MON 10:43 FAX 616 394 5254

FAMILY RESEARCH COUNCIL

Che Washington Cinco

Wednesday, June 12, 2002

By Peter Sprigg

When America's Roman Casholic bishops meet in Dallas on June 13, they will have a lot to talk about. Pinding better ways to respond to allegations of child sexual abuse will be at the top of the agenda, as wall it should. But the bishops should also give careful consideration to the link between homosexuality and child sexual abuse.

As the scandal in the Catholic church has unfolded, it has grown increasingly clear that boys, not girls, make up the vast majority of those sexually victimized by (exclusively male) priests. At the same time, there have been startling revelations of a large and powerful homosexual subculture among priests. These developments suggest that he real problem is neither priestly ecilbacy nor "a culture of sexual repression" (as Newsweek put it), but is instead the sexual exploitation of minoss by homosexual men.

The Family Research Council has now connected the dots to show the evidence of a direct correlation between homosexuality and child sexual abuse—one that existed long before the priest scandals. In a paper eatified "Homosexuality and Child Sexual Abuse," author Dr. Timothy J. Dailey has documented three-key facts:

- The vast majority of child moissters are male (the Journal of Sex Research says that "pedophilis does not exist, or is extremely rare, in women").
- The percentage of the male population that is homosexual is

A missing moral link?

Homosexual men may evolve into molesters

quite small (only 2.5 percent of males, according to one estimate in the journal *Demography*).

Since almost all molesters are men and the vast majority of men are heterosexual, one would expect that nearly all of the children molested would be girls. However, this is not the case—in fact, a significant percentage of the victims of child sexual abase are boys (a study in the Fournal of Sex and Marital Therapy found that 36 percent of male sex offenders had victimized male children).

Taus, it appears that less team three percent of the total male population (namely, men who are homosexual) are committing over thirty percent of the total child sexual abuse (namely, that which is committed by men against boys). Logic thus suggests that in proportion to their numbers, homosexual men are far more likely to be child molesters than are heterosexual men.

The three legs of this argument (most molesters are men; very few men are homosexual; but a third of sex abuse cases involve men molesting boys) are essentially unconfested. So how do homosexual activists avoid the legical conclusion? Only by asserting that men who molest boys are not "homosexuals."

They support this staim with two arguments. One is that "pedoghilla" is somehow a separate saxual orientation unto itself, unrelated to a "homosexual" identity. Yet a study of convicted child molesters, published in the Archives of Sexual Behaviar, found that "eighty-six precent of

offenders against males described themselves as homosexual ex bisexual."

The second argument is that any offender who has even engaged in heterosexual activity—annet be classified as "homosexual." But this overlooks the wide range of sexual beh-vor in which many homosexuals have engaged. Ironically, when they find i in their interest, homosexual activists will use a much broader definition of "gay"—for example, counting as "gay arents" even some people who are sill in heterosexual marriages.

Other defensive satements, like "most child molesters are not homosexual" or "most homosexuals are not child

The Family Research Council has now connected the dots to show the evicence of a direct correlation between homosexuality and child sexual abuse.

molesters," may be tuse, but are irrelevant. The shocking figure is the relative rate of molestation by host-sexuals, not the absolute numbers.

In addition to behavioral studies like those above, the writings of homosexual authors demonstrate a strong undercurrent of fascination with will a temphemistically called "intergenerational love." Cay activist David Thous act says, "Boy-lovers were involved in the gay movement from the beginning." Leading authologies of

"gay literature" prominently feature stories about "the love of odder men for young boys." Paula Martinac. a lashian writer for the Washington Blede, recently acknowledged that among some gay men, "adult-youth sex is viewed as an important aspect of gay culture."

Saddest of all is the evidence that ho-nosexual child abuse is a vicious circle, increasing the chances that its victims will be some homosexual themselves—and that they will victimize whers. One expert reports that "boys vict mized by older men were over four times more likely to be currently engaged in humosexual activity." Another study found that 59 percent of male sex offenders against children reported being a "vict m of contact sexual abuse as a child."

The evidence is in—ho nosexuality is a clear risk factor for child sexual abuse. This fact should impact our decisions not only on qualifications for the priesthood, but also on homosexual adoption, "gay-friendly" policies in schools, and "gay rights" laws that force schools, day care centers, and youths camps to hire homosexuals.

The "exclusionary" policy of the Boy Scouts is looking better all the time.

Peter Sprigg is senior director of Culture Studies at the Family Fescarch Council.

