APA Does Turnaround on Pedophilia

(Continued from cover)

authors, Bauserman, has written an article on "intergenerational sex" for the *Journal of Homosexuality*, as well as an article for Paidika: *The Journal of Paedophilia*, a Dutch pro-pedophilia publication.

Last November, a National Association for Research and Therapy of Homosexuality (NARTH) report criticized the APA article, but it failed to get public attention until Dr. Laura labeled it "junk science" on March 22. A listener to Dom Giordano's Philadelphia radio talk show on which he interviewed article co-author Philip Tromovitch had tipped her off. On May 12, Dr. Laura, Giordano, Majority Whip Tom DeLay (R-Texas) and Reps. Matt Salmon (R-Ariz.) and Dave Weldon (R- Fla.), along with author Dr. Judith Reisman, Childhelp USA President Bill Steiner, FRC's Janet Parshall and Legal Studies Director Janet LaRue, Bob Flores of the National Law Center for Children and Families, and NARTH's Richard Cohen denounced the article at a Family Research Council press conference. Rep. Salmon unveiled a Congressional resolution condemning the article.

On May 27, Dr. Steven M. Mirin, Medical Director of the American Psychiatric Association (not to be confused with the other APA), wrote a letter to FRC severely criticizing the Rind article noting that, "sex between adult and child can never be condoned or considered 'normal' behavior."

In Alaska, state representative Fred Dyson introduced a resolution calling on the APA to repudiate the article. It was quickly approved by the legislature and became a model for similar efforts in Pennsylvania, California, Delaware and in the U.S. Congress.

On June 6, the APA threw in the towel. Chief Executive Officer Raymond D. Fowler hand-carried a letter to Capitol Hill addressed to Rep. DeLay in which the APA admitted error in publishing the "inflammatory" article. In a June 22 letter to FRC, Fowler said the APA planned a special edition of American Psychologist (circ. 100,000) to handle scientific critiques of the Rind article. There is plenty to criticize. Former American Psychiatric Association President Paul J. Fink asserts the article has major flaws.

More than half the data were drawn from a single study done more than 40 years ago, although 59 studies were cited. The authors include data involving mild adult-child sexual interactions with no physical contact, such as encountering a sexual deviant in a public place. "It is as if a study that purports to examine the effects of being shot in the head contained a majority of cases in which the marksman missed," Dr. Fink writes. "Such research might demonstrate that being shot in the head generally has no serious or lasting effect."

In 1994, the American Psychiatric Association paved the way for the current controversy by revising its Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders. To require that for pedophilia to be a mental disorder, the subject must have "clinically significant distress or impairment in social, occupational, or other important areas of functioning." As NARTH President Joseph Nicolosi puts it, "A person is no longer a pedophile simply because he molests children or fantasizes about molesting children. He is a pedophile only if he feels bad or anxious about what he's doing, or if it impairs him in an important area of functioning."

The APA's turnaround on pedophilia is refreshing, but serious problems remain. The June 1999 American Psychologist includes "Deconstructing the Essential Father" by Louise B. Silverstein and Carl F. Auerbach of Yeshiva University. This article asserts that the idea of the two-parent, heterosexual, nuclear family as the best unit for raising children is a myth. Drawing from data on fathering by gay couples, the authors are "convinced" that "neither a mother nor a father is essential" for positive child development and that supporting the traditional family "discriminates against cohabiting couples, single mothers, and gay and lesbian parents."

Another APA-approved study, "Is Homophobia Associated With Homosexual Arousal?" (1996 Vol. 105, No. 3 Journal of Abnormal Psychology) purports to show that people who object to homosexuality are really aroused by it, unlike people who aren't "homophobic." This is akin to the slur that anyone opposing homosexual activists is "obsessed" with homosexuality. The article moves the APA one step closer to labeling as mental illness any moral objection to homosexuality.

The new FRC Insight paper "Harming the Little Ones: The Effects of Pedophilia on Children" by Timothy J. Dailey, Ph.D. examines the abundant scientific evidence that sexual experiences during childhood are harmful. For a copy, call 1-800-225-4008. WW

Witherspoon Fellow Christopher E. Brown contributed to this article.

Get Ready to Pray for the Children.

This nationwide grassroots initiative involves parents and communities of faith in the fight against drugs and will be observed Oct. 22-24. Events will focus on prayer for children to be drug-free and safe. Last year, Pray for the Children was observed across the nation as well as in Australia and Bermuda. To learn more, go to www.prayforthechildren.com, call 630-420-1766, or call the fax-on-demand line at 800-899-7279.

Double Your Impact

Are you considering making a gift to support FRC's work? If so, we have an exciting opportunity for you. The Maclellan Foundation has offered to match up to $400,000 in gifts to FRC! If you have not given to FRC in 1997, 1998, or 1999, the foundation will match your gift dollar-for-dollar. Your gift is automatically doubled. If you have contributed in the past few years, each dollar you give over and above your total gifts for 1998 will be matched. To participate, just write "Maclellan Matching Gift" on the enclosed reply card and on the memo portion of your check. Thank you for your support of our work promoting family, faith, and freedom!

POLICY *Update*

Robert L. Maginnis testifying before the House Subcommittee on Criminal Justice

Drug Legalization Debate

by Robert L. Maginnis

Models for drug legalization were aired and criticized at a June 16 hearing before the House Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy, and Human Resources. More legalization hearings are promised this year.

As Senior Director of National Security & Foreign Affairs, this author testified that, "Legalizers will promote myths. The truth is that drug legalization will lead to more crime and violence and significantly higher social costs, and will ruin millions of lives from addiction and use. These tragic results promise severe consequences for the non-using public as well."

Needle-exchange programs and efforts to legalize marijuana as a "medicine" also were challenged by Maginnis and some members of Congress as being merely surreptitious ways of introducing drug legalization to the United States.

Barry McCaffrey, director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, joined FRC in denouncing legalization efforts. McCaffrey's strongly worded statement accused legalization advocates of using deception to disguise their true intentions.

"Proponents of legalization know that the policy choices they advocate are unacceptable to the American public. Because of this, many advocates of this approach have resorted to concealing their real intentions and seeking to sell the American public legalization by normalizing drugs through a process designed to erode societal disapproval," McCaffrey said.

Refuting the frequent assertion of legalizers that hundreds of thousands of small-time, nonviolent marijuana users were in prison, Florida drug czar Jim McDonough said, "Of the 65,000-plus in [Florida] prison[s] in late '97, there were 14 people … there for the primary offense of the possession of marijuana. In every one of those cases, it was at a level that made you believe that they in fact were trafficking in marijuana."

Witnesses advocating drug legalization represented the Drug Policy Foundation, the Cato Institute, and the ACLU.

Robert Maginnis' full testimony may be viewed on our website at www.frc.org. WW

The Straight "A"s Guarantee: Freedom + Accountability = Results

by Jennifer A. Marshall

Surrounded by students and with a school bus in the background, congressional leaders joined Chairman Bill Goodling (R-Pa.) and Senator Slade Gorton (R-Wash.) to introduce the *Academic Achievement for All Act* (Straight "A"s; H.R. 2300, S. 1266) at a press conference on June 22. Straight "A"s would allow greater freedom for state and local authorities to make decisions about education funding, while providing greater financial and academic accountability to parents and other taxpayers. The Straight "A"s bill has become a congressional priority, and may see action in the House before the August recess.

From left to right: Congressmen Mike Castle, Robin Hayes, Jeff Sessions, and Speaker of the House Dennis Hastert listen to testimony of fifth-grader Chris Webster, Chantilly, Virginia

Straight "A"s stands in contrast to the president's plan for the reauthorization of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* (ESEA), the largest source of federal funding for education, due to expire later this year. While the administration's rhetoric stresses "accountability," its ESEA proposal merely assigns more power to the federal bureaucracy. Straight "A"s, however, would allow a state to opt-out of mandates and paperwork associated with programs under ESEA, to combine funds for any of these programs, and to spend the money on state determined educational priorities.

While the federal government supplies only about seven percent of the total taxpayer funds spent on K-12 education in America, it is the source of 50 percent of the paperwork and regulation with which states and localities must comply. Straight "A"s would begin to address this imbalance and limit the inappropriate role of the federal government in education policymaking. WW

Notes & Quotes

"Judicial radical individualism weakens or destroys the authority of what sociologists call "intermediate institutions" – families, schools, business organizations, private associations, mayors, city councils, governors, state legislatures – that stand between the individual and the national government and its bureaucracies."

– Judge Robert H. Bork