



CFI Community of Long Island

*Working to promote and defend reason, science, and freedom of inquiry
in all areas of human endeavor*

Title:

**Anti-gay Activism and the Misuse of
Science:**

**An example of how science can be perverted to support
ideologically motivated social activism and harm humanity;
the victims in this case: homosexuals**

Author: Gerry Dantone

Coordinator

Center for Inquiry Community of Long Island

PO Box 119

Greenlawn, NY 11740

LIsecHum@aol.com

516 640 5491

www.centerforinquiry.net/li

Date: January 2007

© CFI Community of Long Island 2007

INTRO

CFI Community of Long Island's mission is decidedly non-partisan; in fact, a primary mission of our community could be described as attempting to increase the use of reason and good science in our lives, including our political lives, and lessen the influence of dogma and ideology. Unfortunately, there is no lack of pseudo-science being presented as science by ideologically driven dogmatists with specific agendas.

THE CHALLENGE

This analysis was inspired by a specific email¹ I received as coordinator for the Center for Inquiry Community of Long Island², which was also sent to members of the local media and a local gay rights activist group by Frank Russo, Jr., the leader of a prominent religiously oriented activist organization, the American Family Association of New York (AFA-NY)³. This organization is associated with the national American Family Association⁴, chaired by Donald E. Wildmon. The email challenged a local Long Island, New York gay activist leader, David Kilmnick of LIGALY, to join with the AFA-NY in supporting new government funded studies to determine “whether sexual orientation is correlated to child sexual abuse.” The AFA, and many others, believe the question is somehow relevant to the issue of whether gay marriage or civil unions should be legalized, and whether homosexuals should be allowed to adopt.

You might ask “why shouldn't LIGALY simply support the studies?” Should every study suggested by anyone be supported? Would Catholics, for example, support a study about Catholic pedophilic tendencies compared to the general population *for the purpose of potentially limiting their civil rights?* Would blue-eyed persons support a similar study about themselves? How about a study focusing on persons named “Frank”? It would seem prudent to only pursue such studies where there is a somewhat compelling reason to do so.

Although there seems to be a wide leap of logic involved in justifying the idea of whether a whole class of persons should be denied certain rights on the basis of the alleged criminality of (even many) others in that class, we will not get into that issue here. We will instead deal with the “evidence” presented by the leader of the AFA-NY that he claims indicates that homosexuals, comprising that class of adult persons who engage in primarily same-gender sex, many of whom are clamoring for the above noted equal marriage and adoption rights, are more prone to child sexual abuse than heterosexuals. Mr. Russo noted in his email that he certainly does “not want to allege such a connection between homosexuality and child abuse if such does not exist” and we will take him at his word; after all he concedes that “perhaps some of these studies were done improperly.”

The evidence consists of citations of eight “studies” as described by Mr. Russo; I requested from Mr. Russo a copy of these “studies” if he had them, or if he would direct me to where I might obtain them, noting to him that I knew that the last item was a book that could be found for sale on-line. He had but one “study,” the one from John Jay College, he answered, though he then offered me *other* material and citations, which will not be investigated here.

The precise method and wording of the citations he used in his letter are important so here they are reprinted from the email, without editing (except the numbering of the citations) typos and all, but should not be construed as a comment on the substance of Mr. Russo’s material or his intelligence:

THE EVIDENCE

Excerpt from the email from Frank Russo, Jr.:

Here are some of my citations, regarding the significant correlation between child abuse and homosexuality, and they are not "from the 50's" as you seem to mistakenly believe:

Re: having been abused and being gay:

(1) The study, "Comparative Data of Childhood and Adolescent Molestation in Heterosexual and Homosexual Persons ", Archives of Sexual Behavior, Vol. 30, No 5, 2001 by Tomeo, Templer, Anderson and Kotler (all educators & psychologists with Ph.D.'s) shows that while 46% of gay men were sexually abused by a male as a child, only 7% of heterosexual males were so abused; for females, 22% of lesbians were sexually abused as a child by a female, vs. only 1% of heterosexual females.

This is a recent study by 4 reputable academicians reported on in a reputable journal and the findings were strongly indicative of a high correlation to having been abused as a child and being gay.

Re: the related issue of any correlation between sexual orientation and being a child molester, here are some citations:

(2)"Pedophilia and Heterosexuality vs. Homosexuality", Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy", 1984, Vol 10, ppages 193-200---- two studies by Drs Freund and Heasman of the Clarke Institute of Psychiatry in Toronto found 32% and 34% of molesters were gay; of some 457 pedophiles they personally treated, 36% were gay.

(3) Dr Adrian Copeland of the Peters Institute in Philadelphia, a psychiatrist who works with sex offenders, found that 40% of child abusers were gay (Boston Globe, Aug. 8, 1988).

(4) Of nearly 100 child molesters at the Massachusetts Treatment Center for Sexually Dangerous persons, 1/3 were hetero, 1/3 were bisexual and 1/3 were gay. (Dr Raymond Knight, interviewed after speaking at Eastern Psychological Assn in NY (1991) on "Differential preference of personality disorders in rapists & child molesters".

(5) Of 91 molesters interviewed at Canada's Kingston's Sexual Behavior Clinic, 42%

were gay. "W.L. Marshall, "Early onset and deviant sexuality in child molesters", *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* (1991) , Vol. 6, pp. 323-336.

(6) of the recent John Jay College study of the sexual abuse problem in the Catholic Church some 80% were cases of homosexual abuse, not pedophilia, that is abuse of post-pubescent boys, also known as ephebophilia. (I can email you a report of this major study by the John Jay College as recently published in *Pastoral & Homiletic Review*).

(7) In the study, "Adolescent Sex Offenders--Vermont-1984", by J. Wasserman, pub. in the *Journal of the American Medical Assn* (1986)-of 161 Vermont adolescent sex offenders, 22% were homosexual.

(8) The Kinsey Institute found 25% of some 565 adult gays admitted to having sex with boys aged 16 and younger. ("*Homosexualities: a Study of Diversity Among Men and Women*", pub. by Simon & Schuster, authored by Bell & Weinberg.)

The citations themselves are pretty alarming: one study seemed to indicate that 67% of child molesters were either gay or bi-sexual. What's going on?

Taken in order, the truth turned out to be quite different.

A CLOSER LOOK

The first citation, "Tomeo, Templer, Anderson and Kotler"⁵ indicates a study that is presented as concluding there is a correlation between being abused as a child and being gay; the citation fails to note several highly relevant factors: it was a **non**-clinical study and the data concerning homosexuals was gathered by *setting up an interview booth at a "Gay Pride" parade*⁶ while the data for heterosexuals was gathered at a college. Did the signage attracting participants at the Gay Pride parade booth ask specifically for victims of abuse who were willing to tell their story? The study does not say anything on this point – we do not know how participants were attracted. How likely is it that all the

persons who took the questionnaire at the booth *just happened* to be gay, as it is claimed in this study? At every Pride Parade I've attended there are numerous non-gay persons, and in fact it is possible if not probable that **heterosexuals** would outnumber homosexuals at such an event – *how come some heterosexuals did not wander over to the booth and participate – or were they refused with some undocumented screening or, even worse as far as the data is concerned, counted as homosexuals?* How reliable is this kind of self-reported data from this self-selected, or worse, deliberately skewed sample?

Also note that the data on 39 persons was ignored entirely because their sexual orientation was not known – bi-sexuality was not an optional choice, and this may have led some to leave this section blank. One must also wonder, did many bisexuals describe themselves as homosexuals because of the lack of other options? Would this affect the data? Why on earth wouldn't you allow for such an option?

Meanwhile, the data on heterosexuals was obtained at colleges; is this a group that one could then compare to persons attracted by unknown means to a booth at a gay pride parade? Can one then ethically extrapolate the findings to the general public?

Another interesting aspect of this study is the use of the word “molestation.” In the questionnaire given to participants, the word “molestation” is *never* used; “sexual contact” is used. What does this phrase mean to the various participants? Does it mean one thing to those participating in a festive Gay Pride Parade and something quite different to a student at a perhaps more subdued or introspective University setting? Since 84% of gay men and 95% of women considered themselves gay *before* the “sexual contact” according to the study, could it be something less nefarious than, for example, forcible rape they were recounting? Could it be that the college students were *only* counting more disturbing experiences, such as forcible rape? Of course it is possible the two groups were defining “sexual contact” in precisely the same manner, but we really should not have to assume such a thing; our doubts are due to the absence of pertinent info from the researchers – this should have been made clear. The study does not even

attempt to quantify these probably relevant differences in these two groups. And, instead of continuing to use the phrase “sexual contact” in their closing discussions, the authors of the study switch to “molestation” in their analysis of the data, which might have surprised some of those who participated in the survey.

Also cited in the Tomeo, et al report are studies conducted by **Paul Cameron** that supported the contention that gays are more likely to have been molested and to molest others. Wikipedia⁷ reports that The American Sociological Association has criticized Dr. Cameron, stating that "Cameron has consistently misinterpreted and misrepresented sociological research on sexuality, homosexuality, and lesbianism" and that he was kicked out of the American Psychological Association⁸. Further, in a court case in 1985, a judge saw fit to characterize Paul Cameron’s “expert” testimony thusly:

*Second, this Court reaffirms its findings that Dr. Simon and Dr. Marmor were very credible witnesses and that their qualifications were impeccable. In contrast, **Dr. Paul Cameron--the basis of the claim that Drs. Simon and Marmor committed fraud in their testimony--has himself made misrepresentations to this Court. For example:***

*(i) his sworn statement that "homosexuals are approximately 43 times more apt to commit crimes than is the general population" is a **total distortion** of the Kinsey data upon which he relies--which, as is obvious to anyone who reads the report, concerns data from a non-representative sample of delinquent homosexuals (and Dr. Cameron compares this group to college and non-college heterosexuals); (ii) **his sworn statement that "homosexuals abuse children at a proportionately greater incident than do heterosexuals" is based upon the same distorted data--and, the Court notes, is directly contrary to other evidence presented at trial besides the testimony of Dr. Simon and Dr. Marmor. (553 F. Supp. 1121 at 1130 n.18.) n30⁹***

Yes, this study used data from this same researcher *without commenting on his questionable credibility and the possible fraudulence of his data.*

And finally, even this study acknowledges severe limits on using its findings to make conclusions: *“Perhaps children or adolescents with a higher potential for homosexual behavior are more likely to enter a situation that leads to same-sex molestation. It must also be borne in mind that the present homosexual participants may not be representative of homosexual persons.”*

Unfortunately, Mr. Russo did not provide this disclaimer or any of the other highly relevant facts. Did he make an attempt to understand this study? Has he ever seen this study?

The next paired studies, *“Pedophilia and Heterosexuality vs. Homosexuality”*, *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, 1984, Vol 10, ppages 193-200---- two studies by Drs Freund and Heasman, are difficult to pin down because, as it states above, there are two studies, but only one title is given! Apparently the Freund studies referred to are *Kurt Freund, Robin Watson (sic), and Douglas Rienzo, “Heterosexuality, Homosexuality, and Erotic Age Preference,” The Journal of Sex Research, 26(1), Feb. 1989, pp. 107-117* and perhaps *Kurt Freund and Robin Watson (sic), “The Proportion of Heterosexual and Homosexual Pedophiles Among Sex Offenders Against Children: An Exploratory Study,” Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy, 18(1), Spring, 1992, pp. 34-43, at p. 41.*

Note that the “Watson” referred to above should be “Wilson” – typos and misspellings are common and one can see some of these typos repeated time after time on numerous websites as the incurious cut and paste without doing any serious thinking. Here is what the 1989 study said: *“Findings indicate that homosexual males who preferred mature partners responded no more to male children than heterosexual males who preferred mature partners responded to female children.”*¹⁰

This would seem to indicate that heterosexuals and homosexuals view children of the preferred gender similarly, *contradicting the point of the citation.* Another review of the Freund studies indicated that *“In 1988, renowned sex researcher Kurt Freund at the Clarke Institute of Psychiatry in Toronto studied two groups of paid volunteers and found*

that gay men responded no more to male child stimuli than heterosexual men responded to female child stimuli. He (Freund) later described {in 1992} as a "myth" the notion that gay men are more likely than straight men to be child molesters."¹¹

Upon researching Dr. Freund's other work to clearly understand his findings, I came upon a short biography of his written by a close associate and a partner on the above noted papers, Dr. Robin Wilson, who wrote of the late Dr. Freund, "*I would be remiss if I did not exploit this opportunity to publicly correct oft-misquoted research on which I collaborated with Dr. Freund. In 1989, we (along with Doug Rienzo) published "Heterosexuality, Homosexuality, and Erotic Age Preference" (The Journal of Sex Research, 26, 107-117) and, in 1992, we published "The Proportions of Heterosexual and Homosexual Pedophiles Among Sex Offenders Against Children" (Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy, 18, 34-43). These articles have frequently been cited by fundamentalist lobbyists as proof-positive that homosexuals are more inclined to molest children. This was not a finding of our research, period. What we found was that, among men with a sexual preference for children, there was an over-representation of men with a same-sex preference. To reiterate, among men with a sexual preference for children, as diagnosed using Dr. Freund's phallometric test, there was a higher relative incidence of homosexuality. In all other research we conducted, we never found that androphilic (i.e., a preference for male adults) men had any greater relative erotic interest in children than did their gynephilic (i.e., a preference for female adults) peers. Dr. Freund was and would continue to be greatly distressed that any of his research would contribute to the persecution of any group of people.*"¹²

At this point, I could sense a pattern in the citations. Indeed, I had wondered if the AFA had simply assumed their conclusions in their very argument. The use of Paul Cameron's data confirmed that the AFA is not above calling every same-sex sexual abuse of a child committed as an abuse committed by a homosexual, even *if the abuser has never had sex with an adult person of the same sex, or has, in fact, lived their entire life as a heterosexual!* This habit of ignoring the actual facts about the sexual orientation of the abuser, a tactic used by Cameron, works to exonerate heterosexuals from all instances of

same-sex child sexual abuse in advance of doing the studies; if you do that, why bother with the studies?

The whole point of these studies should be to determine whether those persons that organizations such as the AFA want to deny marriage and adoption rights to, that is, adult homosexuals who potentially might want to marry other adult homosexuals or adopt, are committing child sex abuse crimes at high rates and therefore should not be allowed to marry or adopt (putting aside the possible leaps in logic for the moment.) If those specific persons are not an unusual problem, why deny them anything? If persons who live as heterosexuals are committing abuse as often, why assign their cases of abuse to the class of persons who live as homosexuals, and ignore heterosexual abusers to justify denying the rights of homosexuals?

The next study, attributed to Dr. Adrian Copeland, is not a study at all, or at least no study is actually being cited. Nothing more than an article from the Boston Globe is being cited and nowhere within the article is Dr. Copeland quoted saying anything contained in the citation. Here is what the article did contain:

“Pedophiles tend to be homosexual and are more likely to select boys for abuse. From his experience, Copeland estimates that as many as 40 percent to 45% percent of these men have had ‘significant homosexual experiences.’” (End quote from Boston Globe.)

As you can see, the first sentence is not a quote from Dr. Copeland or from a study – it’s the reporter that is making this statement based on the reporter’s understanding. The quote supposedly attributed to Dr. Copeland, “significant homosexual experiences” is unclear to a degree; are they homosexuals and the very same class of persons that are seeking the marriage and adoption rights that the AFA opposes?

To answer this question, I wrote to Dr. Copeland, who emailed back. Here is what he wrote: *“Dear Mr. Dantone: I have read the Boston Globe article, "Child Abuse by Strangers Is Called Rare," and find the yellow highlighted part of the article misleading.*

1. *Fathers who molest their child and others ARE pedophiles.*

2. *Pedophiles who abuse only underage males will usually **avoid** sex with adult males, and*

3. *Adult males (homosexuals) who have sex with other adult males **rarely have sex with pre pubertal males. The problem is the imprecise use of the term 'homosexuals.'***¹³

It would seem that the actual person being quoted disagrees with the general conclusion as reported in the Boston Globe article and repeated by the AFA of NY and hundreds of others on-line; the problem being that anti-gay activists continually depict same-sex child molesters as “homosexuals” whereas in reality, same-sex child abusers, *according to the scientists being cited*, are **not** disproportionately homosexual in their **adult** sexual orientation.

The next “study” seemed straight-forward: Dr. Raymond Knight, a noted researcher, said, according to the citation, that 1/3 of child molesters were homosexual and another 1/3 were bi-sexual. Here is what Dr. Knight wrote when I contacted him about this citation:

*“This is a misquote. I said 1/3 had exclusively male children victims, 1/3 had both male and female child victims, and 1/3 had exclusively female victims. This statement is accurate for those who were civilly committed to the Massachusetts Treatment Center. We have the data coded for those who were referred to the treatment center, but not committed, but I have not analyzed it yet. **We did not have accurate data on the adult preferences of either group of offenders at the center.** I could analyze the percent of each of these groups who had been married, if this information would be helpful for you. **I never use the term "gay" professionally and would certainly not have characterized those offenders with exclusive preference for male child victims as having exclusive preference for adult males, because we did not have reliable data on this.** I would certainly be willing to do what I can to correct this misquote and misuse of our data. Ray*

Knight.”¹⁴

The next study is also easily explained. Dr. Marshall also responded, twice, to my queries about this citation and his pertinent views on the subject:

Dear Mr. Dantone, I have no idea where this quote came from but it was certainly NOT from my article that you cited. That paper was not concerned with homosexuality at all. To the best of my knowledge I have never said that “Of 91 offenders interviewed at the Kingston Sexual Behaviours Clinic were gay”¹⁵. (End 1st response.)

“Dear Gerry, the paper that is cited in fact has nothing at all to do with the issue of gays so it is entirely an invented quote. I am very angry that my name has been used to justify homophobic nonsense. In fact the evidence from the literature makes it clear that gay men are, if anything, less at risk to molest children than are heterosexuals. You may feel free to place this note to you on whatever website you wish. Good luck with your very valuable work. Bill (W. L. Marshall, O.C., and PhD.)”¹⁶ (End 2nd response.)

Once again, a study that probably had no information on the adult sexual preference of those tested is used to advance an ideological position *that could harm others*.

Of the next citation, Mr. Russo claimed that “*of the sexual abuse problem in the Catholic Church some 80% were cases of homosexual abuse, not pedophilia, that is abuse of post-pubescent boys, also known as ephebophilia.*” (End quote.) He also offered to email a copy of the study.

I did request a copy but I what he emailed back *was not the study* but an article from the “*Homiletic & Pastoral Review*”¹⁷ which merely cited the John Jay study¹⁸ and reported it in the *H&PR*’s own manner! This article also cited the aforementioned Paul Cameron studies as well, which may be a testament to this article’s integrity.

The actual study is not quite what the citation leads one to believe. The executive summary, in fact, does not even mention the sexual orientation of the perpetrators; it is amazing, therefore, that the H&PR's article focuses on this absent finding!

The references to homosexuality within the report are rare. The actual John Jay report did say: *“One way of categorizing offenders, for example, is by the type of victim they choose. Some child sexual abusers are diagnosed as pedophiles, meaning that they exhibit recurrent, intense, sexually arousing fantasies, urges or behaviors related to sexual contact with a prepubescent child over a period of at least six months duration. However, not all sexual abuse occurs with young children, and not all child sexual abusers fit this clinical diagnosis. **Some researchers have identified a similar condition, ephebophilia, which refers to individuals who exhibit these same fantasies, urges or behaviors towards post-pubescent youths.** While some offenders evidence a clear preference for particular types of victims with regard to age and gender, many do not. Individuals who molest children may be heterosexual, homosexual, or bisexual with regard to victim selection. Child sexual abusers who prefer female victims are more likely to be diagnosed as pedophiles than those who prefer male children while child sexual abusers who prefer male victims tend to target boys who are slightly older.”*¹⁹

The concept of *ephebophilia* is often equated to homosexuality by ideologues who adamantly oppose anti-gay marriage or adoption, **but the John Jay report instead compares ephebophilia to pedophilia, not homosexuality – they call ephebophilia “similar” to pedophilia, not homosexuality or heterosexuality. Nowhere did it claim that the adult sexual orientation of the perpetrators was mostly homosexual – it said *nothing* on this issue.**

The report nowhere else mentions homosexuality or the sexual orientation of the perpetrators. The entire substance of this citation has to do with the fact that the John Jay study found that 80% of the victims of the male priests and deacons of the Roman Catholic Church were male. Nowhere did any analysis or research take into account the availability of males vs. female victims or any other extenuating circumstances, much

less the adult sexual orientation of the perpetrators. Yes, those who cite this study assume that all same-sex child sexual abuse is perpetrated by homosexuals – the same tactic used by Paul Cameron and others who prefer to assume their conclusions.

The next study, by Wasserman²⁰, from a Vermont government agency, is another bizarre citation; it's a study of *adolescent sexual offenders*; the average male perpetrator was 15 years old, and female perpetrator, 13 years old, meaning that *there were no adult homosexuals being studied*, and of course, you guessed it, there was no data on the “adult” sexual orientation of the perpetrators – just the genders of perpetrators and victims. How could this study, therefore, be used as an argument to keep adult homosexuals from being able to marry or adopt? The answer can only be that via deception, all things are possible.

Finally, we come to the last citation from Mr. Russo of the American Family Association of NY citing the venerable Kinsey Institute study, “*Homosexualities*” by Bell & Weinberg: “*The Kinsey Institute found 25% of some 565 adult gays admitted to having sex with (sic) boys aged 16 and younger.*”

The Kinsey Institute was a pioneering institution but they recognized their limitations. How did they gather their data when they “*found 25% of some 565 adult gays admitted to having sex wiht (sic) boys aged 16 and younger*” as reported by Mr. Russo?

By now, we know to ask, “*Is this what the Kinsey researchers really found?*” Actually, no, it was what the discredited Paul Cameron says they found! Right now, on the American Family Association web site²¹ you can find the following: “*Other researchers (Bell, Weinberg and Hammersmith, 1978) found the same thing: a quarter of homosexuals admitted to having sex as adults with children and under-aged teens. According to FRI head Dr. Paul Cameron, even in the controversial Kinsey research from the 1940s, which formed the basis of the Sexual Revolution and its progeny, the homosexual movement, homosexuals admitted a propensity for sex with minors. Kinsey found that 37% of homosexual adult men said they had had sex with youths under age 17,*

and 28% admitted to sexual relations with those under age 16. Cameron also said that later research by the Kinsey Institute found in 1970 that 25% of homosexual men in San Francisco “admitted to having sex with boys aged 16 or younger while they themselves were at least 21.” (End quote from AFA web site.)

The essential problem with this study is that almost half of the respondents were found in bars, bathhouses, sex clubs and public cruising areas, hardly the places where you’d find “average” or “representative” homosexuals. The survey also took place in San Francisco at the height of the “summers of love” 1969 to 1970. Finally, all persons who had **any** homosexual experiences **or** inclinations were categorized into the “gay” group, which would include, if done in this manner, numerous persons who would classify themselves as either bisexual or even *heterosexual*.

From the BoxTurtleBulletin website: *“Bell & Weinberg included in their study everyone who rated anywhere from a “2” to a “6” on the Kinsey scale — everyone who was mostly heterosexual to exclusively homosexual (where a “1” denotes exclusive heterosexuality and a “6” denotes exclusive homosexuality). We cannot know if the mostly-heterosexuals (the “2’s” and “3’s”) affected the results while in the epicenter of the free-love revolution. This study cannot be used to describe gay men as a whole. At best, it can only describe the behaviors of those who were found in those locations at that time, and who agreed to participate. The authors (Bell & Weinberg) themselves agree, explaining:*

“It should be pointed out that reaching any consensus about the number of homosexual men or women exhibiting this or that characteristic is not the aim of the present study. The non-representative nature of other investigators’ sample as well as our own precludes any generalization about the incidence of a particular phenomenon even to persons living in the locale where the interviews were conducted, much less to

homosexuals in general. ... We cannot stress too much that ours is not a representative sample.”

And when Bell & Weinberg learned how Paul Cameron was using their work, they reacted this way:

“For him to use our figures to estimate differences between homosexuals and heterosexuals across the board in the general population is ludicrous.””²² (End quote from BoxTurtleBulletin web site.)

SUMMARY:

So what is the sum total of the evidence provided by these citations provided by Mr. Russo of the AFANY?

(1) Tomeo, Templer, Anderson and Kotler: A non-clinical and flawed study with a much skewed sample that even the authors suggest may not be representative.

(2) Drs. Freund and Heasman: An angry denial and disclaimer on the web site from Dr. Freund’s co-author and associate.

(3) Dr Adrian Copeland: This is not even a study, and no such quotation as cited can be found within the article. This author contacted Dr. Copeland via regular mail and phone calls and received an email response that called portions of the article “misleading” and he also wrote that *“Adult males (homosexuals) who have sex with other adult males rarely have sex with pre pubertal males.”*

(4) **Dr Raymond Knight:** He says he was misquoted and did not have data on the adult sexual orientation in his study.

(5) **W.L. Marshall:** Another angry disclaimer indicating that there was no data on the adult sexual orientation in his study and that the quote was invented!

(6) **John Jay College:** Mr. Russo actually cited a citation of this study, not the actual study as he claimed. This study itself did not have any data on the sexual orientation of priestly perpetrators of sexual abuse of children.

(7) **J. Wasserman:** Since this study covered adolescent abusers only, this contributes nothing toward discovering whether adult homosexuals, the class of persons that are attempting to gain the right to marry and adopt, are more prone to committing child sexual abuse.

(8) **Homosexualities: a Study of Diversity Among Men and Women", pub. by Simon & Schuster, authored by Bell & Weinberg:** This study is not representative of homosexuals and indeed, the authors make it clear with angry denials in print that it is not.

CONCLUSIONS:

One cannot conclude on the basis of the citations provided by Frank Russo Jr. that homosexuals are more likely to sexually abuse children than non-homosexuals. If this is the reason that homosexuals should not be allowed to marry or adopt, they have not made their case whatsoever. Please note we have not even attempted to identify alternate or contrary studies that find no correlation between homosexuals and child sexual abuse – we only researched the eight “studies” supplied to us by proponents of one side of the argument, and they utterly failed to make their case, even though one could reasonably

assume that in such a campaign, advocates of a particular position would put their better arguments forward first.

Of the eight studies, **five** of the authors whose “studies” are cited have issued disclaimers against their use for the understandings and purposes promoted by the AFA of NY; two other studies cited contained no data on adult homosexuals and their citations by Mr. Russo were inappropriate; one study was very poorly constructed and should not be used to represent findings for the general population.

In fact, there was some sentiment expressed by some of the cited researchers for the *opposite* finding than that promoted by the AFA of NY’s. In going through the cited literature it would seem that lesbians are unlikely to sexually abuse children. Info is not abundant on this narrowed topic, but the question might be intriguing when the data becomes overwhelming; if lesbians were conclusively shown to offer the smallest risk of child sexual abuse, primarily because they’re not men, would the AFA support their rights to marry or adopt?

Other conjecture that could be provoked from these findings involve motivations; what would drive a person to haphazardly promote “studies” that are either poorly conducted or fraudulent, or use citations that are disavowed by the authors, distorted by agenda-driven dogmatists, or are completely pointless to the issue at hand **and that can do actual harm in the day to day lives of others?**

The shame of this state of affairs is that the above citations are widespread on the Internet; the refutations are sparse. After all, all one has to do is find a study, write a misleading description with an invented quote, and voila! – you have a brand new *citation* that may take days or months of research for someone to uncover as baseless or fraudulent. These eight citations will persist despite this article of course; and even if they are effectively discredited here, hundreds more of new bogus citations, unfortunately, could quickly take the place of these old eight standbys.

The strategy against the misuse of science, therefore, particularly in debate situations, must include protections against the fraudulent use of citations. So here is the rule when dealing with the dogmatically inclined: “*no copy of the original citation, no citation allowed,*” or something to that affect. We might add another rule; “*if you’re guilty of persistently offering misleading citations, no one should take you seriously in the future.*”

My final thought is about how many popularizers of science refuse to debate Creationists. They understand the use of invented citations and the impossibility of being able to refute them all on the spot. It may be that they have it right: in a battle against those who would use invented quotes, distorted data and other non-ethical tools, the best policy might be to lecture the general public on their deceits which you have documented, and not debate them in a live setting, as they can deceive you in ways you might never have been able to imagine or anticipate.

¹ View the email @

<http://www.centerforinquiry.net/uploads/attachments/FrankRussoEmailReChallengeToKilmnick122706ForWeb.pdf> .

² Website: <http://www.centerforinquiry.net/li/>

³ Website: <http://www.afany.org/>

⁴ Website: <http://www.afa.net/>

⁵ Can be obtained from

<http://www.springerlink.com/content/u10022r778788010/?p=7bdac5f1573f4677adfb52117f32e30d&pi=0>

⁶ Info, insight and a subsequent email elaboration from Jeremy from

http://www.goodasyou.org/good_as_you/2006/03/what_does_tvc_r.html

⁷ Go to http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Paul_Cameron_%28researcher%29

⁸ See the letter @ http://psychology.ucdavis.edu/rainbow/assets/images/cameron_APA_letter.jpg

⁹ The findings are @ <http://www.qrd.org/qrd/religion/anti/cameron/baker.v.wade.txt>

¹⁰ For this quote go to http://psychology.ucdavis.edu/rainbow/html/facts_molestation.html

¹¹ For this analysis go to <http://www.robincmiller.com/gayles4.htm>

¹² Go to <http://newsmanager.commpartners.com/atsa/issues/2006-09-15/2.html>

¹³ Go to <http://www.centerforinquiry.net/uploads/attachments/ResponseFromAdrianCopeland050207ForWeb.pdf> .

¹⁴ Go to <http://www.centerforinquiry.net/uploads/attachments/DisclaimerFromDrKnight010807EditedForWeb.pdf> .

¹⁵ Go to <http://www.centerforinquiry.net/uploads/attachments/DenialFromWLMarshall011007EditedForTheWeb.pdf> .

¹⁶ Go to

<http://www.centerforinquiry.net/uploads/attachments/2ndDisclaimerFromDrMarshall011207EditedforWeb.pdf>.

¹⁷ Go to <http://www.afany.org/HPR.pdf>

¹⁸ For the actual study, go to http://www.bishop-accountability.org/reports/2004_02_27_JohnJay/index.html

¹⁹ Go to [http://www.bishop-](http://www.bishop-accountability.org/reports/2004_02_27_JohnJay/2004_02_27_Terry_JohnJay_3.htm#cleric3)

[accountability.org/reports/2004_02_27_JohnJay/2004_02_27_Terry_JohnJay_3.htm#cleric3](http://www.bishop-accountability.org/reports/2004_02_27_JohnJay/2004_02_27_Terry_JohnJay_3.htm#cleric3)

²⁰ Go to <http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/00000649.htm>

²¹ Go to http://www.afa.net/homosexual_agenda/childrenc.asp

²² Go to <http://www.boxturtlebulletin.com/Articles/000,009/000,002.htm#RefY>