

And finally, **"OPERATION DO THE MATH"**

Set aside for the moment that cops around the world use the laws (against prostitution) to [rape, extort, threaten and pimp prostitutes](#)- or the fact that there are SO VERY MANY cops who sexually exploit MINORS - or that adult men and women have a right to make choices for themselves ("MY BODY, MY CHOICE") and that in the thousands of years of attempted eradication of prostitution which include the execution of madams and prostitutes, prostitution continues to thrive- what do the prostitution abolitionists honestly believe the 'end the demand' crusade will do to stop people from doing what they want to do with other consenting adults?

Using their own 'guesstimates' of the number of alleged victims and their alleged 'johns'- which are mathematically impossible- we show that there is not a chance in hell to arrest enough 'johns' to 'end the demand.' There are not enough cops, enough courts, enough prisons, enough probation officers to compel the allegedly hundreds of millions of men (just in the US) to stop hiring a sex worker. And if you cannot stop [LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENTS](#) (or priests, preachers, teachers, rabbis, imams, doctors, neighbors or PARENTS) from sexually exploiting minors- and cops who sexually exploit prostitutes who are minors- how do they expect the cops to stop other men from doing the same?

How will the cops decide which reported crimes to ignore so that they can spend the requisite time pursuing and arresting millions of other men (besides themselves) who are hiring and having sex with prostitutes? Which violent crimes will go unsolved- such as the **6,430,557** unsolved reported violent rapes and sexual assaults (1991-2017 Part V-A page 5) most of which were not even investigated and the victims of those violent crimes have gone without justice? And what about the victims of the 96% of all child sexual exploitation that is not committed by men who BUY the services of

children- but is committed by the pillars of the community as mentioned above? What will those victims think, knowing that those who claim to care about "the children"-

DO NOT CARE ABOUT THEM AT ALL?

And how will the cops and the courts decide whom to arrest and whom to prosecute and punish? Will the men who are caught who are elected politicians (Eliot Spitzer, David Vitter, etc.) continue to 'skate' when it comes to their being arrested and charged with a crime? Will the cops only arrest those men whose sex workers refuse to provide the nice officer with a 'free sample'?

Because prostitution laws, like all other 'vice' laws, can only be enforced arbitrarily and selectively. And laws which allow HUMAN BEINGS- the cops, prosecutors and judges- to CHOOSE which 'violators' to arrest/ prosecute/ punish and which 'violators' to allow to continue to 'break the law' - for whatever reason- always have and always will engender corruption.

We know from many sources that there are ways to continue to 'violate' the laws with the blessing of the cops and courts.

As LAPD Police Detective Daniel Lott testified (in 1990) at the criminal hearings in the case against notorious Beverly Hills Madam, Alex Fleming, ["she had enough class not to flaunt her criminal activities and that the department \(LAPD\) looked the other way because of the help she provided on numerous occasions..."](#)

you can't get that type of information from a church person...

the information we gleaned from her far surpassed what she was doing..."

★ ★ SATURDAY, MAY 19, 1990 B3

Court Told of Help Madam Gave Police

By LOIS TIMNICK
STAFF WRITER

"Beverly Hills madam" Elizabeth Adams was lauded for her undercover police work Friday by a member of the same agency that arrested her on suspicion of pandering in 1988.

"She was the best informant I ever met," veteran Los Angeles Police Detective Daniel Lott testified at a hearing on a defense motion to dismiss charges against her.

Lott, who acknowledged an on-going professional relationship with Adams during most of his 27 years on the force as a vice and narcotics detective, said that Adams had "enough class" not to flaunt her troubled activities, and that the department looked the other way because of the help she provided on numerous criminal cases.

"You can't get that type of information from a church person," he testified under questioning by Adams' attorney, Tony Brooklier.

"We considered Betty as an undercover agent," he said, noting that she had even been assigned an informant number. "The information we gleaned from her far surpassed what she was doing, in total respect. It got to major, major criminals going to jail."

Lott said Adams, who is also known as Alex Fleming, had provided valuable assistance in the investigations of such figures as financier Robert L. Vesco, who is still a fugitive, murder suspects and major drug traffickers.

Police say the blowy woman with the boyish haircut, blinding diamond and sapphire rings and personal driver once ran the most lavish and lucrative prostitution network on the West Coast from her blue-and-white bedroom above the Sunset Strip.

Adams, now 57, does not dispute her reputation, but maintains that she did business under an informal agreement with police that her informant's role would protect her from prosecution. Her lawyers argue that it is unfair to go after a long-time informant for activities police earlier ignored because they "gave results."

Interestingly, all the defense witnesses at three hearings before Los Angeles Superior Court Judge Bert Glennon have been law enforcement officers, including the detective who investigated Adams before her arrest.

That officer, Los Angeles Police Detective Alan Vanderpool, testified Friday that the nature of Adams' relationship with the vice section was "that as long as she provided information she didn't go to jail."

However, sometime in the 1980s, Adams apparently dried up as a source. A 1987 police report on her notes "No contact. Inactive. Should go to jail."

Under cross-examination by Deputy Dist. Atty. Alan Carter, Vanderpool said the investigation and arrest of former informants is not unusual. "It happens every day," he said.

"If someone is no longer an informant, he is just another crook?" Carter asked.

"Yes," Vanderpool answered.

Adams was arrested in March, 1988, and charged with pandering and receiving stolen property and grand theft.

All but the two counts of pandering have been dropped. Adams is free on \$150,000 bail, although prosecutors asked for a million-dollar bail, saying they were worried she might flee.

Glennon set the next hearing for July 27.

The relationship the police had with Madam Alex during the years she reigned as madam in Hollywood raises some troubling questions: first, if 'pandering' is 'worse than rape or robbery' (People v. Almodovar 1985) why would one madam be allowed to continue for years to exploit some women, while other madams or even just prostitutes be prosecuted and sent to prison for the same activity? Is it acceptable to exploit some women as long as one cooperates with the police? How do the police determine which prostitutes it is okay to allow to be exploited and which women should be protected (by being arrested)? Is it acceptable that the women who don't cooperate with the police by providing information about their clients or other prostitutes and the madams for whom they work, go to jail "for their own good"? What is the real purpose of the laws if the laws are so flexible as to allow the police such latitude in using their discretion to punish those who don't want to become informants? Admittedly, the police have used 'criminals' as informants for years - as long as the crimes being committed were of the 'victimless' nature where the criminal and the alleged victim were one and the same... In fact, in this situation, the informants are not only allowed to continue to break the law, they are expected to do so. Without their continued 'pandering' and prostitution activity, there would be no information to provide to the police. Furthermore, would either the madam or prostitute be inclined to cooperate if the police did not coerce them to be 'snitches'? And if they would not otherwise cooperate, then does not the coercion that forces them to do so constitute extortion? That's what it is called in any other situation... "If you don't cooperate with us and give us the (a) sex (b) money and (c) information, you will go to prison..."