

Ipce

NEWSLETTER

Number E 13, June 2002

CONTENT

- 02 Introduction
- Articles**
- 03 The struggles about the free will, facts and morality; The debate about the publications of Rind, Bauserman & Tromovitch goes on – a bird's eye view, 1997 – 2002; Dr Frans Gieles
- 18 Some quotes from: Bruce Rind , Gay and Bisexual Adolescent Boys' Sexual Experiences With Men: An Empirical Examination of Psychological Correlates in a Nonclinical Sample; In: Archives of Sexual Behavior, Vol. 30, No.4, 2001
- 22 Burning a Book Before It's Printed, By Eloquence, Apr 7th, 2002. About: Levine, Judith, Harmful for Minors, The Perils of Protecting Children from Sex,
- 27 Actual: A few quotes from a few articles about The US accused priests
- Internal Ipce matters**
- 29 Financial report
- 29 Report of the secretary
- 29 Report of the web master & proposals to the meeting
- 30 Ethics, by Frans Gieles
- 32 Documentation Service Lists: December 2001
- 33 and June 2002

Ipce is a forum for people who are engaged in scholarly discussion about the understanding and emancipation of mutual relationships between children or adolescents and adults.

In this context, these relationships are intended to be viewed from an unbiased, non-judgmental perspective and in relation to the human rights of both the young and adult partners.

Ipce meets once every one or two years in a different country, publishes a newsletter and a web site, co-ordinates the (electronic) exchange of texts and keeps an archive of specific written publications.

<http://www.ipce.org/>
<mailto:webmaster@ipce.org>

Introduction

This Ipce Newsletter # 13 is made for the few subscribers to the paper edition, and for the other members to have an overview and to prepare the annual meeting. In fact, the *news* can be found on the “What is new?” page of the Ipce web site on the pages to which that page refers. The web site is updated with many files, far too much to put in any paper edition. This Newsletter can only give a bird’s eye view on a small part of it for those who cannot reach the Internet.

The first article gives such a bird’s eye view on the ongoing public discussion about the research done by Rind *et al.* The next articles give a small part of Rind’s most recent research, published at the end of 2001, about the experiences of gay teenage boys, a review of Levine’s book, and an article about the actuality of the accused priests.

Then follow some articles to prepare the annual Ipce meeting: the annual reports of the treasurer, secretary, and the web master. Last but not least, I try to summarize the ongoing discussion we had about ethics. I try to propose the next statement about ethics.

These reports have several topics to discuss at the meeting. I mention two of these topics.

The first one is a negative message: the internal Ipce communication is widely intercepted from the Internet. A Dutch woman who started a foundation with the aim to prevent the emancipation of “pedophiles” has led that interception. She has sent our messages to several authorities, groups and journalists. Most receivers did not react, but some of the latter have ‘outed’ members publicly. So we have changed our way of communication, and supposedly we have to change it again.

The other one is that Ipce gradually has become more known by the public. In some newspapers this is done in a negative way by giving false information about the nature and aims of Ipce. In other newspapers or web sites in a more positive way by mentioning and using our extended library on the Ipce web site.

We are living in the era of the Internet, in which more people have access to articles with research reports, opinions and arguments, which can give a better understanding of reality and truth about relationships between adults and youth.

Regrettably, we are also living in an era of hate-mails and other actions against people who try to reach more rationalized and nuanced views on these relationships. The Rind *et al.* team has been attacked heavily. Prof. Mirkin and Judith Levine are also attacked only because of their opinion.

We have to keep our balance in this world nowadays.

Your secretary,

Frans

ARTICLES

The struggles about the free will, facts and morality

The debate about the publications of Rind, Bauserman & Tromovitch goes on – a bird's eye view, 1997 - 2002

Dr Frans Gieles

Introduction

The research and the debate concern possible harm by *child sexual abuse*, as the authors politically consequent call it. The debate concerns two topics, which are often entangled, but which I want to distinct sharply: facts and morality.

Research on the *facts* shows that sexual experiences in childhood not always result in harm, thus, these experiences should not always called *abuse*. Critics do not accept this. They combat the facts, but this is difficult. Then, *morality* comes into the debate – and so the debate changes. A discussion about facts is another type of discourse than a discussion about norms. Both discussions differ in subject, in type of statements and in criteria for truth.

The crux in the debate is the free will of youths who have had sexual experiences. Some participants in the debate have the opinion that that free will *cannot* exist, *may* not exist, and *thus* does not exist. Research that shows its existence is flawed or biased.

Such kind of research usually works with interviews or questionnaires. One asks people to look back to certain experiences and to tell about them. If there are enough people who say that they were willing to have those experiences and felt positively or neutral about them, one accepts this as true. However, some people who use to say “Belief the children!” don’t accept this. They belief the children only as long as they say to be forced into a negative experience; they don’t belief the respondents who say something else. These respondents *must* be mislead or *must* have repressed their true feelings.

In this Newsletter, we have already seen some articles about this debate: the issues E4 (both attachments), E6 {‘Mister President...’}, and E7 (Science & Morality; explanation of statistics). The debate went on.

In this article, I will start with a look back to three articles published in 1997 by the Rind team. These articles have had few reactions. In 1998, the Meta-Analysis was published. I suppose that the reader knows this article, so I will only give a very short summary. In 1999, the public discovered the meta-analysis and a heated discussion started. I have described this in my article “Mister President...”. That article ended with the mentioning of the condemnation by the US Congress. In this article, I will take up the thread.

It turned out that that condemnation was in fact a free advertisement for the meta-analysis. The article is read worldwide since. If I look to the debate in a bird's eye view, I see some phases. In the **first phase, 1997 & 1998**, there were no or only a few reactions in scientific circles. In the **second phase, 1999**, there were vehement reactions – mostly from people who had not read the meta-analysis at all, or who at least have not understood it. It was the phase of “quotes”,

which were not written at all in the article. It was the phase in which people said that the Rind team had condoned pedophilia, although this word does not appear at all in the meta-analysis. In the **third phase, 2000 & 2001**, several articles were published: defending articles by the authors, and supporting articles by others.

In the **fourth phase, 2001 & 2002**, I see a different intonation in the debate, a more serious one, based on factually reading and studying the meta-analysis instead of condemning it before reading it. The article and its authors are taken more seriously and their findings, analyses and conclusions are debated more accurately.

1997: Searching for Correlates

1) Psychological Correlates of Male Child and Adolescent Sexual Experiences with Adults: A Review of the Nonclinical Literature; Robert Bauserman, Ph.D. & Bruce Rind, Ph.D., Archives of Sexual Behavior, 26-2, 1997.

< http://www.ipce.info/library_3/files/psycorr.htm >

G. Goslinga, Bauserman & Rind, Boys' Sexual Experiences, KOINOS 17, 1998.

“Researchers have generally neglected sexual experiences of boys with adults, assumed them to be the same as those of girls, or tried to understand them by referring to clinical research while ignoring nonclinical research.

A review of nonclinical research allows a more complete understanding of boys' sexual experiences with adults and the outcomes and correlates of those experiences. Research with nonclinical samples reveals a broad range of reactions, with most reactions being either neutral or positive. Clinical samples reveal a narrower, primarily negative, set of reactions. Comparison of the reactions of boys and girls shows that reactions and outcomes for boys are more likely to be neutral or positive. Moderator variables, including presence of force, perceptions of consent, and relationship to the adult, also relate to outcomes. Incestuous contacts and those involving force or threats are most likely to be negative.

Problems in this field of research include broad and vague definitions of "abuse " and conflation of value judgments with harm. Effects of boys' early sexual experiences with older persons in general cannot be accurately inferred from clinical research alone or from girls' experiences.”

2) A Meta-Analytic Review of Findings from National Samples on Psychological Correlates of Child Sexual Abuse, by Bruce Rind & Philip Tromovitch, in: The Journal of Sex Research Vol. 34, No. 3, 1997 pages 237-255.

G. Goslinga, Radical Reconsideration of the Concept of Child Sexual Abuse. New Findings by Bauserman, Rind and Tromovitch. Koinos #20 (1998).

< http://www.ipce.org/Library/00-013a_gos_koi_20_e.htm >

“Our goal in the current study was to examine whether, in the population of persons with a history of CSA, this experience causes pervasive, intense psychological harm for both genders. Most previous literature reviews have favored this viewpoint. However, their conclusions have generally been based on clinical and legal samples, which are not representative of the general population. To address this viewpoint, we examined studies that used national probability samples, because these samples provide the best available estimate of population characteristics. Our review does not support the prevailing viewpoint. The self-reported effects data imply that only a small proportion of persons with CSA experiences is permanently harmed and that a substantially greater proportion of females than males perceives harm from these experiences. Results from the psychological adjustment measures imply that although CSA is related to poorer adjustment in the general population, the magnitude of this relation is small. Further, data on

confounding variables imply that this small relation cannot safely be assumed to reflect causal effects of CSA.

Browne and Finkelhor (1986, page 178) cautioned "advocates not [to] exaggerate or overstate the intensity or inevitability of [CSA] consequences," because such exaggeration has iatrogenic potential. Despite this caution, child abuse researchers have tended to depict CSA as a "special destroyer of adult mental health" (Seligman, 1994, p. 232). McMillen, Zuravin, and Rideout (1995, p. 1037) recently commented that the "experience of child sexual abuse is a traumatic event for which there may be few peers." Results of analyses of the national samples show that such characterizations are exaggerated at the population level. This exaggeration may stem from our culture's tendency to equate wrongfulness with harmfulness in sexual matters (Money, 1979). CSA is violative of norms and laws in our culture; these facts, however, do not imply its harmfulness in a scientific or psychological sense (Kilpatrick, 1987). It is important to add to this discussion of exaggeration that understatement is also problematic. CSA is potentially harmful for young persons because of their vulnerability to being misused. The current findings should not be interpreted by lay persons as condoning abusive behavior.

Finally, analysis at the population level may obscure characteristics of particular segments of the population. In the current review, the effect size estimate of the relation between CSA and adjustment, which was of low magnitude, cannot be interpreted as applicable to every case. When CSA is accompanied by particular dispositional and situational factors, including variables such as temperamental vulnerability, the use of force, or the presence of close familial ties between participants, then CSA might produce intense harm; on the other hand, if temperamental factors are favorable, if the child or adolescent perceives his or her participation to have been willing, or if the sexual experience is essentially trivial or transient, then harm may be absent (Constantine, 1981). Combining the former and later types of experiences into one category labeled CSA is problematic, because both negative and neutral effects can become obscured. By moving beyond sociolegal definitions of CSA and employing strictly scientific definitions (cf. Ames & Houston, 1990, Rind & Bauserman, 1993), researchers can better describe psychological correlates of the heterogeneous collection of experiences currently labeled as CSA."

3) Adult Correlates of Child Sexual Abuse, A meta-analytic review of college student and national probability samples; Philip Tromovitch, Bruce Rind & Robert Bauserman; Eastern Regional Conference of Society for Scientific Study of Sex (ER-SSSS), April 18, 1997.

< http://www.ipce.info/library_3/files/adcorr_txt.htm >

"Child sexual abuse (CSA) is viewed by the lay public, and by many professionals, as one of the most psychologically damaging events that a child or adolescent can experience. Opinions expressed by many professionals imply that CSA possesses at least four fundamental qualities or properties:

- ☀ (1) it causes harm,
- ☀ (2) this harm occurs prevalently among people who have had experiences classifiable as CSA,
- ☀ (3) this harm is typically intense, and
- ☀ (4) CSA is at least as harmful an experience for males as it is for females.

The current paper examines these implied properties by reviewing the results of 54 college samples and 10 national probability samples (5 male and 5 female) which provide data relevant to psychological correlates of CSA. In order to minimize confirmation and sampling biases, 100% sampling of studies was attempted and quantitative analyses (i.e., meta-analyses) were conducted. Meta-analyses of 18 symptom domains revealed that students with experiences classifiable as CSA are, on average, slightly less well adjusted than control subjects across all 18 symptom

domains. Meta-analyses of a composite effect based on national probability samples showed an identical effect size to that found in the college data.

Further analyses, however, indicate that this poorer adjustment cannot be causatively attributed to the CSA experiences because of the reliable presence of confounding variables (in the general domain of family environment), which, when controlled for, rendered the majority of CSA-symptom relations nonsignificant in studies where statistical control could be applied.

Examination of the reported reactions to the CSA experiences also revealed significant gender differences, with males reporting significantly more positive experiences than females; it is further noted that the socio-legal definitions of CSA that are currently used in CSA research are so broad as to be capturing very different experiences under the same rubric.

It is concluded that:

- ☀ (1) college student data on CSA-symptom relations is generalizable to the population at large,
- ☀ (2) the assumptions of causality of harm, prevalence of harm, and intensity of effects are false (at least in college student and national samples), and
- ☀ (3) reactions to experiences included under the wide scope of the currently used socio-legal definitions of CSA differ greatly between males and females.

The findings from this report contradict prevalently held assumptions about CSA — assumptions that may bias not only the lay public, but researchers studying and reporting on activities classifiable as CSA.”

Note, that the authors did not start their own new research project. They have not interviewed anybody, but have only analysed research reports made by others. All topics discussed above will be criticized later, some of these critics will attempt to blame the authors. But one cannot blame the authors of the meta-analysis for what other authors have written.

Remarkably, these three articles hardly caused any reaction, and many professionals had not even discovered them. This changed after the next article was published in 1998; a storm flood of reactions followed.

1998: The Meta-Analyse

A Meta-Analytic Examination of Assumed Properties of Child Sexual Abuse Using College Samples; Rind, B., Tromovitch, Ph. & Bauserman, R., in: Psychological Bulletin 1998, Vol 124, No 1, pp 22-53.

< http://www.ipce.info/library_3/rbt/metaana.htm >

“Many lay persons and professionals believe that child sexual abuse (CSA) causes intense harm, regardless of gender, pervasively in the general population. The authors examined this belief by reviewing 59 studies based on college samples. Meta-analyses revealed that students with CSA were, on average, slightly less well adjusted than controls. However, this poorer adjustment could not be attributed to CSA because family environment (FE) was consistently confounded with CSA, FE explained considerably more adjustment variance than CSA, and CSA-adjustment relations generally became nonsignificant when studies controlled for FE. Self-reported reactions to and effects from CSA indicated that negative effects were neither pervasive nor typically intense, and that men reacted much less negatively than women. The college data were completely consistent with data from national samples. Basic beliefs about CSA in the general population were not supported.”

The authors choose for college samples, because the already mentioned similarity with data from national samples, and because there are far more data about college samples, so the statistical validity could be high.

The authors chose college samples, because of the already mentioned similarity with data from national samples, and because there are far more data about college samples, so the statistical validity could be high.

The researchers investigated if there was harm. There was harm, but only in a few cases, but surely not always and pervasive. The effect size was, statistically speaking, low: 1% for girls, 0.5% for boys, 0.81% on average. For consensual experiences: 0.6% for girls, 0% for boys. Note, that this is the percentage of the effect size, not the percentage of girls or boys. The effect size for family environment was ten times higher: 8.41%. Pervasive harm was reported by 0% of the boys and 4% of the girls. 4% for girls is 4% too much, but it is certainly not 100% for both. There appeared to be a significant difference in reactions to consensual and forced experiences. The boys' reactions were, rounded off, one-third positive, one-third neutral, and one-third negative. The girls' reactions were, rounded off, two-third negative, one-sixth neutral and one-sixth positive.

The authors conclude that the term "sexual abuse" does not match every childhood sexual experience. Since there is not always harm, so there is not always abuse. They advise to use more neutral terms. This advice is not received with thanks, as will become clear.

1999: Not read, still criticized

In contrast to the 1997 articles, the public suddenly discovered the meta-analysis. The first reactions were a flood of rejections. I have already told about this in "Mister president..." (Newsletter E6) and in "Science and Morality" (NL E7), so I will be short now.

NAMBLA was the first to discover it and presented it as "Good news!" on their web site. This text disappeared quite soon after NARTH discovered it and criticized the meta-analysis vehemently. Someone read this and informed "Dr" Laura Schlessinger about it. She has no PhD, but has a radio program with many listeners. She began a heavy attack in her emotional talks. She is well-known because of her anti-gay stance. She attacked the APA, the publisher of the meta-analysis.

The APA had to react and distanced themselves from the content of the meta-analysis, not because they disputed the scientific data but because of political correctness and morality. The APA confirmed its moral code: abuse may be in fact less harmful than is thought, but it is still (morally) wrong.

The Family Research Council also reacted. This conservative-Christian group has never published any research, but it informed politicians. Several states rejected the meta-analysis, as did the US Congress. The Congress rejected a correctly written scientific report, not because of the facts, but because of morality.

In this phase of the debate, most critics had not even read, or understood the meta-analysis. People published "quotes" that could not be found in the article at all. People spoke about "condoning pedophilia", a word that is not used in the article at all. Critics uttered objections, which already were refuted in the article itself. In May and November 1999, the Rind team wrote its first defences. Needless to say the authors were attacked in many ways. The State could not stop their jobs by refusing to pay their income at the universities, because all research is done in free time. Later on, this happened to Harris Mirkin.

During this phase David Spiegel published his first critical article. Spiegel is a leading person in an association with an impressive, but narcissistic name; Leadership Council for Mental Health, Justice, and the Media. In a press release (May 24, 1999), this council proudly presented itself as an organization "whose membership includes many of the nation's most prominent mental health leaders", but this is not true. It's an organization of people who believe in multi personality disorders and repressed memories, which they recall during therapy. These therapists are frequently convicted for making false accusations, and many scientists do not take them for serious.

Spiegel, David, The price of abusing children and numbers, *Sexuality & Culture* 4-2, Spring 2000, 63-66, < http://www.ipce.info/library_3/files/spie_price.htm > and

Spiegel, David, Suffer the children: Long-term effects of sexual abuse, *Society*, 05/01/2000, 37 -4, 18-20, < http://www.ipce.info/library_3/files/spie_suffer.htm >

Both articles have the same content and partly the same text.

Spiegel calls the meta-analyse "abusing children and numbers". By doing research among college students, one misses the worst cases, the people who, because of the sexual abuse, has problems with drugs and more, and so never reached any college study. He also misses the PTSD, the Post Traumatic Stress Disorder, in the analysis. Further, his opinion is that there are too many light problems in the meta-analyse, so the more heavy problems seem to be a small minority.

[This objection concerns the original 59 researchers, not the researchers of the meta-analysis. The first have chosen very broad definitions of CSA as well as of 'problems']

"I don't believe for a minute that sexual abuse is not emotionally damaging. I consider it inconceivable that a child can meaningfully consent to sexual relations with an adult, and I believe it to be a moral outrage to put forward such an idea."

"The way this meta-analysis was conducted, the facts could not speak for themselves, any more than a child can when approached for sex by an adult. There is a great beauty in the innocence of childhood, which is already being invaded enough by the incessant barrage of violence and sex on television, in movies, and in print media.

Sex with children is morally wrong as well as emotionally and physically damaging, Rind et al. notwithstanding. Clear-eyed reason and common sense do not diverge here. Statistical abuse has as many bad after-effects as sexual abuse. We should not tolerate either."

Spiegel's reactions are typical for this first phase of the debate. There follows a second phase, in which the debate changes.

2000: Support and defence

In this phase of the debate, two kinds of articles appeared supporting articles, and defensive articles by the Rind team.

In this phase, APA had problems. A condemnation by Congress and APA appeared to be a free advertisement. Now, people read the article. So do also APA members, who disagree with the APA policy to take distance from its own publication. APA has not used a chance to tell people that science (study of the *facts*) should be separated from politics (thus, from *morality*). Science should correct public moral instead of blindly following it. Members subscribe. Lilienfeld wrote this opinion in an article, which promptly was refused by APA. There was much quarrel and more members unsubscribed.

Harris Mirkin

Mirkin, Harris, Sex, Science and Sin: The Rind Report, Sexual Politics and American Scholarship, Manuscript submitted to *Sexuality and Culture*, Special Issue on Rind-Tromovitch-Bauserman.

< http://www.ipce.org/Library/mirkin_rind_frame.htm >

Mirkin mentions two kinds of attacks on the meta-analysis: objections concerning statistical subtleties, and calls for censorship, avoiding real argumentation. “Many social scientists and psychologists disagreed with the article, but one would have expected them to fight back with other articles rather than with a call for censorship. In fact, the problem with the article wasn't that it was methodologically weak, but that it was strong. It broke the rules of sexual politics.”

The *facts*, discovered by the meta-analyse (‘there is not always harm’), weaken the argumentation of the existing *moral* code. If one will maintain that code, one should give new arguments. Instead, the critics attacked the authors as condoning pedophilia, a word that is not used by the authors. The authors refer for the debate about morality to the domain of the politics. It is another kind of debate. The authors give only the facts.

Mirkin writes not about the meta-analysis, but about the debate that followed after publication. The two kind of debates, the one about *facts* and the other about *morality*, are not clearly separated. The debate should go about ‘the innocent child’, who appears to be not so a-sexual as one had wished. Mirkin compares this debate with the debate after the Kinsey reports were published. Kinsey showed the hidden sexual life of the normal people of the US.

Recently, Mirkin is heavily attacked about this article, and about a former article [*] in which he analyses the political battle, in which conservatives tried to maintain their positions. Laws that should ‘protect the children against the danger of pedophilia’ are made in the same kind of political process as at the time the laws against marriages between black slaves and white people, against masturbation and against homosexuality. In fact, their purpose is not to protect people, but to maintain the power of the conservatives.

[*Mirkin, Harris, The Pattern of Sexual Politics: Feminism, Homosexuality and Pedophilia, *J. Homosex.* Vol. 37, No. 2 (1999)

< http://www.ipce.org/Library/mirkin_frame.htm >]

Mirkin has received hundreds of hate-mails, and there were many letters to the editor and radio programs attacking him. The State of Missouri quickly made a law to diminish the State’s subsidy tot his university with exactly the amount of his salary. Nevertheless, the university found the money elsewhere and maintained Mirkin on his job, to defend the scientific freedom to do research. Such kind of debate is this: very sharp.

Oellerich

Thomas D. Oellerich, Rind, Tromovitch, and Bauserman: Politically Incorrect - Scientifically Correct, in: *Sexuality & Culture*, 4(2), 67-81 (2000)

< http://www.ipce.org/Library/oellerich_rbt.htm >

“The Rind, Tromovitch, and Bauserman study of the impact of CSA among college students is politically incorrect but scientifically correct. It has a number of important implications for the research and practice communities. Among the more important is the need to stop exaggerating

the negative impact of adult/nonadult sexual behavior, as suggested earlier by both Browne and Finkelhor, and Seligman. Another important implication is for conducting research that does not approach the issue of adult/nonadult sexual behavior with a political ideology as often has been the case thus far. And finally it is time to stop the common practices of 1) assuming that CSA causes psychological harm, and 2) routinely recommending psychotherapeutic intervention.”

The Rind Team

1) Rind, B., Bauserman, R. & Tromovitch, Ph., The Condemned Meta-Analysis on Child Sexual Abuse; Good Science and Long-Overdue Skepticism; In: *Skeptical Inquirer* July/August 20001, 68-72 < http://www.imo.myweb.nl/library_two/rbt/skept.htm >

“We would like to offer our own thoughts about this astonishing story of politics, pressure, and social hysteria--the antitheses of critical and skeptical thought.

We conducted our research in the spirit of scientific skepticism, an attitude sadly missing in the CSA panic that arose throughout much of the 1980s and early 1990s.”

“Throughout the 1970s, the “victimologists” gained power and resources. The Child Abuse Treatment and Prevention Act of 1974 provided funding to stem the problem of physical abuse and emotional neglect. By 1976, its focus shifted largely to CSA. Victimology flourished as a result, producing hundreds of studies supposedly verifying CSA assumptions. But these studies consistently violated fundamental principles of scientific methodology in order to reach the expected conclusions. They mostly used highly unrepresentative clinical case studies, yet generalized with little qualification to the whole population (external validity bias).”

“Our study was designed to overcome these biases.”

” Our study brought rigorous and skeptical attention to an issue that has spun out of control, into what Jenkins (1998) called a “moral panic.” Victimologists are advocates, not scientists. There is certainly a place for advocacy, as long as it is not confused with science--and as long as public policy is informed by the best scientific information available, rather than by unvalidated beliefs, however passionately held.”

2) Rind, B., Tromovitch, Ph. & Bauserman, R., Condemnation of a scientific article: A chronology and refutation of the attacks and a discussion of threats to the integrity of science, in: *In: Sexuality & Culture*, 4-2, Spring 2000.

< http://www.imo.myweb.nl/library_two/rbt/condemn_frame.htm >

“The current article chronicles this whole affair. First, we provide background, explaining why an article such as ours was needed. Then we accurately summarize the article, given that it has been so widely misrepresented. Next we present a chronology of the events leading up to and following the condemnation. We then present and refute all the major criticisms of the article, which have included both methodological and conceptual attacks. Next we discuss the threat to science that these events portend. We conclude by discussing the need to separate moral judgments from scientific research, the conflation of which formed the basis for the distortions and condemnation.”

“NARTH was the first to attack the suggestion in our discussion that certain types of CSA should be relabeled by researchers with the value-neutral terms “adult-child sex” or “adult-adolescent sex” (see Rind et al., 1998, p. 46).

NARTH misrepresented what we wrote, falsely claiming that we recommended that psychologists should stop using terms such as “sexual abuse” and should use the phrase “level of sexual intimacy” instead of “severity of abuse.” Regarding the latter point, what we actually wrote, in discussing the progression from exhibitionism to masturbation to intercourse, was that “many

authors referred to this increasing level of sexual intimacy as 'severity' " (Rind et al., 1998, p. 29). This distortion was repeated numerous times in opinion pieces around the country spreading a false impression of irresponsibility and lack of sensitivity. NARTH also attacked our view that *science should separate itself from moral language* [Italics by me], and complained that replacing the term "abuse" with neutral terms is "a repetition of the steps by which homosexuality was normalized." Their logic resonated with many subsequent critics."

Consent

We were also repeatedly attacked for using the construct of consent.

“ ‘Dr. Laura’ asserted that minors are never willing in sexual contacts with adults.

The FRC claimed in a press release for its May 1999 press conference that our study was "based on the premise that children can actually consent to sex with an adult." Its spokes-woman, Janet Parshall, added later that "children cannot consent to sex and any study that does not accept this premise should be dismissed."

The Leadership Council's Dallam et al. wrote that our "study makes an artificial distinction between forced and consensual adult-child sex," adding that our "study suggests that children have the capacity to consent to sex with adults."

Congress rejected the notion of consent by enclosing willing in quotation marks, and denounced the notion that willingness moderates outcomes.

And Fowler of the APA, in his letter to DeLay, wrote that "it is the position of the Association that children cannot consent to sexual activity with adults."

Simple vs. informed consent

In Webster's 3rd New International Dictionary, the first definition of consent is: "compliance or approval especially of what is done or proposed by another." This definition can be termed "simple consent," of which children and adolescents are both capable. [...]

The second definition is: "capable, deliberate, and voluntary agreement to or concurrence in some act or purpose implying physical and mental power and free action." This second definition is "informed consent," which the law takes into account and which is the typical ethical and social definition. Thus, the term "consent" clearly does not always or inevitably imply informed consent.

All our references to "consent" or "willingness" centered on the first definition. From a scientific viewpoint, the issue is whether simple consent predicts reactions or outcomes successfully. If it does, then it is scientifically valid for use in research, irrespective of moral or ethical objections."

“It should also be made clear that when Congress, the Leadership Council, the FRC, or even the APA refer to "children" in the context of sexual relations with adults, they are not referring simply to biological children but instead to minors under the age of consent, which is generally from 16 to 18 in the U.S. Thus, they are talking not only about prepubescent children, but also adolescents. It is thus informative to review what the APA has had to say in the past about adolescents' ability to provide informed consent in a different context. In an October 1989 amicus curiae brief to the U.S. Supreme Court, the APA argued, based on a review of the developmental literature, that pregnant girls do not need parental consent to obtain abortions, because they are capable, in an informed consent sense, to decide for themselves.”

3) Rind, Bruce; Bauserman, Robert & Tromovitch, Philip, Debunking the false allegation of "statistical abuse": a reply to Spiegel; Sexuality & Culture, 4-2, Spring 2000, 101-111.

< http://www.ipce.info/library_3/files/rbt_spie.htm >

“Criticizing our inclusion of only college samples, Spiegel argued that we ‘rationalize this rather odd choice with data purporting to show that the rates of abuse are similar in non-college

populations. Even if this were the case, the severity could be different, and the consequences are undoubtedly different.’

This claim, however, is false, contradicted in our article itself (see Rind et al., 1998, pp. 29-31, 42). In our comparisons between college and national samples, not only did we show strong similarity in prevalence rates, but also in severity, reactions, and consequences.”

“We did not include PTSD because, quite simply, the primary studies did not examine it. Furthermore, PTSD implies very severe pathology. Surely someone with PTSD should manifest many of the specific symptoms we did examine, such as depression or anxiety. Spiegel also complained that we did not examine patterns of symptoms. This "syndromic" argument is weakened by Kendall-Tackett et al.'s (1993) conclusion that the "first and perhaps most important implication [of their review] is the apparent lack of evidence for a conspicuous syndrome in children who have been sexually abused" (p. 173). Given that the Kendall- Tackett et al. review was based exclusively on clinical and forensic samples, it is even more unlikely that evidence for syndromes would be found in general population samples. Indeed, no pattern of symptoms appeared in our review”

“The facts were, for example, that some students reported positive or neutral CSA experiences and reported no harm, while others reported negative experiences and harmful effects. We provided readers with all of this information so the facts could speak for themselves, rather than just reporting in a one-sided fashion only the negative outcomes, as victimologists tend to do in their summaries.”

“[...] our use of the consent construct has been recklessly misinterpreted and misrepresented by our critics. We never stated or implied anything in our article about informed consent; our use was limited to simple consent (i.e., willingness), of which both children and adolescents are capable.

Moreover, this use was completely scientifically justified because:

- (a) the same construct appeared in many of the primary studies;
- (b) it had predictive validity in these studies, successfully discriminating between willing and unwanted CSA in terms of outcome;
- (c) it has been shown in other studies to have predictive validity (e.g., Coxell et al., 1999); and
- (d) it had predictive validity in our review as well.

Therefore, although it may be a "moral outrage" to our critics to use the simple consent construct, it would be a scientific outrage not to. The real problem is that a critic claiming to speak for science ignores scientific criteria in favor of moral criteria in constructing his criticisms.”

4) Rind, B., Bauserman, R. & Tromovitch, Ph., Science versus orthodoxy: Anatomy of the congressional condemnation of a scientific article and reflections on remedies for future ideological attacks' in: Applied & Preventive Psychology 9:211-225 (2000).

< http://www.imo.myweb.nl/library_two/rbt/science_frame.htm >

” In this article, we detail the chronology behind the attacks. Then we discuss the science behind our meta-analysis, showing that the attacks were specious and that our study employed sound science, advancing the field considerably by close attention to issues of external, internal, and construct validity, as well as precision and objectivity.

Next, we discuss orthodoxies and moral panics more generally, arguing that our article was attacked as vehemently as it was because it collided with a powerful, but socially constructed orthodoxy that has evolved over the last quarter century.”

“Clearly, children's resilience is not always welcome. When industries depend economically or ideologically on the harmfulness of early experiences, evidence for resilience may be more of a threat than a relief. Economic and ideological interests have shaped current thinking on CSA over the last 25 years and have become integral to treatment of it as a social problem. This clarifies the poor scientific quality and essentially moral nature of the attacks against our meta-analysis. The intensity of the attacks reflects the strength and scope of the economic and ideological interests”

2001 – 2002:

Read now, but attacked and defended again

1) Spiegel, David, **Real effects of real child sexual abuse**, *Sexuality & Culture* 4(2), 2000, pp 99-105. < http://www.ipce.info/library_3/files/spie_real.htm >

Spiegel again: “I read every word of their article before I wrote mine.” Spiegel repeats his objections: thus use of data from college students, the elite, and the broad definitions of ‘abuse’. Again, the will of the child comes into the debate:

“Can a Child be "Willing" to Engage in Sex with an Adult?

The most disturbing portion of Rind et al.'s rebuttal is their unblinking assertion that it is possible for a child to give (or withhold) "simple consent" (p. 108) to sexual abuse. They try to distinguish this from "informed consent," a term usually reserved for adult agreement to participation in medical procedures or research. There is no vantage point, clinical, moral, or legal, from which a child can give or withhold consent to sexual activity with an adult.”

”In retrospect some may come to believe that they were "willing" participants, but the fact is that they are not. [...] No child can consent to sexual abuse.

One might consider that Rind et al. were merely making the observation that those who were more likely to think in retrospect that they had "willingly" engaged in sexual activity as children were less distressed in adulthood, even though such consent is not possible. [...] They [...] take seriously the notion that a child could give or withhold consent to sexual contact with an adult. They clearly believe that a college student's retrospective report that the episode was willingly entered into means that in fact it was. They therefore go beyond observation to advocacy of normalization of sexual contact between adults and children: [...] A retrospective report of "willingness" or harmfulness by a young adult in college is hardly a sufficient criterion for determining whether or not an adult sexual interaction with a child was in fact entered into willingly, was harmful, or was abusive.”

2) **Special issue of APA’s Psychological Bulletin, November 2001: twelve critics and three defenders**

a) **Ondersma, S.J., Chaffin, M., Berliner, L., Cordon, I., Goodman, G.S. & Barnett, D., Sex With Children Is Abuse: Comment on Rind, Tromovitch, and Bauserman (1998);** *Psychological Bulletin*, 127, 6, 707-714, 2001.
< http://www.ipce.info/library_3/files/abuse.htm >

A clear title. The crux of the article is that the authors “argue for the appropriateness of the term *abuse* and for scientific terminology that reflects rather than contradicts consensual public morality.”

The authors place the meta-analysis in an historical context. They see it as a part of the flood of reaction to all attention to CSA, which reactions frequently speak about a witch hunt, false accusations and a belief that every sexual experience in childhood should always cause pervasive harm. But most of the professionals are far more nuanced than the Rind team says.

In the meta-analysis, data about harm come from retrospective interviews with college students. Doing so, one only can see the harm that is mentioned many years afterwards. So, one cannot see the harm on short-term. Typically for the brave attitude of male college students is to deny problems and victimhood.

Even a low effect size can be important. The effect size of aspirin preventing a heart attack is only 0.3%. Yet, it can save thousands of humans. If the effect size of CSA is low, there are still thousands of clients having problems.

A comparison with masturbation is invalid, because masturbation *is* not harmful, but CSA *is* harmful, according to the opinion of APA, professionals, the lawmakers and the lay public. These opinions are empirical facts and form a solid basis for scientific research – more solid than the belief of some minority groups like NAMBLA that CSA is not harmful. The same holds for the general opinion that “willingness” of children to have CSA experiences *cannot exist*. Science should follow and reflect these general beliefs instead of contradicting them.

Moreover, one should not define ‘harm’ as ‘proved harm only’. For ‘abuse’ as well as for ‘harm’, science should use [no empirical, but] sociological definitions according to how society defines these terms.

b) Dallam, S.J., Gleaves, D.H., Cepeda-Benito, A., Silberg, J.L., Kraemer, H.C. & Spiegel, D., The Effects of Child Sexual Abuse: Comment on Rind, Tromovitch, and Bauserman (1998); *Psychological Bulletin*, 127, 6, 715-733, 2001
< http://www.ipce.info/library_3/files/dal.htm >

Five of these authors are members of the *Research Council for the...*, already mentioned. Again, we see David Spiegel among them. It struck me that the tone of this article differs from the former ones. The difference is that the authors have read the meta-analysis carefully and take the authors, the data and the conclusions far more seriously. The seven authors mention many statistical issues – too much to mention here all. Their conclusions are even moderate: “[...] attempts to use their study to argue that an individual has not been harmed by sexual abuse constitute a serious misapplication of its findings.” Their conclusions are, with a tone of matter of fact, put in a table. Partly, they agree with the Rind team, partly they do not, and partly they don’t know because they did no new research about some topics.

Remarkable is also the angle of the authors: not the moral one, but the statistical and scientific angle.

“Although we agree with Rind et al. (1998) that CSA does not inevitably lead to intense and pervasive harm in all individuals, our conclusions [...] differ from those of Rind et al. in almost every other area.

It is also important to note that although the results of Rind et al.’s meta-analysis support those of previous reviews that show that extreme long-term effects from CSA are not inevitable [...], their findings also demonstrate a significant association between acknowledging a history of such abuse and an increased vulnerability to a wide range of mental health and social problems in adult life.

The fact that many of these associations were small should not be considered surprising given

that the use of correlations coupled with attenuation problems served to minimize the appearance of meaningful effects. In addition, it should be remembered that Rind et al. studied a healthy sample and that the meta-analysis tapped a very broad range of sexual experiences, many of which involved no physical contact. It is well recognized that heterogeneity in abuse severity can distort estimates of the consequences of CSA, as the lack of measurable consequences for the majority who experienced milder forms of abuse are likely to obscure the significant consequences experienced by the smaller number of people who experienced more severe forms of CSA.”

Rind *et al.* wrote: "The college data were completely consistent with data from national samples." (p. 22)". Dallam *et al.* conclude: "Equivocal. Men were more likely to report neutral or positive reactions; however, they tended to experience less serious abuse. Men's subjective perceptions often did not correlate with objective outcomes."

Rind *et al.* wrote: "The negative potential of CSA for most individuals who have experienced it has been overstated." (p. 42). Dallam *et al.* concluded: "Not supported. Despite the preponderance of mild experiences, a significant percentage of both men and woman indicated that the abuse continued to exert a negative effect on their life."

The effect sizes of CSA may be low, but are still important. The effect size of smoking on cancer is only 0.17%. Still, it concerns thousands of died humans. an effect size may be low *on average*, but for many humans still very high and important.

Again, the “willingness” (as the authors consequently mention it) of children comes into the debate. This “willingness” has never been proved empirically and objectively.

Science and morality

Here we see that the critics have acknowledged the difference between a debate about science and one about morality. They have chosen to criticize the scientific validity of the meta-analysis, instead of preaching again their moral values and opinions. They combat the *facts* that fund their moral view on CSA as being harmful. New facts can threat a moral opinion. But the critics acknowledge that facts and morality ask for two different kinds of debate or discourses, just like the Rind team did. Congress did not and mixed both debates. Now, critics want to look at the facts. Will this change their moral opinions? A discourse about morality goes its own way and is not predictable.

c) Rind, B., Tromovitch, Ph., & Bauserman, R., The Validity and Appropriateness of Methods, Analyses, and Conclusions in Rind et al. (1998): A Rebuttal of Victimological Critique From Ondersma et al. (2001) and Dallam et al. (2001); Psychological Bulletin, 127, 6, 734-758, 2001. < http://www.ipce.info/library_3/files/rbtval.htm >

“The authors show all these claims to be invalid. To the contrary, they demonstrate frequent bias in Dallam et al.'s criticisms. S. J. Ondersma et al. (2001) claimed that Rind et al.'s study is part of a backlash against psychotherapists, that its suggestions regarding CSA definitions were extra-scientific, and that the moral standard is needed to understand CSA scientifically. The authors show their suggestions to have been scientific and argue that it is Ondersma et al.'s issue-framing and moral standard that are extra-scientific. This reply supports the original methods, analyses, recommendations, and conclusions of Rind et al.”

The statistical topics are too much to mention here. The authors ask to excuse them for the flood of statistical details given in their article. The authors reply all the critical remarks easily, and clearly with a good knowledge of the literature. They blame Dallam *et al.* for being very selectively in their quotes from literature. They quote if it matches their arguments, they do not quote the same or comparable sources if it does not match.

The too broad definition of “abuse” is not to blame to the authors, but to the authors of the 59 analysed reports. Indeed, the definition should be sharper, as should be the definition of ‘harm’. Now, ‘harm’ refers to an incident that was not pretty for a while, as well to a real traumatic event. This kind of overstatement should be avoided. It prevents a clear view on the real traumatic cases.

Some critics have bases themselves on assumptions like ‘there is always harm, if you don’t see it, it still exists’ or ‘willingness cannot exist; if someone *says* that he or she was “willing”, willingness still cannot exist’. These people break Popper’s rule that falsification must be possible in scientific research.

[This rule says that one must formulate any hypothesis or conclusion in a way that confirmation as well as falsification will be possible. This is not possible in the assumptions mentioned here above, thus these assumptions are unscientific.]

Again, the authors explain that “willingness” refers to ‘simple consent’, not to ‘informed consent’. The first kind of consent is, defined as it is in dictionaries, widely acknowledged in society. Well known researchers *in sexualibus* acknowledge it also as a fact. Only some scientists claim its non-existence, but they do it according to a stand beforehand; they say that consent *may* not exist, this it *cannot* not exist. This is morally firm, but scientifically wrong.

Informed consent has never been studied scientifically, but fully accepted in society... except in sexual matters. Children should not be able to give informed consent, because they are not informed – in the US culture where sex education is nearly forbidden. However, in other countries this is quite different. To study this kind of consent, especially if it concerns sexuality, one should look to other countries and cultures.

Cross-cultural research is not unscientific. It is surely not scientific to follow, as Ondersma *et al.* suggest, society here and now as the only source for definitions, especially if it concerns sexuality. More than other issues, sexuality is influenced by cultural influences and fluctuations.

Anyway, the argument ‘the law says...’ is not correct, because laws differ by state and by country, by period and by subject, and often contradict each other. A minor is allowed to give consent to many decisions, except sexual relationships. The same law that prohibits this assumes the capacity to consent in many other aspects of life. Even the APA has said that even young teenagers are capable to give consent in many aspects of life, according to developmental psychological research. Thus, it is not logical to call *every* sexual contact of adolescents ‘abuse’.

“[...] the victimological perspective has dominated almost all research in this area for the past quarter-century. Victimology has its place but contains a heavy degree of ideology. Researchers should not feel obligated to restrict design, analysis, and interpretation to a victimological perspective, but rather they should consider other models. All of these approaches can help move research on CSA and its correlates beyond the current paradigm in this field.”

2002: The debate goes on

Rind

Bruce Rind published a new research report in November 2002:

Gay and Bisexual Adolescent Boys' Sexual Experiences With Men: An Empirical Examination of Psychological Correlates in a Nonclinical Sample'.

< http://www.imo.myweb.nl/library_two/rind/rind_gay_boys_frame.htm >

For a view on the content, we may refer to the next pages of this Newsletter, which give some parts of the text for an impression.

American Psychologist March 2002, Volume 57, Number 3; Abstracts.

< <http://www.apa.org/journals/amp/302ab.html> >

This special issue gives articles about the debate on the meta-analysis, and especially the role of the APA and the politics in it. So, it is a debate about a debate, thus, a meta-debate. That's the level of the debate at the moment. As usual, a meta-debate is more thoughtful and quiet than a debate in the heat of its beginning. On the URL mentioned above, one can read the abstracts. I was still not able to order and read this issue.

One of the authors is Lilienfeld, whose article was refused by the APA.

Dallam again

Dallam, S. J. (2002). Science or Propaganda? An examination of Rind, Tromovitch and Bauserman (1998). *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse*, 9(3/4), 109-134.

(Simultaneously published as a chapter in *Misinformation Concerning Child Sexual Abuse and Adult Survivors* (Charles L. Whitfield, MD, FASAM; Joyanna Silberg, PhD; and Paul Jay Fink, MD, Eds.) Haworth Press, 2002)

< http://www.leadershipcouncil.org/Research/BOOK_-disin/Rind_SorA/rind_sora.html >

The links to the Ipce Newsletters in this article zijn incorrect and do not work.

Go to < <http://www.ipce.org/> >, click on "Newsletters" and find them.

"The purpose of the present article is to examine whether Rind et al. (1998) is best characterized as unpopular science or pedophile propaganda." [...]

" [...] the authors' views on sex between adults and children have more in common with the ideology of advocates of "intergenerational" sexual relationships, than the reasoned opinions of most other scientists who have studied this issue." [...]

"After a careful examination of the evidence, it is concluded that Rind et al. can best be described as an advocacy article that inappropriately uses science in an attempt to legitimize its findings."

The 'evidence' is that Rind's ideas resemble those of advocates of pedophilia, *thus* Rind *et al.* [only] propagate pedophilia [thus should not be taken as serious science].

Remarkably, Dallam refers to her article, Dallam *et al.*, and to the article of Ondersma *et al.*, both mentioned here above, but she even not mentions the reply of the Rind team to it, not in her article, nor in her list of references.

Cfr what is said here above: "They [Rind *et al.*] blame Dallam *et al.* for being very selectively in their quotes from literature. They quote if it matches their arguments, they do not quote the same or comparable sources if it does not match." Exactly this is what we see here. The reader should not know about this reply. It seems that we are back again in the first hot phase of the debate.

Levine

Judith Levine, *Harmful for Minors, The perils of protecting children from sex*; Foreword by Dr Jocelyn M. Elders; University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis/Londen, 2002, ISBN 0-8166-4006-8.

Judith Levine seems to be the next target for the politically correct critics. I have her book here, so new that I can smell the ink, but even before the book was printed and could be read, a flood of articles, hate-mails and political action already has started, including claims to send her from her job. However, her university defended the academic freedom of investigating and publishing with fervour. One of the articles that describes this storm flood has as the title “Burn the book before it can be read”. These criticisms appeared to be free advertisements, because the book is sold out before it was printed.

You can read more about Levine’s book on the next pages of the Newsletter.

Speaking about *facts & morality*, Levine proposes a new morality in the area of sexuality and youth, based on a mass of facts.

In this article, I have tried to give an overview of the debate on the Rind *et al.* publication in 1998 and earlier. It appeared that the debate was hot and that it had several phases. People began to attack without even reading the meta-analysis, and even politicians mixed the discourse about facts and the discourse about morals. Gradually, the meta-analysis was seriously studied and the debate concentrated on the science and the facts. The science is still in debate, but some facts are acknowledged, and the author and their publications are taken as serious – except the most recent article of Dallam, who even not mentions Rind *et al.*’s reply.

The debate will go on, and we may hope in a reasonable and respectful way. The most logical sequence will be: discuss at first the science that gave the facts, then the facts themselves, and not until then the morality, which then will have a new base. But remember that a discourse about morals is another kind of discourse than a debate about facts.

Some quotes from**Bruce Rind****Gay and Bisexual Adolescent Boys' Sexual Experiences With Men: An Empirical Examination of Psychological Correlates in a Nonclinical Sample;**

In: Archives of Sexual Behavior, Vol. 30, No.4, 2001

Abstract

Over the last quarter century the incest model, with its image of helpless victims exploited and traumatized by powerful perpetrators, has come to dominate perceptions of virtually all forms of adult-minor sex. Thus, even willing sexual relations between gay or bisexual adolescent boys and adult men, which differ from father-daughter incest in many important ways, are generally seen by the lay public and professionals as traumatizing and psychologically injurious. This study assessed this common perception by examining a nonclinical, mostly college sample of gay and bisexual men.

Of the 129 men in the study, 26 were identified as having had *age-discrepant sexual relations (ADSRs)* as adolescents between 12 and 17 years of age with adult males. Men with ADSR experiences

were as well adjusted as controls in terms of self-esteem and having achieved a positive sexual identity.

Reactions to the ADSRs were predominantly positive, and most ADSRs were willingly engaged in. Younger adolescents were just as willing and reacted at least as positively as older adolescents.

Data on sexual identity development indicated that ADSRs played no role in creating same-sex sexual interests, contrary to the "seduction" hypothesis. Findings were inconsistent with the incest model. The incest model has come to act as a procrustean bed, narrowly dictating how adult-minor sexual relations quite different from incest are perceived.

From the Introduction

A quarter century ago, attention to the issue of sexual encounters between adults and minors increased markedly in the United States (Jenkins, 1998). This increased attention was an outgrowth of initiatives taken by the women's movement, which first focused on the problem of rape and shortly thereafter the problem of incest (Finkelhor, 1984). Rape served as a model for understanding father-daughter incest (Okami, 1990), and incest in turn quickly became the dominant model for understanding sexual encounters in general between men and girls, (Finkelhor, 1984). Based on the rape and incest models, these encounters came to be seen as a form of power abuse and violence that exploited unwilling and powerless victims, inflicting lasting psychological trauma in the process (Okami, 1990). The burgeoning child abuse profession, given a major boost in 1974 by passage of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act, rapidly spread this view, across society, where it has remained well-entrenched ever since (Gardner, 1993; Jenkins 1998)

As child abuse researchers expanded their domain of inquiry in the early 1980s, research began to include sexual encounters between men and boys, and eventually between women and boys (West, 1998). The incest model also strongly influenced how researchers, other professionals, and the lay public attempted to understand these encounters, including those between adolescent boys and unrelated adults (Jenkins, 1998; Rind, 1998). [...]

In one typical example, an editorial in a major U.S. newspaper asserted that sexual encounters between adolescent boys and men are "profoundly damaging," because they "invariably involve the imposition of power and exploitation, in the most fearfully private of all ways ... [which leaves] emotional scars, distrusts, [and] self-contempt that last through lifetimes". (*Philadelphia Inquirer*, 1984, p. 22A).

Recent reviews of the nonclinical literature suggest that the incest model, along with its assumptions of intimidation, violence, and pathogenicity, is not valid for boys in the general population who participate willingly in sexual relations with adults -- "willing" indicates simple as opposed to informed consent (see Rind et al. , 2000, for a complete discussion). Bauserman and Rind (1997), in a review of the nonclinical literature on boy-adult sex, found that willing relations were associated with neutral or positive reactions. Rind *et al.* (1998), in their meta-analytic review of college samples, found that boy-adult sex was not associated with symptoms when the boys were willing participants. In these samples, most boys with experiences labeled child sexual abuse reacted positively or neutrally (66%), whereas most girls reacted negatively (72%). These gender differences, which appeared to an equal degree in the national probability samples meta-analytically reviewed by Rind and Tromovitch (1997), imply that it is generally not valid to extrapolate from girls' experiences, especially father-daughter incest, to those of boys.

Nonclinical studies reporting data on woman-boy sex (e.g., Condy *et al.*, 1987; Promuth and Hurkhart, 1987; West and Woodhouse, 1993; Woods and Dean, 1984) have generally found that boys react predominantly positively to these encounters, especially if they are adolescents at the

time. Presumably, most of the boys in these studies were heterosexual, given the predominance of heterosexuality in the general population. It follows that, if adolescent heterosexual boys respond predominantly positively to sexual relations with older females, then adolescent gay or bisexual boys may respond similarly to such relations with older males. This inference differs markedly from expectations that follow from the incest model. It was the purpose of this study to examine these competing predictions.

From: Current Study

The purpose of the current study was to add to scientific knowledge in this area by presenting research that avoided the shortcomings just discussed. A nonclinical, mostly middle class sample of young adult gay and bisexual males was examined. Both adjustment and reaction data were analyzed, as were data concerning sexual orientation development. Consistent with the nonclinical and cross-cultural research just reviewed, and contrary to predictions from the incest model, it was expected that age-discrepant sexual relations (ADSRs) between gay or bisexual males and adult men would be experienced predominantly non negatively and would not be associated with adjustment problems. Furthermore, contrary to psychoanalytic theorizing and labeling theory, it was not expected that homosexual interests would be the "adverse" outcome of ADSRs. In the current study, ADSR was defined as a sexual encounter or relationship involving at least genital contact between a gay or bisexual boy aged less than 18 with a man aged at least 18 and at least 5 years older than the boy.

From: Results

Reactions

Subjects' mean reaction was positive ($M = 3.94$, $SD = 1.25$), although individual reactions ranged from very negative to very positive. Overall, reactions were as follows: 38.5% very positive, 38.5% positive, 7.7% neutral/mixed, 3.8% negative, and 11.5% very negative. Combining categories and rounding, 77% were positive, 8% were neutral, and 15% were negative.

Consent

Overall, subjects were mutually consenting ($M = 4.15$, $SD = .51$); consent ranged from acquiescing to encouraging. Thus, forced or coerced contact was not a factor in this sample. To the contrary, nearly a quarter (23.1 %) encouraged the contacts and about two-thirds (69.2%) mutually consented; 7.7% acquiesced. Thus, 92% evidenced positive desire for the sexual involvement.

From: Discussion

Psychological Adjustment

In the current study, ADSRs between gay or bisexual boys and men were examined. Contrary to conventional assumptions, derived in part from the influential incest model, these relations were not associated with damaged self-esteem or sexual identity development. The self-esteem of subjects who experienced ADSRs was as high as those who did not. ADSR subjects were not delayed in achieving a positive sexual identity; to the contrary, in the two samples combined, ADSR subjects actually reached this milestone earlier than did control subjects. [...]

This finding is inconsistent with conventional professional and lay views, which reflect the incest model, but is consistent with empirical findings on willing boy-adult sex based on college samples (Rind *et al.*, 1998). Given that willing ADSRs predominated in the current sample and that the current sample was composed mostly of college students, this consistency is not surprising.

Sexual Identity Development

Before gay liberation, professionals frequently expressed concern that man- boy sex was pathogenic, because they believed it was likely to cause boys to become homosexual (Rind, 1998). [...] Consistent with a growing literature [...], subjects in the current study became aware of their sexual attraction to other males years before puberty on average- in the case of ADSR subjects, 3.5 years before. All but one ADSR subject became aware of these attractions prior to having their first ADSR. [...] The timeline suggested by these events is, for most of these subjects, as follows: becoming aware of same-sex attractions, labeling these interests as gay, then experiencing ADSRs. This timeline contradicts the seduction hypothesis. [...]

The vast majority of narratives provide no evidence of harm to sexual identity formation. Contrary to stereotypes of harm, Savin-Williams (1997) concluded from his interviews that many of the ADSRs helped "the adolescent more readily identify as gay, feel better being gay, and learn much about himself"

Reactions and Consent

The incest model offers the image of a frightened child, powerless to resist, coerced into a traumatizing sex act. This image fits some case studies presented in clinical research on gay boys' ADSRs (e.g., Myers, 1989), but does not fit the typical ADSR in the current sample. [...]

It was positive and very positive reactions that predominated (77% of the cases). [...]

This predominance of positive ADSRs is strongly at odds with the image forwarded by most feminists, child abuse professionals, and media commentators. The boys in these cases were not frightened, powerless to resist, or coerced into traumatizing sex acts. Instead, the vast majority either mutually consented to the relations or actually initiated them. In contrast to the clinical and clinic-based samples discussed previously, force and coercion played no role in the current sample, the boys were not involved in ADSRs before puberty, and incest was rare

[...] Noteworthy is the finding that age difference, the *sine qua non* of the power abuse perspective, was not associated with type of reaction and was positively rather than negatively, associated with level of consent. The boys were more willing to be sexually involved as the difference in ages between them and the men increased. Moreover, the younger boys (aged 12-14) did not react more negatively than the older ones- to the contrary, they all reacted positively. This contradicts the conventional wisdom that younger participants would be vulnerable to negative outcomes because they are too naive sexually. Contrary to this presumption of naiveté or "innocence," however, almost every boy in the current sample had already become aware of his sexual attractions to other males prior to his ADSR. Additionally, these sexual attractions, whether felt by boys who experienced ADSRs or not, often involved significantly older males. [...]

Rather than seeing older males as a threat to abuse them, these boys often regarded them with "excitement, euphoria, mystery" (p. 24).

This favorable predisposition may account for the receptivity, and hence generally positive reactions, to the ADSRs that occurred in this sample. It also suggests that the reports of positive ADSRs were generally valid, rather than artifacts of psychological or social pressure to present their homosexual history in a favorable light.

From: The Incest Model: A Procrustean Bed

The discrepancy between findings in the current study and expectations based on the incest model is so great as to warrant further consideration. [...]

This sort of extrapolation has become commonplace since the early 1980s. Sexual phenomena that have only age-discrepancy in common with incest are reshaped in a narrow, rigid manner to fit the demands of the incest model. Media commentators conclude that willing sexual relations between adolescent boys and unrelated men are invariably profoundly damaging (e.g., *Philadelphia Inquirer*, September 13, 1984, p. 22A). Professionals reject or distort data regarding these relations

that are inconsistent with the incest stereotype, reaching instead the obligatory conclusion of pervasive harm (e.g., Bartholow *et al.*, 1994; Masters *et al.*, 1985).

A 1993 case in London, Ontario, illustrates paradigmatically the procrustean influence of the incest model when applied too broadly. The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC) documented on its premier informational show *IDEAS* (1994, 1995, 1999) what it termed the biggest sex scandal in North America. About 60 men sexually involved with adolescent boys were arrested in the midst of a "moral, panic ... generated by the police, with the help of therapists and social workers, and ... fueled by the media" (*IDEAS*, 1994, p. 29). CBC interviews with the boys indicated that they generally were gay or bisexual, were "sexually active teenagers who were having sex for fun or for profit" (*IDEAS*, 1994, p. 31), engaged willingly, had reached Canada's age of consent of 14 when the sex occurred, and were treated well by the men. [...]

The producer of the series summed up the procrustean influence of the incest model when applied to teenage males involved in willing relations with unrelated adults: "... the modern and useful feminist analysis of the reasons young women suffer in horrible incest cases -- that analysis has been inappropriately used in an attempt to understand an entirely different set of circumstances. A blurring of motives and psychological effects has taken place, which has created a powerful and misleading narrative that produces neither justice nor happiness." (*IDEAS*, 1999)

From: Concluding Remarks

[...]the current findings are consistent with those of other nonclinical research in demonstrating that adolescent boys' willing sexual experiences with older persons are very poorly described by victimological models (i.e., rape and incest) that evolved in the early 1970s to describe women's and girls' unwanted sexual experiences. Alternative models should be sought that incorporate the consistent finding that adolescent boys generally react neutrally or positively to ADSRs that are willingly engaged in and involve adults of the gender consistent with the adolescent's sexual orientation.

Burning a Book Before It's Printed

**About
Levine, Judith,
Harmful for Minors, The Perils of Protecting Children from Sex,
\$25.95 Cloth/jacket ISBN 0-8166-4006-8; May 2002**

Harmful to Minors will make a much needed and significant intervention into discussions of children's sexuality, adult fears and irrationality about the same, and about the moral, political, and public health risks of failing to come to grips with this culture's anxiety and ignorance about children's erotic desires and needs. This work is extraordinarily informed and wittily incisive—in addition to academics and professionals, our hope is that this book will engage adult and perhaps teen readers, and be reassuring to parents.

Burning a Book Before It's Printed

By Eloquence

Apr 7th, 2002

< <http://www.kuro5hin.org/story/2002/4/7/175457/5447> >

(with long thread of reactions)

It is easy and comfortable to believe that we live in enlightened times, that scientific and rational thought have illuminated all parts of our culture. But every now and then we are reminded that there are subjects that we are not supposed to talk about, even think about. One of these subjects is child sexuality, as is demonstrated by the reaction to the book *Harmful to Minors* by Judith Levine. Even one month before its publication, it has been widely denounced as "evil" by people who have never read the book -- because it argues that children and juveniles should be allowed to have satisfying sex lives. A stunning tale of shutting up those who dare to ask the wrong questions.

"In America today, it is nearly impossible to publish a book that says children and teen-agers can have sexual pleasure and be safe too," writes Judith Levine in the introduction to *Harmful to Minors: The Perils of Protecting Children From Sex* (Amazon.com). The book, on which she has been working since the mid-1990s, was rejected by one publisher after the next, its content called "radioactive" by one of them. The University of Minnesota Press accepted the manuscript a year ago -- a decision it now almost certainly regrets.

The UMNP description of the book reads as follows:

A radical, refreshing, and long overdue reassessment of how we think and act about children's and teens' sexuality.

Sex is a wonderful, crucial part of growing up, and children and teens can enjoy the pleasures of the body and be safe, too. In this important and controversial book, Judith Levine makes this argument and goes further, asserting that America's attempts to protect children from sex are worse than ineffectual. It is the assumption of danger and the exclusive focus on protection-what Levine terms "the sexual politics of fear"-that are themselves harmful to minors.

Through interviews with young people and their parents, stories drawn from today's headlines, visits to classrooms and clinics, and a look back at the ways sex among children and teenagers has been viewed throughout history, Judith Levine debunks some of the dominant myths of our society. She examines and challenges widespread anxieties (pedophilia, stranger kidnapping, Internet pornography) and sacred cows (abstinence-based sex education, statutory rape laws). Levine investigates the policies and practices that affect kids' sex lives-censorship, psychology, sex and AIDS education, family, criminal, and reproductive law, and the journalism that begs for "solutions" while inciting more fear.

Harmful to Minors offers fresh alternatives to fear and silence, describing sex-positive approaches that are ethically based and focus on common sense. Levine provides optimistic, though realistic, prescriptions for how we might do better in guiding children toward loving well-that is, safely, pleasurably, and with respect for others and themselves.

The book has been endorsed by Dr. Jocelyn Elders, who wrote the foreword, and by authors Robie Harris, James Kincaid, and Debbie Nathan. But a misleading interview with the author in late March quickly triggered a national wave of protests against the book, mostly coming from religious fundamentalists. The article by Mark O'Keefe (Newhouse News Service, published in the *Star Tribune*) titled "Some in mainstream contend certain cases of adult-minor sex should be acceptable" discusses recent scientific studies of adult-child sexual interaction. One of these studies is the controversial meta-analysis by psychologists Bruce Rind and Michael Bauserman that found that negative effects of adult-child sexual contact "were neither pervasive nor typically

intense, and that men reacted much less negatively than women." [...]Their study has been subject of loud scientific and political controversy (so much that the US House of Representatives eventually unanimously passed a resolution condemning the study).

The study is cited by Judith Levine in her book, which is described in the article as follows:

A soon-to-be-released book, "Harmful to Minors: The Perils of Protecting Children From Sex," is being advertised by its publisher, University of Minnesota Press, as challenging widespread anxieties about pedophilia.

In an interview, the book's author, journalist Judith Levine, praised the Rind study as evidence that "doesn't line up with the ideology that it's always harmful for kids to have sexual relationships with adults."

She said the pedophilia among Roman Catholic priests is complicated to analyze, because it's almost always secret, considered forbidden and involves an authority figure.

She added, however, that, "yes, conceivably, absolutely" a boy's sexual experience with a priest could be positive.

"When I was a minor, I had sex with an adult," she said. "He was one of my first lovers. My heart was broken, but my heart was broken by a lot of boys, too. I'd say on balance that it was a perfectly good experience."

Even with the little information provided here, it is already obvious that this is a gross mischaracterization. From the UMN press release, it is clear that Levine's book discusses much more than just pedophilia. Her statement about a relationship between a boy and a priest is abridged, and it is unclear to which question she responded. Levine's last statement could come out of a completely different context, e.g. statutory rape laws (how old was she when she had sex with an adult?).

Based on this almost propagandistic mischaracterization, a media campaign against the book quickly followed. One of its main spokespersons is Robert Knight of the religious fundamentalist propaganda organization "Concerned Women for America", which is also anti-homosexual, anti-evolution and anti-abortion. Two days after the *Star Tribune* story, CFI released the following statement:

Reject Academic Cover for Child Molesters, CFI Says

Knight Urges University of Minnesota to Fire Officials Responsible for Book Advocating Adult-Child Sex
Washington, D.C. - "Child molesters are getting a big boost toward legitimacy with the University of Minnesota Press' publication of a book advocating sex with children," said Robert Knight, director of Concerned Women for America's Culture and Family Institute. "*Harmful to Minors: The Perils of Protecting Children from Sex* is every child molester's dream--and every parent's nightmare." "Joycelyn Elders, who was Bill Clinton's surgeon general, wrote the foreword for this evil tome," Knight says. "Not content to advocate for adults teaching children to masturbate, she is giving cover for adults having sex with kids--so long as the kids give their consent. Everybody except for the molesters and their apologists knows that children cannot give meaningful consent to sex. Everybody knows that children are coerced into giving 'consent,' and that the damage can last a lifetime. The author of this book, Judith Levine, is Exhibit A. She was molested as a child and now advocates it for other children.

"Accused molesters have already misused a 1998 study published by the American Psychological Association to justify their perversion; now they will be citing this hideous book to excuse their crimes against children.

"If the Regents of the University of Minnesota do not act quickly to fire those responsible, the people of Minnesota and their elected representatives should move quickly to replace them," Knight said.

One should also note the small notice at the bottom of the press release:

Knight, a former media fellow at the Hoover Institution, wrote and directed *The Children of Table*

34, a documentary about Alfred C. Kinsey's use of children in sex experiments, and is the author of *The Age of Consent: The Rise of Relativism and the Corruption of Popular Culture* (Spence Publishing).

The Children of Table 34 is a professional, expensively produced "documentary" that has been used to discredit Alfred Kinsey's groundbreaking and unique work on human sexuality -- because some of his data on child sexuality came from a pedophile's personal records. As a propaganda expert, Knight was the right man for the job of destroying another book that advocated a positive attitude towards children's sexuality.

He managed to get his message, which was based on a misrepresentation in another article, into the international Associated Press wire news service, from where it was then broadcasted to millions of homes, over websites like MSNBC, ABCNews, CNN and others. The AP story quotes Knight as saying that "the action is so grievous and so irresponsible that I felt they relinquished their right to academic freedom." He calls the book "very evil", although he admits he hasn't read it. He also claims that "this book will aid and abet child molesters because it gives a pseudo-scientific rationale that can be used by a defense attorney."

ABCNews, in their expanded version of the AP story, at least allows Levine to make her case:

Levine says her quote was misconstrued and that she does not approve sex between authority figures such as parents, priests and teachers and the minors in their charge. However, she argues that teenagers should be given more credit for the choices they make when they become involved in relationships with adults.

[...]

Levine endorses the Netherlands' approach to age-of-consent laws. In 1990, the Dutch parliament made sex between adults and children ages 12 to 16 legal as long as there was mutual consent. The child or the child's parents can bring charges if they believe the minor was coerced into sex.

Levine believes the Dutch law is a "good model" for the United States because it recognizes children as sexual beings who can determine their future while not ignoring the fact that they are weaker than adults and still need legal protection. U.S. consent laws, she says, mistakenly put all minors under one category without recognizing their ability to pursue relationships.

"Legally designating a class of people categorically unable to consent to sexual relations is not the best way to protect children, particularly when 'children' include everyone from birth to eighteen," Levine writes. "Criminal law, which must draw unambiguous lines, is not the proper place to adjudicate family conflicts over youngsters' sexuality. If such laws are to exist, however, they must do what [social psychologist Lynn M.] Phillips suggests about sexual and romantic education: balance the subjective experience and the rights of young people against the responsibility and prerogative of adults to look after their best interests, to 'know better.'"

[...]

"The hysteria surrounding my book is precisely what my book is about," Levine said. "There are some real dangers [facing children] in the world, of course. But we need to look at them realistically and separate the real ones from the exaggerated ones."

Elsewhere, Levine also clearly states that she doesn't think children below the age of 12 can have positive sexual experiences with adults. "I deplore rape, sexual abuse of children and any way that a person is forced to have sex against their will," Levine says. "I am a feminist, and I am glad that our legal system has laws against rape. For anybody to say I promote child abuse is absurd."

Of course, given the emotions already invoked by calling Levine a pedophile-defender, her rebuttal was not enough. State Rep. Tim Pawlenty, majority leader of the Minnesota House and Republican candidate for governor, called for the stop of the book's release, according to the *Star Tribune*:

"In recent weeks, the headlines have been filled with the stories of victims sexually abused as

children," he said in a prepared statement. "This kind of disgusting victimization of children is intolerable, and the state should have no part in it."

Pawlenty said Wednesday night that he has not read the book but became upset after reading articles about its content.

[...]

"We deserve to know why the name of one of our most respected institutions is being associated with this endorsement of child molestation," Pawlenty said.

While the UMN has so far mostly defended its release of the book, it had reportedly received more than 200 mostly negative responses by early April, and has now announced to review its publishing guidelines. While the press release still defends the book, it sends a chilling message to all those wishing to initiate rational discourse of children's sexuality.

What we have here is a classical case of an attempt to kill a book before it is even released.

Apparently the rationale of current statutory rape laws, which has put many juveniles in prison for consensual sex, as well as for sexual abstinence education, a major cause of teen pregnancies, is so weak that anyone arguing against it must be singled out and completely discredited in a well-funded *ad hominem* campaign.

Some of Levine's previous writings are interesting to gauge where the author is standing. For example, in *Shooting the Messenger: Why Censorship Won't Stop Violence*, she argues against using the media as a scapegoat for school violence as was done in the aftermath of the Columbine shootings. In *A Question of Abuse* (*Mother Jones* 1996) she tells the tale of a young boy who was treated -- and psychologically destroyed -- for being a "sex offender" at the age of 9. She describes the "children who molest" scare, which I have already discussed in my *Right to Pleasure* article. To understand the child sexual abuse scare, the book *Making Monsters: False Memory, Psychotherapy, and Sexual Hysteria* (Amazon.com) is an absolute must.

If you want to protest the smear campaign against Levine's book, you can contact the University of Minnesota Press to show your support:

you can contact the University of Minnesota Press to show your support:
University of Minnesota Press
111 Third Avenue South, Suite 290
Minneapolis, MN 55401
Phone: 612-627-1970
Fax: 612-627-1980
E-mail: ump@tc.umn.edu

You can also contact the *Minneapolis Star Tribune*:
Minneapolis Star Tribune, Editorial Department,
425 Portland Avenue
Minneapolis, MN 55488
Phone: 612-673-4823, Fax: 612-673-4359
E-mail: opinion@startribune.com

Of course, pre-ordering the book will probably send the strongest message.

The attempted suppression of Levine's book raises another question: How many books about controversial subjects never find a publisher? What is the value of free speech if nobody is willing to make your speech heard? Hopefully, the Internet and books published through print-on-demand will eventually make it possible for non-technical authors to reach large audiences effectively.

Actual:
A few quotes from a few articles about
The US accused priests

Tierney, John, Wrong Labels Inflamm Fears of Catholics, New York Times March 22, 2002

There has been serious sexual misconduct, but we have exaggerated it by mislabeling it. The image of "pedophile priests" is largely a myth, according to Philip Jenkins, a professor of history and religious studies at Pennsylvania State University and the author of "Pedophiles and Priests: Anatomy of a Contemporary Crisis" (Oxford University Press, 1996).

[...] he says there is no evidence that the rate of pedophilia among Catholic priests is higher than among other clergy or other professions.

Most of the church's sexual abuse cases involve older teenagers above the legal age of consent, Dr. Jenkins said. "I don't want to excuse this behavior," he said. "Having sex with a 16- or 17-year-old boy or girl may be phenomenally stupid and wrong in many ways immoral, sinful, an abuse of authority but it's very different from pedophilia, which is the exploitation of prepubescent children. In most of these cases with older teenagers, there's some degree of consent, and in most jurisdictions they're legal." The age of consent is 17 in New York and 16 in many places.

[...] They were not pedophiles. You could call them pederasts, using a term that originally meant men attracted to boys up to adulthood, although it has come to be applied to homosexuals in general. The most precise term, Dr. Jenkins said, would be ephebophile someone with a sexual preference for boys or girls beyond puberty but don't expect to see that in many headlines soon.

[...]

Dr. Jenkins attributes the current misconceptions partly to linguistic imprecision, partly to traditional anti-Catholic stereotypes and partly to the desire to avoid an awkward issue: homosexual priests. Although there is no evidence of disproportionate rates of pedophilia among priests, Dr. Jenkins said, surveys have found that an unusually high number of priests have homosexual inclinations. [...]

Tierney, John, The perils of reform at church, March 29, 2002, New York Times

[..] I worry that an overreaction to the current scandal will deprive today's boys of the kind of mentors that we cherished — the truly celibate men with the time and the freedom to make big differences in our lives. I spoke with one of them yesterday, and he confirmed my fears.

"Today," he said, "I couldn't spend time alone with a kid the way I did with you. I'd be scared somebody would get the wrong idea."

Some boy is the poorer for it.

Berry, Jason, Secrets, Celibacy and the Church, April 3, 2002, New York Times

[...] Celibacy does not cause pedophilia. But celibacy has given rise to a secretive culture in which sexual behavior in any form must be hidden. In such a context, homosexual activity is something to be ashamed of. Under Catholic teachings, it is considered a sin.

The problem, of course, is that pedophilia is not just a sin, it is a crime. But the same secrecy and shame that hides homosexuality in the church produces an atmosphere that has concealed acts of pedophilia. Just as bishops like Cardinal Bernard Law of Boston tolerated pedophiles in their midst, they have largely failed to reckon with the development of a complex culture of gay priests. One narrow strand of this culture consists of those priests who have molested teenage boys.

No reliable survey has been done to determine how many priests are homosexual. But a growing literature on the issue underscores the crisis. The priesthood is becoming a gay profession [...]

The problem is the power structure. Obsessed with secrecy, the bishops have denied the implications of the changes in ecclesiastical culture. In 1992 I published a book on sexual abuse by priests, with a long section on the gay clergy. Much of my research was based on lawsuits filed by abuse victims. In scores of sworn depositions I read, the plaintiffs' legal strategy was clear: to show that a hierarchy that allows priests to break its own ecclesiastical rules would also shelter those who violated state criminal laws.

I interviewed several dozen gay priests across America. With assurances of anonymity (lest their bishops punish them for coming out of the closet), they promptly began discussing their sex lives. I asked why, if they could not practice celibacy, they didn't leave the priesthood. Most saw themselves as leading the church toward the reform of outdated moral teachings — including celibacy. [...]

Conservative Catholics, meanwhile, should recognize that celibacy is a failure, practically and morally. They should also acknowledge that homophobia is immoral. [...]

Jason Berry is the author of "Lead Us Not Into Temptation: Catholic Priests and the Sexual Abuse of Children."

Mattingly, Terry, Fathers, Mothers & Catholic Sons, April 2002

[...] the Catholic Archdiocese of Chicago eventually opened its files on all 2,252 priests who had served in the previous four decades. The powers that be hunted for pedophiles and they found one.

The key word is "one." One priest had been accused of assaulting a prepubescent child. The other allegations involved priests and sexually mature, but under-age, adolescents -- mostly boys.

"Those Chicago numbers are not unusual. This is, in fact, part of a pattern we see in diocese after diocese," said Father Donald B. Cozzens, former vicar for clergy in Cleveland and then rector of a graduate seminary in Ohio.

"Of course, any abuse of children is horrifying and it is just as wrong -- morally and legally -- when sexual abuse occurs with teen-agers. But it isn't helping matters, right now, for people to keep blurring the lines between these two conditions. This isn't just about pedophilia."

[...]

Cozzens stressed that he agrees with researchers who believe sexual orientation is irrelevant in discussions of pedophilia. But what if pedophilia is not the issue?

By definition, pedophiles are sexually attracted to boys and girls who have not reached puberty. But Cozzens said reports he has studied, and his own experience as a counselor, indicate the more common problem among Catholic clergy is "ephebophilia." This is recurrent, intense sexual interest in post-pubescent young people -- teen-agers.

The term "ephebophilia" is rarely used in church debates and the press. Yet, Cozzens said that whenever clergy vicars held conferences 90 percent of the sex-abuse cases they discussed fell into this category. Church authorities are reluctant to investigate this reality.

INTERNAL IPCE MATTERS

Financial report

Posts	June 10, 2000	>>>> June 20, 2001	Jn 20, 01 > Jn 7, 02
	Dutch Guilders	Euros	Euros
STARTING BALANCE	960,58	436,63	-54,45
INCOME			
Contributions	336,65	153,02	498,97
Gifts	923,61	419,82	216,24
Total Income	1.260,26	572,84	715,21
STARTING BALANCE + INCOME	2.220,84	1.009,47	660,76
COSTS			
Newsletters E 11 & 12			-158,82
Newsletters E 9 & 10	-370,75	-168,52	
Costs for the Meeting 1998, 2000	-937,35	-426,07	-4,55
Invitations, account & question			
Costs for the web sites	-907,55	-412,52	-248,11
Other Secretarial costs (porti & postbox)	-125,00	-56,82	-118,06
[Round off difference Hfl > Euros]		0,01	
Total Costs	-2.340,65	-1.063,92	-529,54
FINAL BALANCE	-119,81	-54,45	131,22
Expected costs			
Provider 12 x 32,40			-388,80
Telephone costs			-250,00
Postbox			-37,50
Porti & other secr. Costs (more post mail)			-73,70
Newsletters			-175,00
Reserve / Emergency / Newsletter			-75,00
Total			-1.000,00
Membership's fees: fact > proposal		15,00	20,00

Report of the secretary, June 2002

Ipce has 77 members in 17 countries. 56 Are member of *Ipce Meets Online*, IMO. 65 members have an e-mail connection, 12 only a post address.

Report of the web master, June 2002

The public web site

The web site has had several great updates during this year. Ipce has now 842 files on 22.36 MB, connected with 9034 links. The files are on three domains now. Many files had to be replaced

because of a lack of room. We have opened a new and paid account to have enough room. We have also some accounts to host web sites and books. The former counter has passed the 100.000 visitors. Since January 28, 2002, the counter is renewed. Since that date until mid-June were 6400 visits of the home page, which is about 50 each day on average.

The web site is mentioned in some articles in newspapers or magazines, mostly in positive sense,

The internal list and site IMO

It appeared that our mail was intercepted on a great scale by a Dutch woman, Ireen van Engelen, who is the chair of a Foundation named "Soelaas". This foundation has as one of its aims to stop the emancipation of pedophiles. Many messages have been sent to authorities, persons, groups, newspapers and journalists. In The Netherlands, her actions did not give any reaction, but a journalist in the UK, who said to have received daily faxes from Amsterdam, had published about those received messages.

As soon as we knew this, the sending of e-mails has been stopped. Since then, the list, actually a web site, works as a moderated bulletin board, only accessible with a user name and a password. This is done, because I had the opinion that only e-mails to members were intercepted.

However, recently it appeared that the same journalist had access to the web site, thus to all messages. Since then, we have started a pause, introduced a stop and removed the IMO site from the www.

During the meeting I will propose solutions for the problems.

Ethics

Frans Gieles

Several years ago, in Copenhagen and Amsterdam, we have discussed about ethics. We developed four principles or guidelines. Last year, in Berlin, we have taken up the thread. Tom presented a lecture, published in the Ipce Newsletter E 12, where is also an introducing article by me. Discussion followed on the IMO List. Let's now try to make a statement about ethics.

To refresh the memory: the four principles were seen as good in certain situations, but generally too limited and partly contradictory. The principles speak about avoiding a bad situation, but have no positive goal or a fundament that says what is good. Especially the principle of *openness* was seen as a debatable one.

The idea was to maintain the four principles, but see them as thoughts, not as rules, and to put them in a broader frame and to add more thoughts. Here is a try-out or a proposal to such a statement.

Human rights in intergenerational relationships

'First, do no harm'

"Ipce is a forum for people who are engaged in scholarly discussion about the understanding and emancipation of mutual relationships between children or adolescents and adults. In this context, these relationships are to be viewed from an unbiased, non-judgmental perspective and in relation to the human rights of both the young and adult partner." (Ipce Mission Statement)

Human rights are the fundament of ethical ideas about intergenerational relationships. One of these rights is to choose for contacts and relationships with other humans. Contact is necessary

for humans and relationships can enrich human life for both partners. This is the basis of ethical thoughts about intergenerational relationships.

How much intimacy a contact or relationship has is at first a choice of both partners. If they feel that it is good, it *is* good. This may differ by people and situation. There is only one general rule or principle that counts for every relationship: ***Do no harm.***

There is more to say. What follows, are no general rules, but guidelines or thoughts, points to take into consideration. The result, an ethical idea about an actual relationship, will differ by people and situation.

In former years, Ipce Meetings have developed and accepted *four guidelines*:

"1. *Self-determination*:

Children must always have it in his or her own power to regulate their own sexuality, their relationships with others and their own lives.

2. *Initiative*:

Even in a later stage of the relationship, it is always the children who make the choice to have sex.

3. *Freedom*:

At any moment within the relationship with an adult, children must have the freedom to withdraw from the relationship. (Dependency in sexual relationships limits their freedom). Love and dedication must be unconditional. Sex is never allowed to be a bargaining tool.

4. *Openness*:

The child should not have to carry unreasonable secrets. One has to take into consideration how the child lives with its own sexuality. This openness depends a great deal on the quality of the relationship, and the support from the adult(s).

These guidelines are no commandments on tables of stone. It are guidelines or thoughts to take into consideration. The local mores and customs also play a role, as openness about children's sex lives is not always appreciated. Children often have to be sexual in secret. Homosexuality is for many youngsters a big taboo. This can bring many problems and insecurity. If the sub-culture in which they live is relaxed and strong enough, then children can find support in that environment.

Openness is not always possible and not always wanted. Openness is a typical Western value. Many other cultures have other values. Many youngsters prefer consciously to have their own secrets. Many youngsters make their own choices and do not want to be protected. 'Don't treat me as a child', they say. It is their right to have this freedom. The freedom to say *no* and the freedom to say *yes*. There is also a right for privacy.

'Platonic' love and relationships may be a solution, but they have also the hidden implication that sex is dirty and taboo.

Especially young gays and lesbians, but also youngsters who are in a phase of homosexuality, need relationships to explore their orientation and to develop self-knowledge and self-respect. It is their right to have this. They do not deserve rejection. Harm is possible because of a relationship and the reaction of society to it. Harm is also possible by rejection and by not having relationships at all. One should as honestly as possible estimate if any harm is possible. The leading principle will be *Do no harm.*

Every person and situation is different. Children change in the course of their development from child to adult. Use your best judgment in any individual case.

Documentation Service List NL E 13, December 2001

01-103 @ 11 kB	Theories of child porn's harm , Robin Sharpe I want to examine these theories from a logical common sense approach.
01-104 @ 40 kB	Studies of the effect of pornography , Robin Sharpe This document is devoted to exploring some of the available research data that was used to come to this conclusion.
01-105 @ 8 kB	'Dr. Laura' debacle won't go away as vetoed article dispute reveals. From "The National Psychologist: The Web Site of The Independent Newspaper for Practitioners", vol. 10, no. 4, July/August 2001, at http://nationalpsychologist.com/articles/art_v10n4_1.htm The "Dr.Laura" controversy that caused the American Psychological Association (APA) serious embarrassment two years ago, is turning into an on-going soap opera that has lately threatened to divide the association into warring camps. The latest chapter was being written this spring when a once-accepted, then rejected, and finally re-accepted article by Scott Lilienfeld, Ph.D., an Emory University psychology professor, questioned APA's handling of the 1999 incident over a study of child sexual abuse.
01-106 @ 22 kB	A part of the article " David and Goliath: When Empirical and Clinical Standards of Practice Meet " by Larry E. Beutler, Ph.D. (2000) The article claims that psychosocial treatments are often selected, practiced and governmentally approved based on procedures that are political or commercial in nature, or that do not stand the test of scientific rigor. The "American Psychiatric Association" is especially criticized in this respect. The first part of the article discusses the reign of dubious treatments primarily in light of the recovered memories & satanic ritual abuse saga.
01-107 @ 3kB	Book review: Stealing Innocence: corporate culture's war on children , By Henry A Giroux. Palgrave, 9.99 Childhood is a social construction as well as a biological process. Parents, increasingly backed up by the state, have always tended to raise children in the light of what they believe others will expect of them in later life, with such expectations varying according to family wealth and prevailing cultural and economic norms
01-108 @ 2.7 kB	Boys Starting Puberty Early, Study Finds , 14th September 2001 A new study suggests that boys in the United States, like girls, are entering puberty slightly earlier than previously thought, with blacks the most likely to develop the first signs by age 10.
01-109 @ 5.6 kB	Book note: Men in Wonderland: The Lost Girlhood of the Victorian Gentleman , by Catherine Robson Fascination with little girls pervaded Victorian culture. For many, girls represented the true essence of childhood or bygone times of innocence; but for middle-class men, especially writers, the interest ran much deeper. In *Men in Wonderland*, Catherine Robson explores the ways in which various nineteenth-century British male authors constructed girlhood,
01-110 @ 5.8 kB	Book sparks call to pardon Ellis , by Donna Chishoim, in: Sunday Star Times September 30 2001 AN AUTHOR who has spent seven years researching the Peter Ellis case has called for the government to pardon Ellis and set up a commission of inquiry into the

	criminal justice system.
01-111 @ 13 kB	Ellis in blunderland; A new book on the Peter Ellis case concludes he was the innocent victim of a city in the grip of mass hysteria , by Donna Chisholm reports, in: Sunday Star Times, New Zealand, September 30 2001 Page C5 OPEN Lynley Hood's latest book like an onion and peel back layer after layer of injustice. Read it and weep. Put the cops in the Peter Ellis case on trial, along with the sex abuse industry, social welfare and the judiciary and return the verdicts
01-112 @ 6.5 kB	Uproar Over Child Sex Study Still Going Strong After Two Years , By Walter Truett Anderson, Pacific News Service, May 30, 2001
01-113 @ 8 kB	Abandoned, vulnerable and exploited: Britain's rent boys ; It is a hidden world - but the numbers of boys being forced into prostitution is an untold scandal, Amelia Hill, The Observer, December 9, 2001
01-114 @ 3kB	[Misconception:] The concept of 'youth' was nonexistent in the Middle Ages. Translated from 'Kleine encyclopedie van misvattingen' (Small encyclopedia of misconceptions) by Hans van Maanen, Boom 1990.
01-115 @ 5.6 kB	Stanford researcher rebukes study claiming little ill-effect of child sexual abuse , By Sheila Foster, Stanford Report, December 5, 2001 From http://news-service.stanford.edu/news/december5/CSA.html
01-116 @ 105 kB	Articles about RBT - Index, list & references to BibTeX entries
01-117 @ 5.6 kB	Book review of: Paul Golding: The Abomination (Picador; London; 2000; 16 Hardback; 515 pages) The Abomination is a novel revolving around the love life of a boy in a British boarding school.
01-118 @ 42 kB	"Alarmierende Viktimisierungsraten": - Techniken der Übertreibung und ihre Folgen , Von Martin Killias, Lausanne Es gehört heute in der Forschung zu Gewalt und Mißbrauch in der Familie zum guten Ton, möglichst alarmierende Viktimisierungsraten zu veröffentlichen und dadurch eine moralische Panik in der Öffentlichkeit zu perpetuieren, die immer bedenklichere Auswüchse zeitigt. Dabei lassen sich bestimmte wiederkehrende Techniken identifizieren, die Viktimisierungsraten systematisch als besonders hoch und qualitativ dramatisch erscheinen lassen.
01-119 @ 2.6 kB	Book review of: 'The Wrong Boy' , by Willy Russell, Doubleday/Black Swan, 2000 Raymond Marks, the central character and 'wrong boy' of the title, is a morbid soul, and so would anyone be who had been through what he has by the age of 16.

Documentation Service List NL E 13, June 2002

02-001 @ 2 kB	Most Molested Boys Don't Molest Others as Adults , Yahoo Health, Friday 4 January 2002 (Reuters Health) - A "cycle" of child sexual abuse seems to exist for only a minority of male victims, but not at all for female victims, British researchers report
------------------	--

02-002 @ 4.5 kB	<p>Sex talk 'reduces teen pregnancy rate', by David Walker, The Guardian, January 4, 2002</p> <p>Teenage pregnancy in Britain will remain far above European levels because sex is regarded as "dirty" by too many parents and schools.</p> <p>A study to be published shortly in the Journal of Social Policy, says sex education puts too much emphasis on the riskiness and danger of sex, too little on its pleasure. This leads young people, especially boys, to adopt irresponsible attitudes.</p>
02-003 @ 5.3 kB	<p>Review of: Not In Front Of The Children: Indecency, Censorship, and the Innocence of Youth, Marjorie Heins; Hill & Wang; New York; 2001</p>
02-004 @ 7.5 kB	<p>Old press release, Africa: HARARE March 17 1997 Sapa, STUDY FINDS 30 PER CENT OF ZIM CHILDREN SEXUALLY ABUSED</p> <p>Thirty per cent of Zimbabwe`s children are likely to have been sexually abused, according to a recent study here, which says the rate is three times higher than abuse expected in other parts of the world.</p>
02-005 @ 14 kB	<p>Some in mainstream contend certain cases of adult-minor sex should be acceptable, Mark O'Keefe, Newhouse News Service, Star Tribune, March 26, 2002</p> <p>Sex between adults and children has been a societal taboo so strong that it's considered one of our few unquestioned moral principles. But arguments have emerged in academic journals, books and online that at least some such sex should be acceptable, especially when children consent to it.</p>
02-006 @ 1.5 kB	<p>Court Strikes Down Child Porn Ban, AP, April 16, 2002</p> <p>The Supreme Court struck down a congressional ban on virtual child pornography</p>
02-007 @ 19 kB	<p>Explanation of the decision in 02-006 by LEGAL INFORMATION INSTITUTE - CORNELL LAW SCHOOL</p> <p>These are not the decisions themselves nor excerpts from them, but summaries (syllabi) prepared by the Court's Reporter of Decisions.</p>
02-008 @ 3.9 kB	<p>Guatemala children adapt to survive, news.bbc.com April 13, 2002</p> <p>Homeless urban children in developing countries are healthier than was originally thought. The rapid increase in the number of homeless children in cities in the developing world is a matter of grave concern. But researchers have found that although the lives of these children can be fraught with danger, they adapt physically to survive. These kids are resilient and self-reliant and adapt physically to the difficult conditions of homelessness</p>
02-009 @ 60 kB	<p>Decision of the Court of Appeal in New Zealand, against the film and literature board of review</p>
02-010 @ 7 kB	<p>TV Sex Linked To Sexual Behavior In Some Teens, By Alison McCook, 5-22-2 NEW YORK (Reuters Health) - Some teens who watch television programs with high sexual content appear to engage in sexual behaviors more often than those who watch other types of TV programs, according to new research.</p>
02-011 @ 19 kB	<p>Boys of Boise - Furor, Vice, and Folly in an American City. [1966] Foreword by Peter Boag. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 2001. Reviewed by Thomas C. Mackey, Department of History, University of Louisville. [Re] Published by H-Urban (May, 2002)</p>