



EYE ON BUREAUCRACY

John Lofton, Editor

Volume X, Number 2

February, 1999

CONGRESSIONALLY FINANCED STUDY ENDORSES SEXUAL ABUSE OF CHILDREN

It is, without a doubt, as slimy and *evil* a piece of work as I have *ever* read. And, to add insult to injury, it has been published by a militantly pro-homosexual organization that most recently (Fiscal Year 1998) got \$2.2 million worth of your hard-earned tax dollars and mine, most of it from the Department of Health and Human Services.

CLAIMS OF POSITIVE CONSEQUENCES OF PEDERASTY, INCEST, AND PERVERSION ADVANCED AT TAXPAYER EXPENSE

The 31-page article is titled "A Meta-Analytic Examination of Assumed Properties of Child Sexual Abuse Using College Samples". It was published in the American Psychological Association's (APA) *Psychological Bulletin* (Vol. 124, No. 1, 1998). The authors are: Bruce Rind, Department of Psychology, Temple University; Philip Tromovitch, Graduate School of Education, University of Pennsylvania; and Robert Bauserman, Department of Psychology, University of Michigan.

What this study did was review 59 studies re: child sexual abuse (CSA) that were based on samples using college students. And what the authors conclude is appalling: That "basic beliefs" about CSA in our general population — that is that CSA "causes intense harm, regardless of gender" — are *not* true. In fact, the authors go so far as to say that, in some cases, having been sexually abused as a child has had "positive" results!

The first thing the authors do is try to confuse the issue re: terminology. They object to the "indiscriminate" use of the words "child sexual abuse" and, specifically, such terms as "victim" and "perpetrator". They cite, approvingly, one study which criticizes society for equating "wrongfulness" with harmfulness in sexual matters, when, it is said, this is not true.

Another study cited is a study by two of the authors of *this* study! (Bauserman & Rind). It tells of the repeated rape of a five-year-old by her father which is contrasted with "the willing sexual involvement of a mature 15-year-old adolescent boy with an unrelated adult". The difference here? The former is "a clear violation of the person with implications for serious harm, the latter may represent only a violation of social norms with no implication for personal harm".

But, of course, *God* says there *is* harm from the latter. He calls such a sexual relationship outside of marriage fornication. And *God* says to *flee* fornication (1 Corinthians 6:18). He says those who fornicate are "worthy of death" (Romans 1:29ff). He says no fornicator will have "any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God" (Ephesians 5:3-6). And *God* says that it was because of, among other things, fornication, that He destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah, those doing this "suffering the vengeance of eternal fire" (Jude 1:7).

All of which sounds "personally harmful" to me.

The authors say that their review of these 59 studies shows that college students who were *victims*

(sorry, but that's what they were) of CSA "were, on average, slightly less well adjusted" than those not sexually abused as children. In addition, citing another study, they say that "self-reports" by those who suffered CSA do not support the view that their CSA "usually or inevitably causes harm". Another study showed that "CSA does not produce pervasive and intensely negative effects regardless of gender". And yet one more study concluded that CSA has "no inbuilt or inevitable outcome or set of emotional reactions" associated with it.

So, what all this means, the authors say, is: "The negative potential of CSA for most individuals who have experienced it have been overstated." In fact, they say: "Two-thirds of male CSA experiences, but less than a third of female CSA experiences, were reported not to have been negative at the time. Three of every eight male experiences...were reported to have been *positive* at the time!" (emphasis mine).

The authors reiterate what is the theme of their demented document: "The current results imply that the claim that CSA inevitably or usually produces harm is not justified." They cite another study which says that children and adolescents (in a small city in New York State) who were sexually abused "performed as well in school as non-abused in all areas measured".

Referring to the "self-reported" effects of CSA, the authors say that "lasting psychological harm was uncommon among the college students". More common was (get this) "perceived temporary harm", but this was "far from pervasive". They say that "multiple regression analyses" failed to show support "for the common belief that contact sex is more harmful than non-contact sex or that contact sex for girls is especially harmful".

BIBLICAL TRUTH IS "UNSUPPORTED BY RESEARCH"

Remember: What is being discussed here so nonchalantly is *the sexual abuse of children!*

Their analyses, the authors say, provide empirical support for another study which found that our society's view of intercourse as the most damaging form of CSA is "a well-ingrained prejudice" but is "unsupported by research"!

In a section headed "Child Sexual Abuse As a Construct Reconsidered", the authors trash our laws and Christianity. Noting, disapprovingly, that most studies define CSA "based on legal and moral, rather than empirical and phenomenological, criteria", they cite, approvingly, a study which says "this is inadequate and may be invalid in the context of scientific inquiry....Classifying a behavior as abuse simply because it is generally viewed as immoral or defined as illegal is problematic...."

Rind/Bauserman/Tromovitch agree with a study which criticizes mixing "morality and science" because this "hinders scientifically valid understanding". An they cite, approvingly, the sex pervert and child-molester Alfred Kinsey who, among other things, criticized the fact that "scientific classifications of sexual behavior were nearly identical with theological classifications and the moral pronouncements of English common law in the 15th century, which were in turn based on medieval ecclesiastic law...."

FEDERALLY FINANCED SCIENCE MOCKS THE LAWS OF GOD

In other words, what is being attacked here, explicitly, is the fact that our current laws against child sexual abuse are based on the English common law, which is based on Christianity, on the Bible!

Citing, approvingly, another study by one of their own (Rind), the authors say — in case you have thus far missed their hatred of Biblical Christianity: "The history of conflating morality and law with science in the area of human sexuality by psychologists and others indicates a strong need for caution in scientific inquiries of sexual behaviors which remain taboo, with child sexual abuse being a prime example."

So, again, in other words: Forget all the morality and law stuff. These are *not* to be applied to science — which, of course, is *exactly* what, among others, Adolph Hitler and the Nazis believed when they murdered so-called "useless eaters" — the mentally ill, the handicapped, the "feeble-minded" and anybody else they chose to put in these categories.

Returning to their dismissal of the notion that "abuse implies that harm is likely to result from a behavior", the authors deny this. They say, incredibly, that for the male college students who were sexually abused as children, "37 percent viewed their CSA experiences as positive at the time they occurred; 42

percent viewed these experiences as *positive* when they reflected back on them; and in the two studies that inquired about *positive* self-perceived effects, 24 percent to 37 percent viewed their CSA experiences as having a *positive influence* on their current sex lives" (emphasis mine)!!

The authors have even found a study where its author has changed his views on the harmfulness of CSA. This person J. Fishman of the University of Massachusetts, in his 1990 doctoral dissertation, based on subsequent interviews, now believes it is wrong to impose "a confining definition onto someone's experience" — he means sexually abusing children or being sexually abused as a child. Fishman argues "for the use of language of a more neutral nature rather than labels such as abuse, victim, and molestation — in short, for use of empirical and phenomenological criteria in conceptualizing early sexual relations, rather than legal or moral criteria."

Translation: Let's not call sexually molesting children what it is: An evil, un-Godly *sin*. Let's lie and come up with some language that makes it sound harmless.

For example, the authors say that one possible "scientific definition" re: CSA would be what yet another study suggests: "To focus on the young person's perception of his or her willingness to participate and his or her reactions to the experience. A willing encounter with positive reactions would be labeled simply *adult-child sex*, a value-neutral term" (emphasis theirs).

And, one more time, we are told how *positive* CSA can be. Another study is cited which shows that "some women perceive their early experiences (their being sexually abused as children! — J.L.) as positive". Thus, they "do not label themselves as victims, and do not show evidence of psychological impairment". So, "it is important for researchers to be cautious in defining abuse for both men and women in attempts to validly examine the antecedents and effects of these experiences".

THE PSYCHOLOGY INDUSTRY IS PRO-HOMO AND ANTI-CHRISTIAN

Earlier, I said the American Psychological Association (APA) is militantly pro-homosexual. And it is — with a vengeance. If you go to the APA's web page on the Internet, you can read the full text of a document titled "Answers to Your Questions About Sexual Orientation and Homosexuality".

Among other things, the APA tells us, falsely:

--- "No", sexual orientation is not a choice and cannot be "voluntarily changed".

--- "No", homosexuality is not an "illness, mental disorder or an emotional problem". This is said despite the fact that until 1973 the APA and every other mental health group said flatly and categorically that homosexuals were, basically, crazy, nuts.

--- "Yes...lesbians and gay men can be good parents." Studies comparing groups of homosexual and heterosexual parents "find no developmental differences between the two groups of children...."

--- "No...therapy cannot change sexual orientation....In 1990, the APA stated that scientific evidence does not show that conversion therapy works and that it can do more harm than good". No mention is made, of course, of the thousands of homosexuals — lesbians and "gay" men — who, by the grace of God, were converted to Christianity and saved from their deadly, sodomite lifestyle.

For further information, the APA refers us to other militantly pro-homosexual groups such as: the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force; Parents and Friends of Lesbians and Gays; and the Sex Information and Education Council of the United States.

A footnote: Although the American Psychological Association gets \$2.2 million worth of your hard-earned Federal tax dollars and mine a year, Susan Knapp, head of the "Journals" department at the APA, tells me that their *Psychological Bulletin* — which costs \$153-per-year for non-members and \$76-per-year for members — actually makes a profit. And, she tells me, she's applied for a \$1.5 million grant from the National Science Foundation to make available the full texts of all articles in their 35 journals dating back to the 1890s! Knapp says her department got a \$1 million NSF grant in the 1970s to do a bibliographic/abstract data base of all their journals.

John Lofton, a former editor of *Conservative Digest*, is an author, lecturer, and advocate for Christian and conservative causes. He publishes *The Lofton Letter*, a sample copy of which is available for \$2 from: Box 1142, Laurel, Maryland 20725.