

Aclu's arguments in the article, aclu and nambla: a match made in hell



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

The ACLU in its article "ACLU and NAMBLA: A Match Made In Hell", argues that child molesters should have rights, and freedom of speech. NAMBLA is the North American Man/Boy Love Association. It is a story about how a man named, Charles Jaynes viewed the group's web site shortly before the killing of a ten year boy, Jeffrey Curley. Also convicted was a 24 year old named Salvatore Sicari. Prosecutors said Jaynes and Sicari were sexually obsessed with the boy, lured him from his Cambridge neighborhood with the promise of a new bike, and then smothered him with a gasoline soaked rag when he resisted their sexual advances. NAMBLA states that they are on an important mission, and that it's simple. The mission is abolition of age of consent laws that classify sex with children as rape. The ACLU is a supporter of NAMBLA; they represented the organization in the civil case related to murder mentioned in the summary. Their official position is that they don't advocate sexual relationships but they advocate of the robust of freedom of speech. Thanks to the ACLU this organization is supported due to freedom of speech. However, if they aren't supportive to the relationship of adults and children, then they shouldn't be representing two men that killed a boy because he wouldn't have sexual relations with them in the courts. The ACLU is very contradictive to their statement by on behalf of them in a court of law. In February 2005, three NAMBLA members were arrested because they were going on a boat for a sex retreat with boys as young as 9. Later that day the FBI arrested four more men that were on sail for the same retreat. For the ACLU to represent a group of people that are going on a sex retreat with young boys is unbelievable. There is not a lot of evidence stating that these people should have rights. All they are saying is that they should of freedom of speech. Freedom of speech would just be able to get their point <https://assignbuster.com/aclus-arguments-in-the-article-aclu-and-nambla-a-match-made-in-hell/>

of views in court. It is shown on the NAMBLA website that there are programs that are protecting NAMBLA members while they are in prison. For example, Jaynes engaged in sexual acts in the prison and have not been disciplined. There is too little evidence represented in the article that Jaynes and Curley are receiving special treatment and are not getting any consequences for their actions. This is not very good evidence showing that sexual offenders should have rights.