government conspiracy?

Kathleen 19:51

Okay, so when you say it's not against the law to arrange a rendezvous with, are you saying it's not against the law for the police to pretend that whole part?

Andy 20:01

I mean, obviously they're doing it. No one is stopping them.

Kathleen 20:05

Oh, no, no, no, no, no, your own sentence is going to come back to you right near here. They're going to do it until somebody makes some stop, right? That doesn't mean it's legal. Come on. So repeat the question, because you took me on a little loop there.

Andy 20:21

So it's not against the law for them to arrange for there to be an encounter with an underage person, even though there's not one. So who's the actual victim? We'll keep that off to the side for just a minute. So it's not illegal for them to do this.

Kathleen 20:39

Oh, why do I believe it's a conspiracy? Okay. So sorry, I lost my train when I was laughing at you, I can't help it. So the conspiracy part, you know, honestly, everybody who's been caught in these can't believe what's happening to them. And I think that's really a huge part of how it happens is because people are caught so unaware, so confused as to what's happening, and why it would even happen. It doesn't make sense on any level to try to entrap people who aren't looking for something and then label them and put them in prison. We don't get that because we don't expect that in the United States of our government. And I certainly didn't for a long time, and a lot of people started telling me, you know, a lot of people in my group deal with conspiracies. The QAnon and the just the entire gambit of especially concerning sexual trafficking, and, you know, all the Democrats have children in their basement kind of craziness. Okay. So it really threw me for a long time that the point where I finally got to it's a conspiracy is when - and I'm a scientist, I'm a computer programmer have been for 36 years now - is when I went to find the data. And it wasn't there. That said conspiracy to me because we know it's happening. We know it's being reported. Where does that go, then? If we can't find it, if the FBI does not have that information, there's a reason for it. And at that point, the FBI is the government, ICAC, who are running these things is the government. And so for them to be covering their tracks. And even worse than just covering their tracks. They use the statistics from the FBI, to go to the legislators and basically say we need more money for these. So they are funding themselves here. They're using statistics that are not accurate. And so all of this to me is it's kind of make believe, and at that point, it's a conspiracy, because you're lying to the people. That's the only way I could get to it. And so and I am not a conspirator by any stretch of the imagination.

Andy 23:03

The piece there, it almost sounds like they are using their own data to support the reason why they're doing it. Therefore, making more of it happen. And thus, this feedback loop. I think I heard somewhere along the way, and it was something completely unrelated to this. ICAC, you mentioned that term a second ago. Who was that real quick?

Kathleen 23:26

So ICAC. It's a program out of the Department of Justice for child justice. I forget what it's called DOJ, Department of Justice, juvenile protection, I don't even know. So many acronyms. Anyways, they created through statute. It originally created in 1998. It was reorganized in 2008. And it stands for Internet Crimes Against Children. It's a taskforce created. There are 61 of them across the nation. And they are funded through the Department of Justice to theoretically keep the internet safe from sexual predators for children, against children.

Andy 24:09

The reason why I wanted to bring that up is if it's the same organization, then I heard that they have either a third or half of all the CP that is on the internet, that they control those servers. That's why I was bringing that up.

Kathleen 24:21

It's the same people.

Andy 24:25

So are you saying that the people that do end up going down this path, that they should not be prosecuted? They are often guilty of doing these things, but they shouldn't be prosecuted?

Kathleen 24:40

Yes. So let's just take a very generic example. I'll use kind of the basis of my son's example without extreme details. Obviously, he's in the middle of trial number two, which most people go how the heck is that even possible? But anyways, so the basis of this is that you go online, you go onto an adult site, you meet somebody, they say they're a minor. You, in his case, don't believe them. Ask for some kind of, you know, backup kind of proof. Get a picture. Supposedly like a picture. So imagine you walk into a bar, you see somebody there, it's an adult setting, you see them, they appear to be in their 20s. Okay, this is kind of the similar way we do things these days. So she had mentioned she was a minor. She didn't talk like a minor, she had a neck like a minor, she sure as F*** didn't look like a minor Oh, am I allowed to swear. And he doesn't know, the finalities here. He doesn't know to be nervous, he goes to make sure. And in his 20-year-old mind, if it was a child, which he is not interested in, then he would turn and walk away. Not knowing that, you know, according to the government, he's already committing the crime by going there. But the funny thing is, is someone could legally be online, say the same exact things that happened to Jace, and a picture the same as Jace got, you know, an adult. He could go there, it could be somebody pretending to be adult, they could have sex, and there is no crime committed. So I don't understand where a crime could be committed, where there couldn't be one, depending on the outcome? The outcome, how does the outcome change what you do? I don't know. I'm lost there.

Andy 26:30

We'll get some opinion from Larry, I guess, as we get towards the end of this. That in the bar scenario, they carded you to get in. So you'd have some sort of gatekeeper that made it that everyone was above age, at least 18, presumably. And now you say, hey, do you want to go do something? (Kathleen: Yeah, great analysis.) And they turned out to be some level of underage, but you were supposed to check their ID, look for the hologram on the ID, you're supposed to do all of that, and then sign a consent. I don't understand how anybody... I just, it seems very complicated to me. But whatever. This is the world that we live in. Um, I'm assuming that some of the men come to the trap house or some location and meet up with a teenager, what happens next after they have enticed them or whatever word we're gonna use?

Kathleen 27:20

Well, they never meet up with a teenager, because there is no teenager. But if you mean intent, there are some men who do want to meet up with a teenager. And that is why they go. But my point to these is that all the police would have to do... well, first off, you don't have to necessarily encourage those people to show up with a picture of an attractive adult woman, because that wouldn't turn them on in the first place. But my point to that is that those people are going to have other evidence that would be easily collected to corroborate that that was their intent. They would either have pictures of children on their phone or at their home computer. They would certainly have history on their computer of looking up that kind of stuff. I mean, you don't become interested in something and at the turn of a dime, and then all of a sudden say, hey, tonight, I'm gonna go have sex with a 13-year-old. It just doesn't really work that way. So if the police wanted to differentiate, they could. They don't care because they're paid whether it's true or not. So no, I don't think the people that are tricked should be prosecuted. I think the police and the government, certainly the judge, should be able to think about, hey, there's nothing else in this person's history. There's nothing else in this investigation that points to yeah, we got the right guy. It's a free for all and it makes me sick honestly.

Andy 28:43

You guys should probably join up with the people the against mandatory minimums also, because I mean, the judge's hands end up getting tied in that too where the judge said, I'm sorry, you are guilty of doing something. And I have to give you 5-10... I could go along with that one. Now that means that we people, we have to go hire attorneys - which cost 10s of 1000s, which that's even like a gross underestimation of it - to support this whole gravy train of going down the pike. I think Larry has referred to it as the sex offender industrial complex. (Kathleen: accurate.)

Are you a first-time listener of Registry Matters? Well, then make us a part of your daily routine and subscribe today. Just search for Registry Matters through your favorite podcast app. Hit the subscribe button and you're off to the races. You can now enjoy hours of sarcasm and snark from Andy and Larry on a weekly basis. Oh, and there's some excellent information thrown in there too. Subscribing also encourages others of you people to get on the bandwagon and become regular Registry Matters listeners. So, what are you waiting for? Subscribe to Registry Matters right now. Help us keep fighting and continue to say FYP.

Andy 30:09

And where do we get it? I mean, in the case of your son, how old was he when this happened? (Kathleen: 20.) Did he have some big bankroll? Five, six digits hanging out in the bank waiting to hire an attorney?

Kathleen 30:25

No, he did not. He had been through boot camp for the Navy. So he had attempted to successfully launch from home. Unfortunately, he had been diagnosed very young with ADD, as a lot of children are these days with the videos and just on and on with the constant, fast moving life. And so he had, unfortunately had to come back home unsuccessful in his naval career, and so was living at home. He was working two jobs at the time. Had been trying to get into computer programming, to see if he had a knack to follow in mom's footsteps. But no, he had no bank role. He had enough money to play games, which was his norm. (Andy: I like playing games though.) Yeah, I know.

Andy 31:19

Something else said on your website is that some cases, they will then read them the Miranda rights, but then later, they're being booked, they tell them they need to write an apology letter to the victim or the victim's family. Who are you apologizing to? There isn't a family even... I've always struggled with this, like, you're guilty of a crime... this is really a thoughtcrime. This goes like Minority Report where you have the little people in the little bubbling ooze, whatever with headsets on and like guilty guilty, um. But what do you do with that letter? What do they do that letter?

Kathleen 31:55

They use it as evidence against you. And this is probably part of the whole fact that they realize they really don't have any evidence of an intention, no intention of a crime here. So from the moment you're arrested on, they do an interview, they do a polygraph, they do everything they can to try to collect information that would seem damning. One of those would be a letter to the victims you know, explaining what you went there for and how sorry you are for it. They can use that as intent.

Andy 32:34

Like, who are you apologizing to?

Kathleen 32:37

Yeah, I also, yeah, Jace paid- I paid \$500 into the Victims Fund. And then when he was about to be released, which we opted to leave him in prison for extra time, so that he would not have to get out in the state of Washington, which has some really nasty rules up there. We're in Oregon. And so during that time, he had to serve an additional 30 days in order for them to notify the victims. For Jace's case, when there was no victim. Yeah.

Andy 33:11

Over the years, I know that Larry's beat this into my head over the years of going through this that once a person is convicted with a plea deal, I get like you're signing all these little checkboxes as you go down there that you weren't coerced, you're doing this of your own freewill, all that stuff, that there's little chance of a successful appeal. But you're headed down that path, correct?

Kathleen 33:35

No, we already won our appeal. Jace did not take a plea, we went through a bench trial. The appeal, our appeal lawyer, who was a public defender appeal lawyer, she pointed out that we had never signed any documents or that Jace had not waived his right to the trial by jury, which is what we wanted. Our lawyer vehemently said you don't want that. We kept saying we did. And my point was what if, you know, the judge didn't get laid the night before... Whatever. You know, I'd rather have 12 people where one could see the logic versus one person, you know, judging the whole thing. And so we went back and forth repeatedly. And I want to say that, you know, my son really isn't wasn't, hasn't been overly involved within the whole strategy of why we do what we do- what we've done. So, you know, he wasn't really involved, but I have all the emails where me and the attorney were fighting about, I wanted it to be a jury trial, and here are my reasons and he kept saying no. And eventually what happened was he signed the paper saying that his client had waived his right to a jury trial, which is illegal. So the appeal lady lawyer, she found that. Pointed it out and the state conceded that they had to overturn the conviction. Now this was after Jace was already through prison and released. You know, appeals don't happen very quickly. And fortunately for us, unfortunate, unluckily, he went to prison for nothing. But fortunately, he was already out at that time. He got a seemingly short sentence.

Andy 35:28

Why do you say that Washington state is worse? I realize that this is your opinion. But why do you think that it's so much worse than other states?

Kathleen 35:36

Oh, everything is my opinion that comes out of my mouth. We'll just put that there. But Washington State, one of the reasons was... First off, at that time, I did not realize that these were being performed across the country, and that some are worse than others. I had it in my brain that that this would never happen in the state of Oregon. Well, apparently, it does. Maybe not as severely. So it's one of the worst, worsers. How's that?

Andy 36:06

I like that word a lot.

Kathleen 36:07

Worsers. It's one of the worsers states as far as their tactics. Like, for instance, I had spoken to a number of different people from ICAC offices across the country when this first happened. And I spoke to a woman named Mary out of Las Vegas. She worked, she was a police officer at the ICAC office. And I was complaining, basically trying to find out about the picture. The picture really bothered me. Why you would send the picture of an adult. And Mary out of the ICAC office in Las Vegas says that they're not allowed to. They cannot send a picture of an adult. It would not make it through their court system. It would be thrown out. So that will kind of show you how some states are worse than others as far as the things go. But what happened for the state of Washington is, for the release, they are much harder on their restrictions. Not necessarily residential, but it's one of those states where, and Larry would know this better than me what it means or why, but where the sheriff's can change your level. Like if you're on a tier system, they can up you to try to get you to move out of their

area. I didn't know that was even possible in the state of Oregon. Your tier is your tier, and it doesn't change without due process. But up in Washington, they can harass the heck out of you. They also send out flyers and notify all of your neighbors with your address that you have a person required to register on your block. And that is for anybody above a tier one. Now, amazingly, in these stings, depending on how they do their tiers, and for the state of Washington, they use the static-99. Jace is mid-level even though he has no history, no record. He was 20 years old.

Andy 37:59

I would bet most people are like somewhere up in some kind of higher level. Just like overall, I bet you they are.

Kathleen 38:05

Yeah, but with no victim. I just find that shocking. How do you say that they're a medium, you know, threat to anybody when he's never hurt anybody? So that was interesting to me. So those reasons were why I feel Washington is pretty harsh. Additionally, the sentencing up there is off the chain.

Andy 38:27

We cover cases all the time on the program from all the different states when we know of them at least. And they generally, I don't know that we've ever covered anything up that way. They come from places like Minnesota or all through the South. Alabama and Mississippi and stuff like that. They come from the states that are generally considered to be worsers. So we have worse, worsers, and worstest. (Kathleen: Yes.) How about, what are the similarities and what are the differences between the states in these PPSS's? And can you cover what a PPSS is?

Kathleen 39:01

Police proactive sex stings? Yeah, I get tired of saying it. Police proactive sex stings. It's also a bit of a tongue twister. So I just started saying PPSS. It's almost like ROUS's, isn't that the one from Princess Bride?

Andy 39:15

You know what I've never seen that movie. I know sorry. I've never seen it all the way through. I've seen pieces.

Kathleen 39:21

Okay, rodents of unusual size. Anyway. PPSS, it's police proactive sex stings. So across the nation, I think that we tried to find a state that didn't have any at all and we were unsuccessful. On the CAGE website by state you can go into the state and see listing of stings. It's probably by far not inclusive for everything, but it's a start. And so the different tactics, well, one would be whether or not you use a picture of an adult, which was one that happened in my son's case. Some of the places are horrific, like New Hampshire has scenarios where the person isn't even informed the piece about that the person they're speaking to is a minor until they arrive at the site that they're supposed to meet. So it's like, hey, I'm here to meet you. Oh, yeah, I'm sorry to bother you with this, but I'm a minor. Click. On go the handcuffs. I'm not sure how that works. But apparently, they're getting convictions off of it. And that's pretty sick. And then there are states who don't really go to this extreme like that. I do know that in the state of Oregon, I don't know right now, but at the time, the rule was that the ICAC office would create their own web page. Like they wouldn't go on to

adult dating sites, they would be on their own webpage that somehow hinted at sex with minors and those people that went to that website and then started trying to hook up... which I personally think is probably a much more realistic way to go. Okay, those people were looking for children. Okay. Guess what? You're in the right ballpark, woohoo. So there's some differences there.

Andy 41:16

In preps for doing this interview with you, and again, thank you very much for coming on. You shared with me where you got on, I think it's called open mic with an attorney. And honestly, I didn't realize that that was like, they are friendly. They're friendly towards the vigilantes.

Kathleen 41:39

Well, it is Chris Hansen's attorney. So that does make sense, right?

Andy 41:41

I just thought it was an interview with an attorney and he was pushing back. You seemed to stump him. To me, you seemed to stump him a time or two of him trying to completely get himself wrapped around the argument of in a case like your son's versus some true predator.

Kathleen 41:58

I certainly tried. Yes, yes, a true predator. I certainly tried to be logical. And at the end of that interview, he did, after we were off, he did thank me and said it was an interesting case. And he was very confused. If you watch the interview, you can tell he's confused why they would continue to prosecute Jace after he already served his sentence in jail. But the thing that he said after we were off air was he was definitely concerned with the picture. The picture was it for him as well. Why send a picture of an adult? And he even said on his interview that he'd asked the other people in his group and yeah. The most that someone could say was maybe 16 or 17. But most people thought that the picture was of a 20-some year old and that is the truth. It is a 20 some year old.

Andy 42:56

You've also been on the Dr. Phil Show? What kind of shit show is that? Hate that show so bad. I guess you could almost call it like a tame down version of Jerry Springer, almost. It's just garbage.

Kathleen 43:12

It is drama. But what we thought was how do we reach as many people as possible? So you kinda, you got to go there. And honestly, the first person to reach out to me after the New York Times article was Tamra Hall. I guess she's a woman who does a talk show. I don't watch her. She certainly hasn't been on as long as Dr. Phil or anything. But she reached out to us first, saying that one of her producers had read the New York Times article and that they were very interested in having us on the show. That got delayed because at that time, Lloyd came through and COVID was going and so it got delayed and delayed, and eventually, we got on the Dr. Phil instead. And so then Tamra Of course, you know, we were tainted to her. She didn't want to talk to us. So, but that's okay. So and I do know that a lot of people don't like Dr. Phil. Obviously, as I said, on the Mike Morris podcast, you know, all of these are TV shows, and they require good ratings in order to stay afloat. So they have to create drama and controversy and they're not really looking for the truth. But I was able to speak my truth

and Jace was able to speak his truth and so we felt good about that. And it was a segue for us to get into how to talk to a group. How to anticipate adverse reactions and you know.

Andy 44:48

Did they like berate you? I mean, I haven't seen the program, but did you get like the whole big 200 people or whatever it is in the audience booing at you for things said?

Kathleen 44:56

Well, that's pretty funny too, because a really good friend of mine, Anne – Jace's best friend's mother - was in the audience. One of the three founding family members from CAGE was in the audience, Dan. My sister was in the audience and my sister's a character. And she was actually pretty much telling the other people to shut up and be respectful. So no, we were covered in the audience. Obviously, there were a lot of trolls ripping me a new one in the comments as always happens. But, you know, that's those people. Usually when I talk to somebody one on one, they see the points. They may or may not agree with it, but they didn't know these were happening the way they're happening. And it is confusing and upsetting to them at some level.

Andy 45:52

Totally. If you could get, most of the time, if you can get someone one on one and describe how the whole registry works, and how long it lasts, people don't normally like pile on and keep going... like, yeah, this should just be forever, forever, forever. Like, people generally have a more humane side of things. They think that it's while you're being punished that this goes on. Not that it goes on for people for forever. It's generally my experience. Tell me, we're getting sort of close to the end timewise. But go into the advocacy side of what you're working on with the legislature.

Kathleen 46:26

As I had mentioned, for CAGE, we have three founding families and one of the families, their son managed to get a 10 year sentence, which is unthinkable and disgusting for a 20 year old with no prior criminal record whatsoever. That family, of the three families, that is the only family that physically lived in the state of Washington. They are kind of affluent. And so, for that reason, they already knew a few legislative families. And so they started heavily reaching out to try to recruit people to help change the laws up there. That family is laser focused on trying to get their son out of prison who's been in there for five or six years now. He went through a year and a half of solitary confinement. I'm not sure if you can imagine what that does to a 20-year-old. (Andy: I can't imagine what it does to anybody.) Yeah, yeah, it's a really sick case. And so, they now have a group of people who are on board. A group of legislators who are on board with we need to alter some of these. All of the legislators had no idea what was going on to this extent. And so we've really brought focus to just letting everybody know, and then saying, okay, this is unreasonable, because in the state of Washington, someone caught in a sting will do more time than someone who actually offends. So they have a diversion program up there, where as we all know, the majority of people who offend are known to the victim. And so, if you're known to the victim up in the state of Washington, you'll get a 12-month sentence, and then the rest of you can serve out as probation of your sentence. That's not available to anybody caught in a sting because you can't know

nobody, because there was no victim. And therefore, we have to serve the entire sentence in prison. And so it's atrocious. And so they have been fighting tooth and nail to get their son out of prison and we just back them up with anything we can. Recently I had to put together a flyer because the police chief up in the state of Washington who was in charge of the net nanny and that is the name of the campaign that they ran up there, he denied that they're breaking any rules whatsoever. And so I had to write up a statutes... and the other thing that happens a lot is when the police get on the stand in this case is they're like, we don't have to follow the ICAC rules. They're just suggestions. We can break any rule we want to get through these nasty people you know. They deserve to go to prison at any cost.

Andy 49:19

Larry wouldn't that go directly to if you sign a confession, they don't really have to do much else. You're sunk.

Larry 49:28

That's generally the case. When you sign a confession, this troubles me a lot. I don't think I've heard that conducted that way in our state in terms of making apologies to a non-existing victim. But they're pretty zealous here.

Andy 49:44

We were gonna move over to this case. What is subjective versus objective entrapment defenses?

Kathleen 49:55

And I hope Larry's gonna answer this. (Andy: I hope so too.)

Larry 49:59

Well, I don't generally think of it in those terms. So I don't relate to it that way. But there's entrapment, where the person, they show that they were predisposed to commit the crime. If you have a nice looking decoy out doing a prostitution sting, and the person makes the approach to the decoy and makes the offer, that is a predisposition. The decoy just happened to be a law enforcement officer. If, on the other hand, the decoy is actually making the approach, and suggesting that there will be a rewarding relationship for the right price, then you have what she's talking about with the law enforcement, which is what they do in these sting operations. They suggest a crime that the person has not thought about. If you're predisposed to commit a crime, and you happen to approach an officer, whether it be a heist of a bank, or whether it be at embezzlement from your company, if you're predisposed to commit a crime, and you happen to make the approach to an officer, that's just too bad. I mean, you shouldn't have had a criminal mind. You know, an evil mind, an evil hand. But what's happening in these stings is not that. The people have no criminal mindset. They're looking for a hookup. And all of a sudden, the person transforms and morphs into something that was not advertised. And people are in doubt that that's what happens, that this person is really a minor. Particularly when they show a picture- I watched the entire interview. It was like 33 minutes long. And I watched it, and I looked at the video, and I looked at it. I froze the picture, and I couldn't conclude that I would think it was a 13-year-old. Something we've got to do better is we got to tell people, if anybody ever says I'm a minor, you have to stop. What we're gonna have to work on doing is educating. If a person says, I'm a teenager, you're going to have to stop right

then. And say, I am reporting you to the operator of this website. And I'm reporting you to the police. And the police, of course, that's who you'd be reporting them to, because they are the police. But we've got to stress that message, when someone morphs into something that they have not represented themselves to be, you must stop. Now, that doesn't mean that we don't need to be working on litigation and legislation. But the message has to go out as best we can. When you're in an adult website, and someone morphs into a child, you've got to stop, and you've got to say, I'm going to report them. I'm going to report you, you shouldn't be here, you clicked and said you were an adult. You should not be here, go away. Now a 20-year-old, depending on their maturity level, is not going to have that reaction in most cases. But that's what the message, we're gonna have to start teaching in terms of what the proper course of action.

Andy 52:56

I don't know how we bring that to everyone preemptively though. I mean, that means from the time that they start going through almost like sex ed classes, whatever they call it now, like we're gonna have to say... like, there has to be some training. Because if all your indicators, Larry, tell you that it is not a minor, and someone just goes, I'm 13, you're like, No, bullshit. No, you're not. Like, I understand what you're saying you have to then walk away. But all of your other indicators tell you that it is not a 13 year old.

Larry 53:33

I agree with you. And I agree with Kathleen. But I'm saying in terms of what we can do immediately, because most of the people that listen to us are not pretrial. They're post trial. So our ability to reach people is somewhat limited. Because they wouldn't be here except for they've already encountered this problem. And where we're losing the battle is that just like Kathleen said, people don't know this is happening. All they know, and I can tell what I was gonna say earlier, when there was a point being addressed about the legislature and what the police do to self-fund. Kathleen was making a point about this is a self-funding operation, which is exactly correct. That is what it is. The lawmakers are told, and I've sat through these hearings with the Office of the New Mexico Attorney General present. And they say that they need additional funding for these things because they consider this an approach crime. The argument they make us is somewhat similar to like, if you work in a retail establishment and you have the tendency to graze. Many employees, I'd say even maybe a majority of employees tend to pick up whatever item that they might want to have or eat something and they refer to that as grazing. But the argument the AGs office makes is that but for us, these people have a tendency and a predisposition to have sex with minors or they would have done just what I said. They would have stopped when we presented ourselves as minors. So, but for us, we have saved the community from dozens and dozens of approach crimes. And the public is terrified that they're actually people out there lurking online, trying to hook up with their minors. So the reality is I have not seen any evidence. As Kathleen says, there's no evidence because it just doesn't happen. Seldom is it really an adult tried to hook up with a real minor. But that's the story that they tell in the legislative chambers and the committee's. That's what they say justifies what they do. (Andy: Kathleen?)

Kathleen 55:37

Yeah, absolutely. And to bring that even further, I did do a survey. I have an online survey, because I couldn't find any data on these stings, what's happening. And one of the things that came out was that over 60% of the men who are convicted and arrested, of course, but convicted of these say that they did try to walk away from the conversation. They disconnected in some way, and then they were reached back out to by the police. And that's pretty scary, too. So even if you accidentally fall into this doesn't mean you're going to get out.

Andy 56:16

Larrt, did you have anything else? Comments from other parts that we were talking about?

Larry 56:22

No, you've done a great job covering this. And Kathleen's done a great job describing what happens. This is actually a serious, serious problem nationwide. I don't think there's any state that doesn't have some degree of these stings. They're just too easy to do. There's too much funding available. When we talk about cutting funding to law enforcement, this is an example of what we're talking about. The reason why they are able to do this is because the federal government piles money into it. And like my state, the New Mexico Attorney General's Office has a unit, a particular unit, where they prosecute these cases. This is one of the few prosecutions that's handled solely by the New Mexico AG. And they come to the legislature and say, we just need more. You just wouldn't believe how much of this is going on out there. And who can say no when they're showing statistics? The self-fulfilling prophecy that Kathleen was talking about. They say in the last year we arrested dozens or hundreds, or whatever the case may be, and we need even more. We could do so much more if we had more money. That's what they do. And nobody understands that.

Andy 57:39

I'm not going to frame this exactly right. But I've heard that because police patrol less affluent neighborhoods, they then find more crime, which then they say, oh, we need to go fight crime in those neighborhoods where we found the crime before, thus perpetuating the loop of less affluent neighborhoods ending up with, quote unquote, more crime, because the police are there because they found crime before but they might find the same amount of crime somewhere else, but they weren't there already. Sounds identical to that.

Kathleen 58:07

It is very similar. Yes. So the increased presence then gets you more. Unfortunately, you know, this is pretty open to any single person and plenty of married people who go online looking for companionship, which is the norm in this day and age.

Larry 58:27

No way married people would be online looking for... that is the most bizarre thing I've ever heard Kathleen. *sarcasm*

Andy 58:36

They're all going to singles nights at the local Y or something like that, right? Is that what they're doing?

Kathleen 58:42

It was closed down in COVID.

Andy 58:45

Right. What are we supposed to do now? (Kathleen: I don't know.) Is there anything else before we let Miss Kathleen go?

Larry 58:54

I would be delighted to have a conversation probably off grid about the about the retrial. And I can certainly offer my insight pro bono. Not that I expect your strategy to change. But I can tell you what our experience is with these type of trials.

Kathleen 59:08

That'd be great. Thank you so much.

Larry 59:11

Kathleen, thank you so very much for coming. I really appreciate it. You're probably about to go have dinner because it's three hours behind what it is on the east coast.

Kathleen 59:20

It is. I have to go cook for Jace who's gonna come home from his Amazon job.

Andy 59:24

Oh, okay. And I'll say this, and then I'm going to cut you off. East Coast is the only time that matters. (Kathleen: You suck.) Thanks so much, Kathleen. Have a great night. (Kathleen: Bye, everybody.) I think Larry, we've been going for quite a long time and we have this case to cover from Connecticut. Are we ready to go there? Or is there anything else that we need to do?

Larry 59:48

Well, it looks like we're almost out of time.

Andy 59:50

We are almost at a time. So I'm going to speed read. Okay. So if you are listening to this at Advanced speed, I'm sorry.

Larry 59:57

Well, we could kick this out until next week if you like. I mean, this is not time sensitive.

Andy 1:00:03

It's not time sensitive? Because we're already right at an hour without some cutouts, whatever. I mean, we can kick it. If you want to.

Larry 1:00:10

We can kick it. And then also, there was a document about PFR registry reform proposal in Connecticut. We could combine those into an episode maybe for the Thanksgiving holiday. But yeah, this is not time sensitive.

Andy 1:00:23

Okay. Well, then let's jump right on down to the very end where we will go to Who is That Speaker? So last week, Larry, I played this.

Larry 1:00:40

Accordingly, I shall not seek, and I will not accept the nomination of my party for another term as your president.

Andy 1:00:52

Larry, who was that?

Larry 1:00:54

That was former president, the late President Lyndon Baines Johnson.

Andy 1:01:00

And I gotta tell you, it must have been because we talked about nobody writing in on these easy ones. You keep giving people these little softballs. And I think everyone's like, Come on, man. Everyone knows who that is. You got to make these things harder for people to dive in. So incidentally, because of that, I received like 40 submissions, but the first one to come in was from Carl. Carl, thank you very much for writing in and being the first one listening to this and submitting the answer. And then for this one, this one probably will be a little bit harder Larry. And for Episode 203, send me an email message at registrymatterscast@gmail.com with the subject line of who's that speaker and tell me who this is.

Who's That Speaker? 1:01:47

It doesn't fit. If it doesn't fit, you must acquit.

Andy 1:01:51

Do you think I need to play that one again?

Larry 1:01:53

Give them one more shot at that. That's an old clip.

Who's That Speaker? 1:01:58

It doesn't fit. If it doesn't fit, you must acquit.

Andy 1:02:03

All right, there you go.

Larry 1:02:07

And that is fitting in view of what happened this weekend in Kenosha.

Andy 1:02:11

Oh, boy, here we go. Okay, I really don't want to talk about this because this is like just a powder keg. But what do you want to talk about with the jury trial that closed out this week?

Larry 1:02:22

Well, the jury... Of course, everyone knows that's listening to this, we have the best audience on earth. Not even just in the country, but on Earth. The audience knows that there was an acquittal. There seems to be a lot of dissension out there. I've heard so much misinformation about it. And the case crashed way before the conclusion of the trial. The case crashed when the surviving person testified that he had a gun at the head of the accused and now acquitted. When he did that, the case crashed. You were not going to get a first-degree conviction, you weren't going to get hardly any. It was like unlikely to get any conviction. So what I wanted to talk a little bit about is this is an example of mob justice. When prosecutors are forced by the angry population to file

charges that are really not supported by the evidence just because the public is angry. This is a dangerous way to conduct prosecutions in this country. I am not on the side of Kyle Rittenhouse at all. I'm not on anyone's side. I'm on the due process of law, presumption of innocence, proof beyond a reasonable doubt. That's my guiding principle. The proof just wasn't there in this case. And it reminds me of, I believe it was 99. The Ramsey case out of Boulder. And those who've been listening since day one have heard me talk about the Ramsey case before. You had a very prominent person in the Boulder community who was accused or suggested, he was never accused, he was ever formally charged. But his daughter disappeared, she didn't even disappear. I'm gonna get the story wrong. She was murdered. And a ransom note was left for approximately the amount of money of his annual bonus which was something around \$100,000-\$113,000 (Andy: Annual what?) Bonus from his job.

Andy 1:04:27

Oh, I'm sorry, I misunderstood you.

Larry 1:04:29

The Boulder district attorney was a relatively honorable guy, which I've said repeatedly. I don't even know if Alex Hunter is still alive. I do know that his chief deputy Peter Horstman is not. Most of those guys believe that you should actually have evidence of the crime before you made the accusations. And if you couldn't prove them, you shouldn't make accusations. I mean, that wasn't being soft on crime. It's just they believe the power of the state of Colorado should be used for the charges they could prove. They didn't just throw things at the wall and hope they would stick to appease the mob? Well, the Boulder community was very enraged that these are fluent people who obviously had had taken the life of that beautiful little model girl, JonBenet Ramsey. They were they were they were outraged. And they said, anybody else would have been in jail. Well, maybe they're right. Maybe anybody else would have been in jail in most jurisdictions, but not in Boulder. That's not the way they ran that office. And he ended up no longer being DA because of the outrage about him not prosecuting. Well, it hasn't been many years ago, that they have completely exonerated and said, neither of the Ramseys could have been involved in this. That would have been a case of a travesty of justice if they had succumbed to the angry mob and filed charges. Just because something is horrible doesn't mean that you have to have a charge to satisfy the mob. This situation was a tragedy, a total tragedy in Kenosha. Bad decisions were made on both sides. And two lives were lost, and another person was injured. And I don't know what all I'll let fall out of that because there were people arrested and cars burned and all sorts of things went on in Kenosha. But there just wasn't evidence of premeditation and planned murder. Prosecutor, you should never have charged him with that. You should not have done that. You should have charged him with what you could have proven. And when your case crashed and burned, you should have walked over to the defense table, you should have said, Hey, I just took a hit on my case. Do you want to talk a plea negotiation? But they were not allowed to do that because of the angry mob. You know what the public would have said? The conspiracy theorists would have said, See, the prosecution deliberately lost that case. They deliberately tossed it because they deliberately did a bad job so they could offer him a sweetheart deal. That was just not an option that they

could have done. But that's what a good prosecutor would have been is hey, we just got sunk. Do you want to talk a deal?

Andy 1:07:06

But that goes in contrast to what a lot of our people experienced that you did cross the line and did do something that's going to get you a PFR charge, but then they also throw in all of this other stuff that they probably can't prove. But then they get you to take a plea deal, because you know you're guilty of something way down. And then like they completely, I don't know, I don't know if I want to call this a bluff. But they do a boo game. How about that? A boo game, that's a prison term for people. And they scare you into taking the plea deal. That's in contrast to what you're just describing, though.

Larry 1:07:41

I don't think it is in contrast. I think it's very consistent. That's what I'm saying. That at the very beginning, they had a horrible case. But they could not offer him a plea, they could not offer him a plea. (Andy: Just because of the public pressure?) Because of the public pressure. (Andy: I see.) There's no plea offer that could have been made. And at the time when the case crashed, in my opinion, and this is not hindsight quarterbacking, I said that at the time. I said this case just went down the crapper when I saw that testimony. And at that time, they still didn't know about the lesser included. The prosecution still had the weapons charge, and they had the option of making a deal on a lesser charge. And that would have been the prudent prosecutorial move to have done. But with mob justice, you can't do that. You cannot say, because people don't understand how the system works. And they want it all or nothing. And they got nothing. A good prosecutor wants a conviction on what the appropriate crime is. Alex Hunter would have made a deal. He would have said, Look, this is what I've got, folks. This is what I've got. And this is what the plea offer is going to be. But that's not permissible anymore. And this judge, I don't know what Wisconsin's law is on recall and removal. But if that exists in Wisconsin, this judge is going to be subject to the same type of effort that Judge Persky was in California.

Andy 1:09:04

Interesting. Wow. That would be very interesting. I, Larry, I have a homework assignment for you, then. Can you then research can that judge be recalled. And if you hear any grumbings about that, that would be interesting to follow up on.

Larry 1:09:18

I will do that. I don't know what the process is there. But I'm sure with our vast research staff, I can assign this and we could probably... and our winner also put a nice humorous email together about our research staff. You remember that was same person that won. He made some jokes about our research and our writers and our copy editors and all the stuff that we have at FYP.

Andy 1:09:46

I do. I just don't know if they're the same people. Alright, with that Larry, on the heels of who Who's that speaker for this week of episode 203. Again, send me an email message at registrymatterscast@gmail.com. And for that if you have an answer... and for the bonehead in chat that already unleashed it, you're going to get banned if you keep that up. Just saying, just saying. It's not an idle threat. But I think Larry, then we can talk

about our new patrons, we did get a new one named Lydia. Thank you very much for becoming a new patron. Part of the FYP global headquarters Alliance or something like that. I got to come up with a very slick name. And defjunkies was very generous. He increased his support for the show by a factor of three, Larry, a threefold increase. So now he's that stimulus check times three.

Larry 1:10:34

So what's 14 times 3?

Andy 1:10:40

28. I don't know what goes on after that. 42?

Larry 1:10:43

Yeah, \$4200 a month.

Andy 1:10:46

Cool. Like it. And Larry, did we get any new snail mail subscribers?

Larry 1:10:49

We did get one, but the name escapes me. (Andy: How about Roger?) That sounds right.

Andy 1:10:55

That's why the show notes are there, man.

Larry 1:10:57

You think I actually look at that screen?

Andy 1:11:00

Well, obviously not. All right. Well, I think that closes it up. We are bumping up right up against the time there for the transcript. If you don't know, we have a certain number of pages that can fit into an envelope without costing more than one, I think, one first class postage stamp. Is that right?

Larry 1:11:15

It's actually more than one. But we don't want to keep going up. Yeah, we're at two ounces. We could go higher. It's just money.

Andy 1:11:25

Oh, that just grows on trees.

Larry 1:11:27

Yeah, and we have a vast amount of grant money. I mean, it just flows in. And there's grant organizations approaching us wanting to give us money.

Andy 1:11:37

That's why we need that 501c3 that we talked about at the beginning of this year. And we'll talk about it again at the beginning of next year, I suppose. Thank you, everyone, for listening on the live stream channel on Discord. It's super fun. Everyone keeps me on my toes in there. And they post good information like the person posting the information about what to do for PC, for the person that is being threatened there and doesn't want to go on to general population. I have information for you that we're going to get sent out. But you can find all of the show notes over at registrymatters.co. You can leave voicemail at 747-227-4477. Email me again at registrymatterscast@gmail.com. And of course, if you want to support the program, all

contributions are greatly, greatly appreciated. We spend a crap ton of hours doing the stuff Larry puts together all this legal analysis stuff and all the postproduction work that I have to go through and pre-production work. And that's over at patreon.com/registrymatters. This is Thanksgiving week. Larry, Thursday is Thanksgiving, if I'm not mistaken, and I hope that everyone has an enjoyable holiday. And we will be here again Saturday night if I'm not mistaken. And have a great night. Larry, I'll talk to you soon.

You've been listening to Registry Matters Podcast.

Registry Matters Podcast is a production of FYP Education.

More show transcripts are available at <https://RegistryMatters.co> (that's right... just C O with no M)

In prison and can't get the podcast? Have a loved one "subscribe" at <https://patreon.com/registrymatters> at the **\$15 level**, and include your prison address information. Or send a check to cover at least 3 months.

Glossary:

PFR – Person Forced to Register
NARSOL – Nasional Association for Rational Sexual Offense Laws
AWA – Adam Walsh Act
BCC – Bureau of Community Corrections
CCC – Community Corrections Center
CCF – Community Corrections Facility
ICAOS - Interstate Compact for Adult Offender Supervision
PC – Protective Custody
PREA - Prison Rape Elimination Act
DOC – Department of Corrections
CSL - Community Supervision for Life
DCS – Department of Community Supervision
IML – International Megan's Law
SOMP – Sex Offender Management Program
BOP – Bureau of Prisons
CAGE – Citizens Against Government Entrapment
PV – Parole / Probation Violation
SMART Office - Office of Sex Offender Sentencing, Monitoring, Apprehending, Registering, and Tracking
ICAC - Internet Crimes Against Children



REGISTRY MATTERS
MAIL-IN SUBSCRIPTION FORM

Sign me up for _____ months X \$6 = \$ _____
(Minimum 3 months) * **We do accept books or sheets of stamps. No singles please.**

First Name Last Name

Name of Institution ID Number

Address

City State Zip Code

**Make check payable to FYP Education and send to RM Podcast,
Post Office Box 36123, Albuquerque, NM 87176**