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Introduction
“My spirit has been burned but still glows through the flames. Hear me roar, see me glow, and watch me grow.”

These are the words of Pieper Lewis, who, at 15 years old, was sold to a 37-year-old man. Pieper’s statement was made in court; not as a plaintiff, a complainant, a survivor, or even a victim, but as a defendant. She was charged with first-degree murder of the man she killed after he drugged and repeatedly raped her over the course of three days while she faded in and out of consciousness.

Pieper’s criminalization is just one example of the abuse to prison pipeline for girls, a cycle we identified in 2015—and, as this report establishes, still persists. In this cycle, girls—especially girls of color—are punished for the gender-based violence they endure, sent into the prison system without access to critical support.

The roots of this cycle reach far and run deep. Public systems, entrusted with authority over girls’ lives, not only fail to protect the safety of survivors; they affirmatively criminalize them. This injustice is particularly egregious when viewed against the backdrop of the sheer scale of sexual violence against girls in the US: girls aged 16-19 are four times more likely than the general population to be victims of rape, attempted rape, or sexual assault. And according to data released by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention in 2022, one in four women in the United States (26.8 percent, or 33.5 million) reported “completed” or attempted rape at some point in their lifetime.

These rates are even higher for women and girls of color, resulting in inequitable patterns of impact. According to the Rape, Abuse, Incest National Network (RAINN), the nation’s largest anti-sexual violence organization, Native girls run the highest risk of sexual violence of all girls. On average, Native people aged 12 and older experience 5,900 sexual assaults per year. They are twice as likely to be raped and/or sexually assaulted compared to all other races/ethnicities. Meanwhile, the Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS) revealed that 13.9 percent of Native Hawaiian high schoolers in that state reported that they had been forced to engage in sexual acts by someone they were dating within the past 12 months, compared to 6.8 percent of white high schoolers. Black girls also face extremely high rates of sexual violence. Ujima, the National Center on Violence Against Women in the Black Community, reported that one in four Black girls are sexually abused before the age of 18. In a study Ujima conducted on a national sample of high school students, 11 percent of Black girls reported having been raped.

One cause of the high rates of sexual violence against girls of color—as well as the disproportionate degree of punishment imposed on them in response to that violence—is the adults who dehumanize them. In previous reports, we have documented the distorted lens through which adults view Black girls, perceiving them as older than white girls of the same age, more promiscuous, and undeserving of the same protection. Further, we have exposed a pattern of disproportionate sexual exploitation of girls of color by white men, as well as inequitable rates of arrests on prostitution charges.

To elevate awareness of the criminalization of survivors, our organizations, together with the Ms. Foundation, published The Sexual Abuse to Prison Pipeline: The Girls’ Story in 2015, which highlighted the hidden pattern that routes survivors like Pieper—who are often girls of color—into the legal system despite the fact that they present little, if any, risk to public safety.

Since that time, the concept of the abuse to prison pipeline for girls has spread widely, influencing policy, research, and the public narrative—most notably championed by President Obama in 2015. The Sexual Abuse to Prison Pipeline report has been cited in hundreds of peer-reviewed journals, law review articles, and reports; and it has been referenced in support of legislation and policies designed to decriminalize survivors and increase the use of trauma-informed practices and community-based programs for survivors of gender-based violence.
Subsequent research, too, has produced findings that substantiate the correlation between girls’ and women’s experience of sexual violence and their involvement in the legal system. This body of work points to the need for a range of further studies, including examinations of the specific factors at play in the cycle, as well as the pipeline’s effects on subgroups of girls and women.

The press has also widely recognized the abuse to prison pipeline in the wake of our report. Articles about gender-based violence have increasingly questioned why girls who have histories of sexual victimization are sent into the prison system and shined a light on the harms of incarcerating survivors.

These developments have taken place against a cultural backdrop that has changed considerably since our report was published. Seismic points of inflection include the rise of the Black Lives Matter movement, the Covid pandemic, the #MeToo movement, and the Supreme Court’s decision in *Dobbs v. Jackson Women’s Health Organization*, which eliminated the constitutional right to abortion.

Of these touchpoints, the rise of the #MeToo movement has been uniquely influential in expanding mainstream recognition of the prevalence of sexual violence against women and girls, challenging conventional biases against claims of sexual abuse and prompting us to do better in hearing, believing, and supporting survivors. As more and more women and girls have publicly acknowledged their survivorship, the hashtag #MeToo has stood for a movement to end the nation’s complicity in perpetuating sexual harassment and abuse.

Although the #MeToo movement continues to evolve, its focus has changed from the original intent, which was to provide safe spaces for women and girls of color to connect and heal from sexual violence. Its explosion into the mainstream was marked by increased attention to the experiences of affluent white women—a focus that persisted despite the disproportionately higher rates of sexual violence against girls and young women of color. Tarana Burke, the founder of #MeToo, recognized this phenomenon as part of a historical pattern, noting that “sexual violence knows no race, class, or gender—but the response to it does.”

In light of the changes that have taken place since the publication of our 2015 report, we set out to examine the current state of the pipeline for girls. Here, we provide new analyses of the most significant paths that funnel survivors into the system, points of progress made in law and policy reform, and the challenges that persist. Finally, we offer a set of principles to guide systemic change.

Solutions are possible, if only we choose to act. The top priority must be the prevention of gender-based violence itself. But as long as that violence persists, we must end the criminalization of victims. Through systemic, structural change, we can achieve justice for survivors.
State of the Pipeline: Girls who Survive Abuse Are Still Pushed Into the Legal System
Despite clear evidence and increasing awareness of the prevalence of gender-based violence, girls are still pushed into the legal system in three main ways as a direct result of the violence they experience:

- Girls are blamed and criminalized for being sex trafficked;
- Girls are criminalized for acting in self-defense against abusers; and
- Girls are punished or criminalized for reporting abuse.

These categories are not intended to represent an exhaustive list of all routes into the system for survivors of gender-based violence. As we highlighted in our original report, there are many other unique pathways into the system for girls, such as the criminalization of status offenders who run away from home to escape abuse or are forced to be truant because they are being sex trafficked. We highlight the three paths above as among the most urgent to address.

**Girls are Blamed and Criminalized for Being Sex Trafficked**

Awareness of the prevalence of child sex trafficking and the injustice of criminalizing survivors has grown tremendously in recent years. Arrests of children on charges related to prostitution and “commercialized vice” have declined at rates that exceed the decline in total juvenile arrest rates. In addition, thanks to the leadership of survivors, use of the term child prostitute—itself a legal oxymoron, since children cannot legally consent to sex—has begun to wane in recent years. In an influential development, the Associated Press revised its Stylebook—the foundational guideline for journalists and other writers on language, usage, style, spelling, and punctuation—to discourage use of the term when referring to child victims of sexual exploitation. This trend, as well as the legal reforms we detail in the next section, are helping re-shape perceptions of child survivors in ways that are more legally accurate and ethically just.

Yet the criminalization of child survivors continues. The US Department of Justice has reported that 110 children were arrested nationwide on prostitution charges and commercialized vice in 2020, but local reports indicate that number is a vast underestimate. In states that report a reduction in arrests of children related to prostitution, survivors may simply be arrested on different charges—a practice known as proxy or masking charges—including loitering; trespass; drug possession; or status offenses, such as truancy or running away. These arrests are overwhelmingly of girls: in 2019, 71 percent of youth arrested on charges of prostitution and commercialized vice were girls, far exceeding their proportion of the population. The arrests are also disproportionately of Black youth: According to the US Department of Justice, in 2019—the latest year for which data has been released—Black children were over five times more likely to be arrested for prostitution and commercialized vice than white children. Overall, children of color were over three and a half times more likely to be arrested on these charges than white children.

As we emphasized in our original report, the arrest and criminalization of child sex trafficking victims, whether on prostitution charges or other charges related to their exploitation, is both ethically and legally wrong. Under federal law, any child under the age of 18 engaged in a commercial sex act is a victim of a “severe form” of human trafficking. Criminalizing child victims as if they were offenders undermines that legally protected status; it also perpetuates abuse by directing focus away from adult exploiters and masking structural, systemic failures to provide community safety and accountability. And the failure to screen youth who come into contact with the system upon intake to identify whether they are victims of trafficking—a common failure in many states—is inconsistent with federal guidance set forth in the Juvenile Justice Reform Act. As a result, many child trafficking victims remain unidentified, without critical services or support, and without the benefit of context when placement and treatment options are assessed.

Still deeper criminalization occurs when more serious charges are brought against survivors. One example: child sex trafficking victims who are charged with recruiting other victims. This practice, which holds child victims liable as traffickers traffickers or co-conspirators, fails to recognize the broader circumstances: that is, the violence, coercion, threats, manipulation, and other forms of control that traffickers use to force their victims to exploit other children. It also discounts the harmful effect of survivors’ ongoing trauma on their sense of agency and decision-making.
An example in Florida provides a case in point:

Multiple traffickers were recently arrested and tried for running a drug and human trafficking ring. At trial, prosecutors identified one witness as a victim. Yet to force that survivor to cooperate, they charged her as a co-conspirator, offering her a plea deal that required her to testify against her exploiters and attend a program for victims.

Treating survivors as offenders—even if they are simultaneously acknowledged as victims—revels a fundamental disregard of the effects of being charged as a criminal after surviving a human rights violation, as well as the burden of living with a criminal record.

**Girls are Criminalized for Acting in Self-Defense Against Abusers**

Despite the emergence of reforms, samples of which we discuss in the next section, girls continue to be funneled into the youth—and sometimes adult—legal system for acts that are rooted in attempts to escape the men who rape, sell, and abuse them, including acts of self-defense that sometimes require violence. In these cases, police, prosecutors, and judges often fail to consider the role of underlying victimization. As a result, victims often face a catch-22: they can comply with their exploiter and run the risk of arrest on prostitution or related offenses, or they can use the force necessary to escape, which risks criminal punishment for harming their abusers.

Sentencing girls to years, even decades, of imprisonment for acting in self-defense against abusers is common across the country. But punishing survivors for acting against their exploiters without considering the trauma they have endured or the context of traffickers’ coercion is not only unjust; it deprives girls of their freedom and the treatment and support needed to heal and end cycles of violence and harm.
INCREASING PROTECTIONS FOR CRIMINALIZED CHILDREN

Until the 21st century, American children could be sentenced to die or spend the rest of their lives behind bars. Through a series of holdings over the last two decades, the US Supreme Court has gradually increased legal protections for children accused of serious crimes:

• In 2005, the Court ruled that sentencing children to death for crimes they committed before the age of 18 violates the Eighth Amendment’s prohibition against cruel and unusual punishment.42

• In 2010, the Court abolished the sentence of life without the possibility of parole for children convicted of crimes other than homicide.43

• In 2012, Miller v. Alabama held that mandatory sentences of life without parole for children convicted of homicide are unconstitutional.44 While life sentences could be imposed, Justice Kagan wrote: “Although we do not foreclose a sentencer’s ability to make that judgment in homicide cases, we require it to take into account how children are different, and how those differences counsel against irrevocably sentencing them to a lifetime in prison.”45 The decision invalidated mandatory life sentencing provisions in 29 states.46

• In 2016, Montgomery v. Louisiana held that Miller applies retroactively, requiring states to allow individuals to be considered for parole for crimes they committed as children.47

According to the Equal Justice Initiative, which argued the Miller case before the Supreme Court, more than one thousand people who had been sentenced to die behind bars for acts committed as children have been resentenced pursuant to that holding, and hundreds released.48

These cases represent important progress. However, children—including, as demonstrated by the case studies outlined in this report, child survivors of exploitation—are still being tried as adults and sentenced to decades in adult prison for acts of self-defense against exploiters. The federal government and states have the authority—and, we would argue, the duty—to enact legislation that provides greater protection to children than the standard established by the Constitution, as the Supreme Court has noted.49 Yet, as this report makes clear, bills have often failed to pass even when they prohibit sentences of life without parole for children only after youth have served at least 20 years.50
Below, we describe a handful of representative cases of the criminalization of girls who act in self-defense. Significantly, the defendant in every incident is a girl of color. What makes these cases unusual is that they are known at all. Only the most egregious cases garner national attention and outrage, and even then, awareness is raised only because of heroic efforts by families, friends, lawyers, advocates, and journalists—and, in some cases, the extraordinary involvement of public figures. Although most of these survivors were ultimately released, far more often, survivors—especially girls of color—stay in the shadows of the system.

**CYNTOIA BROWN (TENNESSEE)**

Cyntoia Brown was 16 years old when she was imprisoned for killing a 43-year-old man who paid to rape her. According to a court opinion in her case, “the victim showed [Cyntoia] some guns, and they got into bed together. The victim whispered to and touched [Cyntoia] and reached underneath the bed. [Cyntoia] thought the victim was reaching for a gun, so she pulled a ... handgun out of her purse and shot him.”

Cyntoia was tried as an adult; the jury rejected her claim of self-defense. She was found guilty of first-degree premeditated murder, first-degree felony murder, and aggravated robbery, and she was sentenced to 51 years to life in prison.

After a documentary was aired about her case, Cyntoia was granted clemency by Governor Bill Haslam and released, having served 15 years.

**CHRYSTUL KIZER (WISCONSIN)**

At 17, Chrystul Kizer shot and killed Randall Volar, who had previously been charged—then released without bail—for sexually exploiting numerous Black girls. According to the *Washington Post*, police had seized videos in Volar’s home showing him abusing several underage Black girls, including Chrystul, and “hundreds” of other videos of child sexual abuse.

According to Chrystul, after a year of complying with his demands, she finally rejected Volar, and he tried to rape her. She shot him with a gun her boyfriend had given her. Chrystul was charged with first-degree intentional homicide, which carries a mandatory sentence of life in prison.

In July 2022, the state Supreme Court ruled that Wisconsin’s affirmative defense law, which applies to victims of sex trafficking for any offense committed as a direct result of trafficking, could provide a complete defense to Chrystul’s charge of first-degree homicide. Now, after the delay that stretched on for years as her case made its way through the courts, Chrystul may present evidence to support the application of this defense to her case, which would allow her to be released.

**PIEPER LEWIS (IOWA)**

Pieper Lewis, a 15-year-old girl, was trafficked by a 28-year-old man claiming to be her boyfriend. In 2020, her trafficker forced her to go home with a 37-year-old sex buyer who drugged and raped her multiple times over a three-day period. She used a knife on the nightstand to kill him.

Charged with his murder, she faced 20 years in prison. She pled guilty to voluntary manslaughter and willful injury. After being held in a juvenile detention facility for two years, prosecutors recommended probation. Pieper was sentenced to five years’ probation in women’s transitional facility without the possibility of early release and was required to wear an ankle monitor. The court warned her: “[T]his is the second chance you asked for. You don’t get a third.” The judge ordered her to serve 200 hours of community service, pay more than $4,000 in civil penalties, and pay $150,000 in restitution to the rapist’s estate. But Pieper, who has said that she plans to become a youth justice advocate, broke her ankle monitor and fled the center soon after her trial. She was returned to jail; in March 2023, she pled guilty to an escape charge. A hearing to determine if she will be forced to go to prison is pending.

**ALEXIS MARTIN (OHIO)**

Alexis Martin, 15, helped plan a robbery of her 36-year-old trafficker, Angelo Kerney, who had forbidden her from attending school. According to news reports, Martin said...
she had agreed to participate in the robbery to escape Kerney and go to school: “[Education] was my only hope that I ever would leave behind the ghettos—that abuse.” Things went wrong, and the robbery turned into a homicide.

Alexis was charged with felony murder, despite her status as a child victim. Prosecutors argued that Alexis was a “manipulator;” that she had played a key role in the robbery; and that she should be tried as an adult. Her lawyer, three years out of law school, was unaware of the safe harbor law that had been enacted 17 months earlier. As a result, the availability of safe harbor protections was not raised.

The judge characterized Alexis as “working” for Kerney, stating: “It is almost beyond comprehension to think that a 15-year-old child would be involved in that kind of work.” Tried and convicted, Alexis was sentenced to 21 years to life in adult prison.

Governor Mike DeWine later commuted Alexis’ sentence—after advocates raised awareness about her case—as part of a broader effort to limit the spread of Covid in prisons. In a statement about his decision, the governor noted: “Alexis was 15 years of age when she committed the crime; 17 when she went to prison. She is a child sex trafficking survivor. She will be sent to an appropriate group home and she will be under supervision for an extensive period of time.” Alexis had already served seven years. As a condition of the commutation, she was required to wear an ankle monitor, forbidden from leaving the state, and placed on parole—which included being subjected to random checks by parole officers—for the remainder of her sentence: 14 years.

In 2021, a parole officer conducted an unscheduled visit of Alexis’ apartment and found drugs and weapons in moving boxes belonging to her boyfriend. Although her lawyers argued that Alexis was not aware of them, she was held to have violated the terms of her parole. In response, the parole board chose the harshest punishment possible: it revoked Alexis’ commutation and reinstated her prior sentence in its entirety. The governor did not intervene. Alexis is now scheduled to be released in November 2034.

BRESHA MEADOWS (OHIO)

Bresha Meadows ran away twice to escape her home, where she had witnessed her father repeatedly and violently abusing her mother and threatening the rest of the family. At the age of 14, after she was forced to return home, she shot him, and was charged with aggravated murder. She pled guilty to involuntary manslaughter. She served a year in a juvenile detention center, then another six months in a residential treatment center. Amid public outcry and with the support of advocates, Bresha was released under her family’s supervision for two more years.

PATRICE SMITH (NEW YORK)

Patrice Smith was a 15-year-old girl when, according to court records, she was repeatedly raped by a 71-year-old man in exchange for money and gifts. In an incident in which she refused his demand for sex, he threatened to kill her and began pushing her toward the bedroom. A physical fight ensued in which Patrice feared she would be killed. She fought back, ultimately killing him. She was charged with homicide and robbery.

She was convicted and sentenced to concurrent indeterminate terms of 25 years to life on two second-degree murder counts and 10 years on a robbery count. The conviction was unanimously affirmed on appeal.

Decades later, while Patrice was still incarcerated, New York enacted the Domestic Violence Survivors Justice Act. The law provides discretion to judges to depart from mandatory minimum sentences in cases of domestic violence if those sentences would be “unduly harsh” in light of the nature and circumstances of the crime and the defendant’s history, character, and condition. The law defines domestic violence broadly to include acts committed by anyone in an “intimate relationship” with the victim. A related provision of criminal procedure establishes that the law can serve as a basis for resentencing survivors who are serving at least eight years for offenses committed before the effective date of the law. Patrice requested resentencing under this provision, which the district attorney opposed. The court held that the law applied to Patrice’s case, based on its finding that Patrice had been subjected to substantial physical, sexual, and psychological abuse that significantly contributed to her committing the offense. Patrice had served over 20 years before her sentence was vacated; she was released in 2020.
Girls are Criminalized for Reporting Abuse

Law enforcement officers are charged with protecting victims of crime; but they, themselves, perpetuate the abuse to prison pipeline when they file false reporting charges against girls who report assault or trafficking. Charging survivors with false reporting reflects the lack of credibility often afforded to victims of gender-based violence. A recent ethnographic study found that detectives’ determination that a survivor has filed a false report involves a complex combination of factors, including “the institutional frames of the department and the individual-level attitudes of the detective including adherence to rape myths.” It concluded:

[W]e found that detectives’ construction of false reports is not only an individual-level phenomenon, but speak[s] to wider structural issues such as policing culture and societal views about rape.

The findings do not suggest that detectives believe all sexual assault cases are false reports, but they do hold the belief that false reporting occurs more frequently than the statistics indicate, suggesting that the rape myth of the lying victim/false report continues to be salient in [the jurisdiction], and potentially policing culture. Adherence to the myth of the lying victim continues to shape how detectives view, understand, and respond to sexual assault and victims.

Despite guidance issued by the FBI and the International Association of Chiefs of Police recommending against filing false reporting charges in these cases, women and girls are significantly vulnerable to this form of criminalization. According to Deborah Tuerkheimer, former assistant district attorney and author of Credible: Why We Doubt Accusers and Protect Abusers:

Most women who come forward with an abuse allegation against a man will confront the credibility discount. Judging credibility is a mighty power—because credibility is itself a form of power. Whenever we judge credibility, we are in a position to value, or to devalue, the speaker. ... The most vulnerable women experience credibility discounting at its most extreme, while men who are protected by greater status or position are the beneficiaries of massive credibility boosts.

A leading researcher on the prosecution of rape victims has observed that “the vulnerability of the complainant is a key factor in determining who gets charged with falsely reporting a rape. Vulnerable complainants are easier targets because they have fewer resources—both social and financial—with which to challenge the police’s treatment of them.”
Girls are a particular target of the “credibility discount.” Research shows that interviewers often engage in “characterological victim blaming” of girls. In fact, adolescent girls, who experience particularly high rates of sexual assault, paradoxically are also more likely to be discredited than both older and younger victims. Research has shown that adults view teenagers who allege sex abuse as less credible than younger children “in part because ... adults view children as losing their sexual naiveté, and thus become capable of instigating lies about sexual abuse, at around 12 years old.” At the same time, adolescents are viewed as less credible than adult survivors: “Adult stereotypes of adolescents may lead them to perceive adolescents’ stories as less credible than adults’, particularly when the victim was involved in illegal or experimental adolescent behavior (e.g., drinking alcohol).”

According to the authors of a study on police refusal to submit sexual assault kits:

> Adolescents are often singled out by police as being particularly less credible, as law enforcement believe that their claims of rape are fabricated to cover up for “bad behavior” (being out late, drinking) and to try to avoid getting into trouble with their parents for those behaviors.

Treating victims with undue skepticism and hostility creates disincentives for victims to report abuse which, in turn, reduces opportunities for them to receive critical forms of support. It can also bias investigations and thwart the investigation of gender violence—and, by extension, place more women and girls in the community at risk of harm.

In addition, disbelieving survivors can traumatize them as victims in what has been described as “‘secondary victimization’: insensitive, victim-blaming treatment that makes survivors feel as though they are being [re-victimized] by the systems that are supposed to help them.”

This treatment can exacerbate girls’ culturally imposed tendency to blame themselves for the abuse they experience, which, studies show, can lead to anxiety, depression, PTSD, and suicidal ideation.

**MARIE’S STORY**

The story of Marie, an 18-year-old resident of Washington State, illustrates police officers’ tendency to doubt the accounts of young people who report sexual assault and investigate cases in ways that confirm their bias.

Marie reported that she had been bound, gagged, and raped at knifepoint by a man who had secretly surveilled her. Within a week, police picked her up and took her to the station, where they confronted her with inconsistencies in her story—a common occurrence among victims who experience trauma. Marie recanted her claim under pressure by the detectives. She then reinstated it, and again recanted, in circumstances that she later characterized as duress. She was charged and pled guilty to filing a false report. After agreeing to a sentence of a year of probation and $500 in court costs, the charges were dropped.

In the next several years, the same person raped five other women.

The police chief later requested reviews of the investigation. These reviews determined that the detectives had “bullied,” “hounded,” and “coerced” Marie; ignored evidence of the crime; and focused on “minor inconsistencies” in her story, despite the well-established frequency of such inconsistencies among sexual assault survivors. The conclusion: the detectives had purposely elicited a confession of false reporting. According to a sex-crimes unit supervisor, their actions amounted to “nothing short of the victim being coerced into admitting that she lied about the rape,” which compounded the trauma of her assault.

The case gained national attention when a Pulitzer Prize-winning article was published in 2015 by Pro Publica and The Marshall Project; it also became the subject of a Netflix documentary. As of the time of this publication, the detectives have not been disciplined.
Many survivors have attested to the profound harm inflicted by authorities’ hostile responses to their pursuit of accountability. Chanel Miller describes her decision to press charges against Brock Turner, who raped her behind a dumpster while she was unconscious, as naive:

I didn’t know that if a woman was drunk when the violence occurred, she wouldn’t be taken seriously. I didn’t know that if he was drunk when the violence occurred, people would offer him sympathy…. I didn’t know that being a victim was synonymous with not being believed.

Women and girls who are viewed as promiscuous—a common gender stereotype that is often levied against marginalized girls—are even less likely to be perceived as credible. One study, for example, found that detectives “dismissed rape allegations by women they believed were involved in [the sex trade] as ‘economic crimes.’” In other words, they believed that the women only “alleged rape when they were not paid.”

Discrediting survivors is especially common for girls with intersectional identities. According to Tuerkheimer:

When women belong to groups that are marginalized, subordinated, or otherwise vulnerable, their allegations are even less likely to be credited. Class matters. Line of work matters. Immigration status matters. Drug and alcohol use matters. Sexual history matters. Sexual orientation matters. Nowhere are the particulars more important than when it comes to race, which is ‘inextricable from gender’. Black girls, in particular, are targeted by stereotypes that portray them as hypersexualized, seductive, and exploitative of men’s weaknesses. These deeply racist perceptions are firmly ingrained in American culture. Anita Hill described her experience testifying before the Senate Judiciary Committee in 1991 about being sexually harassed by now-Justice Clarence Thomas: “Falsely casting me as an erotomaniac … fit neatly within the myth of Black women’s sexuality.”

Age matters too. Stereotypes of Black girls warp adults’ perception of them; they tend to view Black girls as young as 5-9 years old as more adult-like and more knowledgeable about sex than their white peers. In the context of sexual abuse, this adultification bias may translate into authorities’ dismissal of Black girls’ reports. In fact, one study showed that in some circumstances, “even 6-year-old Black girls are perceived as less credible (and perhaps more sexual) than 6-year-old [w]hite girls,” and less traumatized by their victimization than white girls.

[Interrogators fail to recognize [Black girls] as … [victims], but instead see them as mature, competent, and self-reliant … [because] of adultification bias. The dominant narrative depicting [Black girls] as mature women, competent about sex and capable of consent, provides a readily available explanation for their traumatic experience.

Ultimately, the practice of retaliating against women and girls who report sexual abuse excuses—and in so doing, perpetuates—gender-based violence. In the words of Chanel Miller:

Victims are often, automatically, accused of lying. ... Why is it that we’re wary of victims making false accusations, but rarely consider how many men have blatantly lied about, downplayed, or manipulated others to cover their own actions?
SIDEBAR

GIRLS ARE CRIMINALIZED OR PUNISHED AT SCHOOL FOR REPORTING SEXUAL HARASSMENT AND ABUSE

Schools should function as safe havens that nurture and protect youth; but they contribute to the abuse to prison pipeline for girls when they punish students who report sexual abuse and harassment. In an echo of police officers’ discounting of girls’ claims of sexual abuse, schools sometimes discipline girls who report harassment or abuse despite the protections offered by Title IX, the federal law that bans sex discrimination in federally funded schools. Schools have been shown to have suspended, expelled, and otherwise disciplined girls who have reported sexual assault, turning blame for the abuse onto the victims. And exclusion increases survivors’ risk of involvement in the legal system.

This pattern ripples across the country. In Georgia, for example, a 16-year-old Black girl was suspended and then expelled in 2017 for “sexual impropriety” after reporting sexual assault. That same year, a 14-year-old Latina girl was suspended in Florida for “inappropriate sexual behavior” after reporting that she was raped. In New Jersey, a Black high-school girl was suspended for “disorderly conduct” in 2016 after reporting she was sexually assaulted on a bus.

Racial bias further increases the risk of punishment for students of color who report abuse. According to Shiwali Patel of the National Women’s Law Center,

[D]iscriminatory responses from schools are far too common, particularly towards girls of color and especially [B]lack girls, who—because of harmful race and sex stereotypes—are too often disbelieved, misperceived as the initial aggressor when they defend themselves against harassment, face minimization of their harm, or are blamed for their victimization.

The role of schools in the sexual abuse to prison pipeline points to the need for policies that end school pushout for girls who experience sexual violence and harassment. Instead, schools must meet their obligation to students by investigating claims fairly; providing support to young people who experience sex discrimination, harassment, and abuse; and providing opportunities for healing and safety to girls and youth.
Disrupting the Abuse to Prison Pipeline: Progress in Policy and Legislation Since 2015
Progress in developing systemic reform to end the criminalization of survivors has been slow. Still, in the last several years, policies and laws adopted at both the federal and state level have begun to meaningfully reduce the criminalization of sexual abuse survivors.

The White House and Federal Agencies

In 2015, the White House adopted the language of the abuse to prison pipeline report and called for reducing its harms. In President Obama’s speech to the Congressional Black Caucus that year, for example, which showcased his administration’s commitment to expanding its youth-justice work, he recognized that work to reduce youth pipelines into the prison system should not focus only on Black boys:

> [A]lthough in these discussions a lot of my focus has been on African American men and the work we’re doing with My Brother’s Keeper [an initiative launched in 2014 to support boys and young men of color], we can’t forget the impact that the system has on women, as well. The incarceration rate for Black women is twice as high as the rate for white women. Many women in prison ... have been sexually assaulted, both before they got to prison and then after they go to prison. ... While boys face the school-to-prison pipeline, a lot of girls are facing a more sinister sexual abuse-to-prison pipeline. ... So we’re focusing on boys, but we’re also investing in ways to change the odds for at-risk girls—to make sure that they are loved and valued.

President Obama later emphasized his administration’s prioritization of disrupting the pipeline for girls when he proclaimed January as National Slavery and Human Trafficking Prevention Month, noting, “[W]e have worked to address the sexual abuse to prison pipeline that disproportionately affects those especially vulnerable to sex trafficking—including young women and girls of color.” His administration convened a meeting entitled “Girls of Color and Intervening Public Systems: Interrupting the Sexual Abuse to Prison Pipeline,” which invited young women and girls and national experts to discuss strategies to dismantle the sexual abuse to prison pipeline and promote better outcomes for girls of color. Further, in 2015, the White House Council on Women and Girls acknowledged the role that status offenses—violations that often are indicators of underlying abuse—play in increasing girls’ routes into the system:

> The most common offenses for which girls are arrested include running away and truancy. These behaviors are also the most common symptoms or outcomes of trauma and abuse. Once in the system, girls may be treated as offenders rather than girls in need of support, perpetuating a vicious cycle that is increasingly known as the ‘sexual abuse to prison pipeline.’

Other federal agencies, including the US Department of Justice’s Office on Violence Against Women; its Office of Justice Programs; and its Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), as well as the Federal Interagency Reentry Council, have also recognized the pipeline and taken action to break the cycle. In discussing funding directed at increasing the availability of programs focused on girls in the youth legal system, OJJDP highlighted that trafficked girls often become caught up in the system and that 73 percent of girls in the system “had past histories of physical and sexual abuse.”

Federal Policy and Leadership

Federal lawmakers have addressed—and continue to address—the pipeline through legislation and leadership. We describe below some of the most promising and noteworthy examples.

In 2015, former Congresswoman and current Los Angeles Mayor Karen Bass hosted a congressional briefing on Capitol Hill on legislative strategies to help curb the abuse to prison pipeline and better protect survivors of violence and exploitation. Several current and former Members of Congress made remarks at the briefing, including Representatives Barbara Lee, Bonnie Watson Coleman, Judy Chu, Hank Johnson, Bobby Scott, and Ted Poe. In 2017, the Senate Judiciary Committee held a hearing in which formerly incarcerated girls and experts on the abuse to prison pipeline testified about the need for federal and state reform to dismantle the harmful cycle for girls. The hearing contributed to the introduction and eventual passage of bipartisan legislation explicitly addressing the criminalization of girls and survivors of abuse and exploitation: the Juvenile Justice Reform Act of 2018 (JJRA).
The JJRA includes several provisions that align with recommendations in our 2015 report. For example, it requires states to develop policies and procedures to screen all youth upon intake at juvenile justice facilities for human trafficking, document the number identified, and refer those children to appropriate services. The law also follows two of our recommendations to reduce inappropriate treatment of pregnant girls in the system. First, it requires facilities to collect data on the number of pregnant girls in secure detention and, perhaps most critically, it requires states to implement plans to eliminate the use of restraints on pregnant girls in correctional facilities during labor, delivery, and post-partum recovery, barring evidence of an immediate and serious threat to hurting herself or others. In addition, the law echoes our report’s call for states to create “a plan to provide alternatives to detention for status offenders [and] survivors of commercial sexual exploitation . . . such as home-based or community-based services or treatment.” Finally, the JJRA follows our recommendation that at least one member of each State Advisory Group have expertise in sexual abuse and sexual exploitation.

More recently, in 2022, President Biden signed the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act (VAWA) into law, which includes several important provisions that will help prevent the pipeline for survivors. After years of advocacy, the law expands tribal courts’ jurisdiction over non-Natives who commit crimes—including sexual assault, child abuse, sex trafficking, and stalking—against Native people. The law also increases support and services to survivors of gender-based violence from marginalized communities, among other important updates.

Also of note, the Senate passed a resolution in 2015 to promote the principle that trafficked children should not be viewed as prostitutes. Senate Resolution 81 expresses “the sense of the Senate that children trafficked for sex in the United States should not be treated or regarded as child prostitutes because there is no such thing as a ‘child prostitute’—only children who are victims or survivors of rape and sex trafficking” and encourages federal agencies to treat them as such.

Other bills related to the pipeline have been introduced but have not passed. For example, the First Step Implementation Act of 2021 sought to retroactively end juvenile life sentences and de facto life sentences without parole. The legislation would have allowed individuals who
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**THE CREDIBILITY DISCOUNT FOR GIRLS OF COLOR**

* Girls of color stand at the intersection of anti-credibility bias against youth, women, and people of color.
were convicted of crimes as minors to petition the court for sentencing review after serving at least 20 years.\textsuperscript{140} The bill also outlined a process for sealing and expunging certain nonviolent juvenile records.\textsuperscript{141} When deciding whether to reduce prison terms, the bill instructed courts to consider “the family and community circumstances of the defendant at the time of the offense, including any history of abuse, trauma, or involvement in the child welfare system.”\textsuperscript{142}

In addition, the \textit{Childhood Offenders Rehabilitation & Safety Act} was introduced in 2021 to limit the transfer of youth into the adult legal system.\textsuperscript{143} The legislation established a minimum age of 12 to hold children criminally liable and the minimum age for a child to be tried as an adult to 16.\textsuperscript{144} The bill also sought to eliminate the felony murder rule—which allows defendants accused of committing a violent felony to be charged with murder if the felony resulted in death—for minors, and it forbid placing children in federal adult correctional facilities.\textsuperscript{145} The legislation also required data to be collected on children who are adjudicated in federal criminal courts or detained in federal custody.\textsuperscript{146} Finally, the bill established a grant program to promote greater collaboration between child welfare and juvenile justice systems to improve outcomes for at-risk youth, including victims of commercial sexual exploitation.\textsuperscript{147}

Also in 2021, legislation was introduced in Congress that would allow trauma-informed sentencing for young survivors accused of harming their abusers. The bill provided discretion to federal judges to deviate from mandatory minimum sentencing guidelines to reduce sentences in cases where the defendant was under 18.\textsuperscript{148} This bill, known as \textit{Sara’s Law and the Preventing Unfair Sentencing Act}, sought to provide important protections for child sex crime survivors by allowing judges to take into account a defendant’s age, trauma history, and reduced culpability in sentencing.\textsuperscript{149} It was named in honor of Sara Kruzan, who was 16 years old when she shot and killed a man 20 years her senior who began sexually abusing and exploiting her at the age of 13.\textsuperscript{150} She was tried as an adult and was prohibited from presenting evidence about her abuse. Sara was sentenced to life without parole. After a campaign was launched in her behalf, Sara was released after serving 18 years and later pardoned.\textsuperscript{151} If passed, the bill would represent significant progress at the federal level for survivors of sexual abuse. In Sara’s words:

\begin{quote}
I was an 11-year-old child when I was approached by a man I thought was safe. He exploited my innocence, and he set into motion a two-year process of grooming defined by repeated physical, psychological and sexual violence. When I turned 13, he began sex-trafficking me. Three years later, I shot and killed my abuser while he was again attempting to rape me in a hotel room. I was only 16. I was arrested and prosecuted, and by the time I was 17, I had been sentenced to life without the possibility of parole plus four years. I was wounded by an abusive system, incarcerated for almost 20 years and relegated to the shadows of our society.\textsuperscript{152}
\end{quote}

Finally, the \textit{Prohibiting Detention of Youth Status Offenders Act of 2022} was designed to ban the “valid court order” (VCO) exception, a legal loophole that allows children who commit noncriminal status offenses, like running away or truancy, to be incarcerated in juvenile detention facilities.\textsuperscript{153} The bill included the finding that the VCO has led to “thousands of youth being placed in secure detention” for these nonviolent violations.\textsuperscript{154} It further found that girls are more often sent into the legal system for these acts than boys, and that girls often commit these offenses in response to abuse or trauma.\textsuperscript{155}
States’ Safe Harbor Laws: Eliminating Prostitution Charges for Children

In recent years, more states have enacted “safe harbor” laws, which protect youth from arrest or prosecution on prostitution and related charges. While approximately 12 states had safe harbor laws in 2015, a majority of states have some form of this legislation today. The provisions of these laws range from prohibiting the arrest of any minor on a charge of prostitution—the most protective mechanism—to permitting youth to assert an affirmative defense to a prostitution charge, to proscribing or mandating diversion for children prosecuted on charges of prostitution in lieu of adjudication.

Some state laws go further, protecting survivors from a broad array of charges so long as the acts were committed while the child was being trafficked or was directly related to their exploitation. Ohio, for example, enacted a series of protections for child victims charged with crimes during the period of exploitation. The Ohio Supreme Court has directed juvenile courts to interpret these protections broadly regardless of the child’s criminal history or the charges filed against them.

Despite the progress that safe harbor statutes represent, they offer little practical protection from criminalization if unaccompanied by mechanisms that support implementation. Data on safe harbor implementation is limited, but studies have found limited improvement in the rates of arrests of trafficked children after many of these laws have gone into effect. According to the Washington Post, for example, in Nevada alone, at least 110 children were arrested on prostitution-related offenses in 2019, despite the state’s safe harbor law.

Robust implementation of safe harbor laws can be limited by many factors, such as failure to commit to enforcement or lack of awareness, cross-system communication, training, or effective screening tools for first responders and other system actors. Minnesota provides an example: according to a 2017 evaluation of the implementation of its safe harbor law, the legislation increased awareness of sexual exploitation among service providers, school officials, and law enforcement, resulting in greater understanding of what constitutes child sex trafficking and how to identify and respond to victims. The law also led to expansion in available services, including housing beds. Despite these gains, however, enforcement varied widely, in part due to communications challenges when coordinating services across agencies.

Limited resources and intervention options can also undermine enforcement of safe harbor laws. Often, authorities decide to detain survivors because they believe it is the only means of keeping them safe. This approach sacrifices victims’ freedom in the name of “protection,” despite their status as crime victims. To create grounds to justify locking them up, sexually
exploited children are brought into the system on prostitution or proxy charges. The injustice inherent in this treatment of child survivors was recognized by the Nevada Supreme Court in 2016, when it decried the practice of charging youth with offenses “just to get the child off the street.”

In addition to depriving young people of their liberty, this approach also operates on the false premise that detention necessarily offers children safety. Detention is far from safe, especially for girls who have experienced abuse: according to one study, children who had experienced prior abuse were 52 percent more likely to experience sexual violence in detention. Meanwhile, those who have been previously abused in another detention center were 697 percent more likely to experience sexual abuse in subsequent facilities.

Enforcement and application of safe harbor laws are also vulnerable to authorities’ race and gender bias, which can contribute to the disproportionate punishment of exploited Black girls as criminals rather than victims of sexual violence. Studies show that Black girls are more likely to be arrested for prostitution, more likely to be adjudicated, and more likely to be detained in a locked facility than white girls, even after being identified as victims of trafficking.

Survivor Justice in the States: Protecting Survivors Who Commit Offenses in Connection with Sexual Abuse

Growing recognition of the injustice of criminalizing trafficking survivors for coerced criminal acts has led to the adoption of vacatur and expungement laws in almost every state. Though most states provide some degree of criminal-record relief for trafficking survivors, the extent of the support they provide varies widely. In some states, for example, vacatur laws only apply to minor victims of trafficking. Despite the variance among these statutes, their widespread adoption across the country is a promising step toward addressing the harms of the pipeline for survivors of trafficking by clearing criminal records and allowing victims the chance to move forward with their lives. Of course, vacatur laws represent a limited form of justice because they are premised on victims’ having entered the legal system; ideally, survivors would not have a criminal record in the first place.

More “upstream” protection has come in the form of state laws that protect child survivors of sexual abuse from being charged, sentenced, or incarcerated for extreme periods for crimes stemming from their exploitation, including for harming their abusers. Below, we highlight four examples of state approaches to reduce the criminalization of child survivors:

- In California, the Justice for Survivors Act went into effect on January 1, 2022. This law provides an affirmative defense to defendants charged with non-violent offenses for actions that were committed as a direct result of trafficking and sexual violence. The law requires prosecutors to consider the impact of sexual violence and trafficking on victims and their age in plea negotiations. It also encourages judges to consider whether trauma, age, or sex trafficking contributed to the offenses when sentencing and re-sentencing.

The law was inspired by a Black teenage girl who was sentenced as an adult to almost 10 years for offenses committed while she was being trafficked. According to State Assemblywoman Sydney Kamlager, who introduced the bill, the legislation represents “an opportunity to correct unjust outcomes of the past and provide full context of the experiences that might impact a person’s actions and use a more humanizing and trauma-informed response to criminal adjudication.” When the bill passed committee, Assemblywoman Kamlager stated: “Today brings us closer to acknowledging the role sexual abuse plays in criminal behavior and ending the abuse to prison pipeline.”
In Virginia, a child sex-crime victims protection act was passed in 2020 that prohibits all mandatory minimum sentences for children and requires judges to consider adverse childhood experiences, childhood trauma, child welfare involvement, and the differences between children and adults in sentencing youth.\textsuperscript{180} The legislation’s lead sponsor, Delegate Vivian Watts, explained the drive behind the legislation: “A life sentence for a young girl who kills her sex trafficker is anything but trauma-informed or age-appropriate. Under our new law, after the judge considers the child’s exposure to trauma, he or she can depart from any mandatory minimum and suspend any sentence that would otherwise be required for an adult….We’ve created a paradigm shift that should prevent tragic injustices…from ever happening in Virginia.”\textsuperscript{181}

In New York, the \textit{Domestic Violence Survivors Justice Act (DVSJA)},\textsuperscript{182} passed in 2019, authorizes courts to impose alternative sentences for survivors of domestic violence—broadly defined to include any intimate relationship—if the underlying offense was committed against the abuser and was influenced by abuse when offense was committed.\textsuperscript{183} Though the law does not specifically mention youth, courts have applied the law to adults who were convicted as minors: Patrice Smith, for example, whose case is detailed above, was released in 2020 pursuant to the law.\textsuperscript{184}

In Wisconsin, an affirmative defense law enacted in 2018 protects trafficking survivors from being prosecuted for “any offense” committed as a direct result of trafficking.\textsuperscript{185} Child trafficking survivor Chrystul Kizer, whose story is outlined above, successfully argued before the Wisconsin State Supreme Court that this statute can apply to her case and provide a complete affirmative defense to the murder charges pending against her.\textsuperscript{186}

These efforts represent significant progress in reducing the abuse to prison pipeline for girls; but much work remains to end it. Whenever a child is charged with offenses against his or her abuser, courts should have the information, resources, and authority to respond in a manner that is trauma-informed and developmentally appropriate for youth survivors.
Recommendations
Below, we offer a set of principles to guide action to end the pipeline. In all cases, reform must be informed by survivors’ own experiences, perspectives, and input. We hope these concepts will move researchers, policymakers, and others to engage in the critical systems change needed to build a world where all girls can live their lives to their full potential without fear of violence or exploitation.

1. **Prevent Gender-Based Violence.** Gender-based violence in the US remains pervasive. In fact, a recent survey by Thomson Reuters revealed that the US was the only Western nation to rank in the top ten most dangerous countries for women, measured by the risk of sexual violence and harassment.\(^\text{187}\) And violence starts early for many. Childhood abuse, in turn, increases the risk of poorer long-term health and wellness.\(^\text{188}\) We must invest in preventing gender-based violence so that all girls and young women can live in freedom and safety.

“The abuse of women and girls is the most pervasive and unaddressed human rights violation on earth.”
—President Jimmy Carter\(^\text{189}\)

2. **End the Credibility Discount Against Girls and Hold Law Enforcement Accountable for Disregard of Abuse Claims.** In light of the evidence that unambiguously shows the pervasiveness of sexual violence against young women and girls,\(^\text{190}\) it is time to end the discrediting of girls who report sexual abuse. This cultural change must be anchored in structural, systemic reform that treats claims fairly and provides girls with safety, accountability, and healing.

This means ending the practice of filing false reporting charges against survivors who report abuse. Unwarranted suspicion of girls who report abuse creates disincentives to seek justice, interferes with fair investigations, sows mistrust in the legal system, and perpetuates a culture in which rape is normalized. Most importantly, it exacerbates survivors’ existing trauma, compounding the harm they have already experienced and depriving them of the resources needed to heal.

“[O]ne of the most overlooked yet effective ways to create social change is to just believe the stories that girls and young women of color tell us.”
—Salamishah Tillet & Scheherazade Tillet\(^\text{191}\)

3. **Decriminalize and Support Girls who have been Sexually Abused and End the Punishment of Children Who Act Against Abusers in Self-Defense.** The abuse to prison pipeline is driven by behavior that is rooted in responses to sexual violence—including violent or defensive behaviors to protect against sexual violence or exploitation. Girls who survive gender-based violence should be recognized as victims of crime and protected from prosecution and harsh sentences for acts related to their victimization. Punishing victims reinforces the message that survivors receive from their abusers: that they are responsible for what has happened to them; that no one will believe them if they try to escape or seek help; that they will be punished for the abuse they survived; that their lives do not matter. Reforms must be enacted to expressly ban the arrest and incarceration of victims for offenses related to the gender-based violence they have survived; to educate and train authorities about the pipeline; and to build systems of support to address the trauma inflicted by sexual abuse.\(^\text{192}\)
“I can’t tell you how many times I was arrested. And I’m standing there in handcuffs and the ‘john’... has a little talk with the police and they say, ‘Go on home now, let’s not see you out here anymore tonight.’ And I go to jail. You know, as a young person, I’m standing there with handcuffs on looking at the situation thinking, ‘Why am I the criminal? Why isn’t he getting in trouble?’”
—Noel

4. **Address the Disproportionately High Rates of Sexual Abuse Against Girls with Intersecting Identities.** Girls of color, girls with disabilities, LGBTQI+ and gender expansive youth, immigrant girls, and other girls who experience adversity continue to experience violence at disproportionate rates and are more likely to be blamed and punished for the abuse they have survived. While all youth who experience violence deserve to be supported as child victims of crime, inequities rooted in discrimination and bias merit special consideration.

“Everybody loves to throw around the term intersectionality. And for valid reason...we need to have an intersectional approach and an intersectional lens when we talk about any form of gender-based violence, especially when it’s on the premise of race. But what I want people to understand is that many of our current, what I call the injustice systems, they don’t have that intersectional lens. And if you don’t understand the intersectionality between race, between capitalism, between patriarchy and misogyny, specifically when it comes to sexual violence, you’re not going to understand why our system isn’t working.”
—Melanie Thompson

5. **Ensure that Efforts to Address Gender-Based Violence Account for the Unique Experiences and Vulnerabilities of Adolescent Girls.** Gender-based violence is committed against even the youngest girls. According to the CDC, nearly 35 percent of female rape victims were first victimized between ages 11 and 17; 14 percent were age 10 or younger. The impact is long lasting and generational, tending to repeat in future patterns of adversity. Yet despite the unique factor of age, children, and particularly adolescent girls—who experience the highest rates of sexual violence—are often grouped with women in research, reports, and policy reform. Young girls and adolescents must be recognized as distinct and explicitly protected against sexual abuse.
“My stepdad was an abusive person. Both to my mom and to me and my sister. Physically and sexually to me and my sister. I would say when I look back now there was a pattern going on. Little patterns, you know, starting out with the bathing at six; ‘Don’t worry I have the kids, you can go to the store’. At eight, there were road trips that my mom didn’t come on. So the pattern started building. I know that my sister protected me a lot of the times, and she endured more than I did just to protect me. So, growing up in it, I assumed it was normal.”

—Bobette

Acting on these principles can help bridge remaining gaps in ending the abuse to prison pipeline. It is our hope that this report will illuminate harmful patterns of unjust criminalization and provide guidelines that promote action in eliminating this inequitable treatment of girls.

**GIRLS ARE RAPED AT YOUNG AGES**

- 35% of female rape victims were first victimized between ages 11-17
- 14% of female rape victims were first victimized at 10 or younger
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