

## Chapter 2

### The Traditional Values of Sex Offenders and Their Victims: What the Research Shows

[Incest offenders'] respect for organized religion—in America at least—is something that is referred to again and again by people working with them. . . . Roger and Florence Wolfe, psychologists who work with incest offenders in their practice in Seattle, commented that they had found one of the characteristics of sexual offenders to be that they were more religious than other people. This went hand-in-hand with a surprising ignorance about sex—as they said, “They know what goes where, and that’s about it. They come from families where information about sexuality is strictly restricted. They believe in the most extraordinary myths, and have very few facts.” Someone else said, “for some of these religious people all sex is sin, it’s all bad, so what the hell difference does it make what you do? Screwing mummy when she’s on birth control is just as much sin as screwing your 11-year-old daughter.”<sup>1</sup>

For most Americans, the association of religion with sexual abuse is limited to the now well publicized problem of Catholic priests molesting children. But my survey of the clinical and scientific literature on sexual abuse (Appendix A) found more than 100 studies<sup>2</sup> that reveal much more widespread and disturbing connections between sexual abuse and traditional moral and social values. If you read Appendix A, you will find that:

- Many sex offenders had a morally conservative upbringing and, as adults, have puritanical standards of sexual behavior, often rejecting masturbation, premarital sex, extramarital sex, and any sexual activity except “missionary position” intercourse. They tend to regard sex as dirty, and many are self-righteously moralistic. Child molesters and incest offenders are frequently more religious than average.
- Many child molesters and incest offenders, and some rapists, are sexually inhibited, even prudish, and relatively inexperienced sexually.<sup>3</sup> They have more guilt, shame, fear, and anxiety about sex than non-offenders.
- Sex offenders, especially rapists, tend to have conservative social and political beliefs. They believe that men and women are not equals and should not deviate from traditional social and economic roles. They believe in the double standard—men are expected to be sexually active, but women are either virgins or whores. Sex-role stereotyping is associated with belief in rape myths—that rape is a woman’s fault, that rape is motivated by sex rather than by a need to dominate, and that a raped woman is less desirable. Men who believe in stereotypes and rape myths are more likely to rape, and women who believe them are more likely to be victimized.
- Sex offenders and their victims usually had inadequate sex education. One study found that girls whose mothers punished them for asking questions about sex or for exploring their own bodies were 75 percent more vulnerable to sexual abuse than other girls in the study.<sup>4</sup>

These findings are the opposite of what many Americans would expect. The religious conservatives who dominate moral discourse in the mass media tend to associate sexual abuse with sexual permissiveness. But in fact, abuse is more often connected with sexual puritanism.

In this chapter I will review and interpret what has been discovered so far about the connections between traditional values and sexual abuse, an important issue that has been ignored for too long.

### **How Do People Become Sex Offenders?**

In Chapter 1 I suggested that people become sex offenders because their sexuality has not been properly socialized. While that may be a valid generalization, we need to understand the dynamics of how it happens. The clinical and scientific research on why people become sex offenders suggests that there are multiple causes which interact in complex ways, resulting in many different types of offenders. Although the details of offenders' lives may be very different, therapists who have extensive experience treating offenders have found some common themes in their lives. These themes include lack of attachment bonds with parents, lack of empathy, emotional loneliness and lack of intimacy, low self-esteem, a preference for domination and submission rather than equality in relationships, misattribution of responsibility (such as blaming their victims), and the use of sex for non-sexual purposes.

While many sex offenders were physically or sexually abused as children, almost all of them appear to have been emotionally abused.<sup>5</sup> They did not bond emotionally or identify with their parents. Their basic needs were often neglected. Physical affection and emotional communication were non-existent in most offenders families, but for many, severe and erratic punishments were commonplace.

Some sex offenders come from totally dysfunctional, chaotic families, in which the parents did not behave like adults; poverty, drug and alcohol abuse, violence, and sexual exploitation were everyday realities in these families. But other sex offenders come from families that externally appeared to be normal and respectable. These types of families include exploitative families, in which the parents manipulated the children to meet their own needs; rigid or enmeshed families, characterized by secrecy and social isolation, but rationalized as being "close-knit"; or "perfect" families, in which every family member faithfully played out his or her traditional role on a superficial level, but there was an obsession with control and a lack of emotional communication.<sup>6</sup>

Examples of these respectable but emotionally abusive families can be found in most religious congregations, as well as among the non-religious population. The first link between religion and sexual abuse can be found in the model of the family promoted by some churches. Some conservative churches promote a family model based more on rules than relationships; these churches give emotionally abusive parents no reason to question their dysfunctional parenting style. In addition, churches that condone the physical punishment of children are teaching the next generation that coercion and humiliation, not empathy and mutual pleasure, are the norms for intimate human relationships. On the other hand, churches that emphasize love, empathy, and nurturing are promoting conditions that discourage sexual aggression. From this perspective, it's not surprising to find a study of religion and child sexual abuse which shows that persons

sexually abused by a relative were much more likely to come from socially isolated fundamental Protestant families rather than liberal religious or non-religious families.<sup>7</sup>

A childhood without emotional nurturing can become dangerous when combined with an unfortunate fact of human biology: sex and aggression have some close physiological similarities.<sup>8</sup> Both sex and aggression are mediated by the same mid-brain structures and neural networks, and both are activated by the sex steroids, including testosterone. The dramatic increase in sex steroids at puberty results in dramatic increases in both sexual and aggressive behaviors. The attitudes and behavior patterns that a pubescent boy has acquired during childhood set the stage for him to respond to his new sudden, strong urges with either a pro-social or an anti-social mindset. If he lacks emotional attachments to his family, he is also likely to lack self-confidence in relationships with his peers. Since male self-esteem in our culture is determined largely by sexual ability, a boy who can't develop a relationship with a girl will feel frustrated, resentful, and possibly hostile. To prove his masculinity, he may find it easy to combine his urges for sex and aggression and express them in rape or sex with younger children—either in his masturbatory fantasies or in actual behavior. Research has shown that childhood social incompetence often leads to adult social incompetence, which sometimes includes a proclivity toward sexual assault. And more than half of all adult sex offenders began committing offenses before the age of eighteen.<sup>9</sup>

Lack of intimacy is one of the defining characteristics of sex offenders. As W. L. Marshall observed, “Although a limited few sexual offenders appear to have the capacity to form intimate relationships, but have chosen not to, the majority appear to be either isolated loners or to have superficial and unsatisfying relationships.”<sup>10</sup> Marshall and other researchers have found that sex offenders (like many other men) pursue intimacy almost exclusively through sexual activity. When consensual adult relationships fail to satisfy their need for emotional connection, they may turn to sex with children or to rape or exhibitionism. Strange as it may seem, Marshall reports that some rapists and exhibitionists “hoped their victims would fall in love with them.”<sup>11</sup>

A more common scenario occurs when emotional loneliness leads to frustration and anger at women, who are seen as the cause of the man's frustration. Hostility toward women and the need to dominate and humiliate them is the most common motivation for rape. Most rapists find great satisfaction in humiliating their victims, but few find the experience to be sexually satisfying.<sup>12</sup> Not having experienced empathy in their own lives, sex offenders are unable to have empathy for their victims.

So far we have considered family and individual dynamics in the origins of sexual aggression, but it is important to also consider social and cultural factors that contribute to sexual aggression, particularly gender role stereotypes and violence.

### **Gender Role Stereotypes and Violence**

A large body of research has demonstrated that a particular constellation of traditional attitudes and beliefs, collectively known as *gender role stereotypes*, plays a major role in the motivation of sexual aggression.<sup>13</sup> These stereotypes include the belief that men should be dominant and

women submissive, belief in the traditional roles of man as breadwinner and woman as homemaker and caregiver, belief in the sexual double standard, belief in rape myths (e.g., it is a woman's fault if she gets raped), and hypermasculine attitudes (toughness, absolute control of emotions).

Sociologist Diana Russell points out that in the masculine mystique, aggression and sex are closely related: "Being aggressive is masculine; being sexually aggressive is masculine; rape is sexually aggressive behavior; therefore, rape is masculine behavior.... How else can one explain statements like Ogden Nash's 'Seduction is for sissies; a he-man wants his rape'?"<sup>14</sup>

On the other side of the coin, stereotyped feminine characteristics such as submissiveness, passivity, and physical and emotional weakness make women easier to rape. Women are not taught how to fight. When a woman facing a rapist acts as she has been trained to act—submissively—she is blamed for the rape. Women are supposed to be kind, compassionate, patient, accepting, and dependent. They are supposed to take care of men's emotional needs before their own. They are supposed to achieve happiness by pleasing others. All of these traits make women easier to rape.

Surprisingly, rapists often place women on a pedestal. Many rapists hold conservative beliefs such as: women should be more virtuous than men, women need men's protection, women should not have sex before marriage, and women should not swear in public. Rape is sometimes triggered by an incident in which the rapist's wife or lover fails to live up to his impossible standards. These rapists are motivated by revenge and punishment. They hold all women collectively responsible for the alleged offenses of their wives or lovers, and they believe men have the right to punish women.

The pedestal or "good girl" stereotype is accompanied by the gutter or "bad girl" stereotype. Good girls do not wear revealing clothing, flirt, go out in public alone, or otherwise advertise their availability, nor do they have sex with more than one man. Any woman who makes herself available in any way is presumed to be a bad girl, and bad girls deserve to be raped in this belief system. Rapists feel that any man has a right to have sex with a woman who can be identified as a bad girl, even though the identifying trait may be a figment of the rapist's imagination. One rapist claimed that all of his victims were prostitutes, but investigators found that none of them were.<sup>15</sup>

Social conservatives who want to keep women on their pedestal are unknowingly promoting rape by perpetuating the good girl/bad girl dichotomy. It's a short distance from the pedestal to the gutter. Both stereotypes—the pedestal and the gutter, the virgin and the whore—can provoke male hostility. Both stereotypes prevent men from seeing women as individual human beings and as equals. It's no surprise that people who have the most rigid attitudes toward proper female behavior also have the narrowest definitions of rape.<sup>16</sup>

Rapists can find ample justification for their hostility toward women in the Christian tradition, beginning with Eve's temptation of Adam in the Garden of Eden.<sup>17</sup> With the exception of Jesus' mother and consecrated virgins, the church has denigrated women as sexual temptresses for most

of its history, until the Victorian Protestants dethroned the Virgin Mary and replaced her with the desexualized middle-class wife and mother.

Widespread dominance of men over women in our society has led feminists to conclude that rape, the sexual domination of women by men, is not a deviation from our society's norms but rather a crude exaggeration of them.<sup>18</sup> An analysis of the psychological needs of rapists confirmed that rapists are not rebels but conformists.<sup>19</sup>

In our culture, men are socialized to be sexually attracted to characteristics of inferiority or subordination, such as smallness, youthfulness, vulnerability, inexperience, dependency, acquiescence, and helplessness. That is why men so often marry women who are younger, smaller, and of lower social status. Sociologists David Finkelhor and I. A. Lewis point out that all of these characteristics apply even more strongly to children. "It is not surprising," they write, "that socialization into a value system that sexualizes subordination will end up sexualizing children."<sup>20</sup> The subordination principle is one reason why men who are not sexually attracted to other men can still be sexually attracted to boys. In fact, boys are more often molested by heterosexual men than by homosexuals.<sup>21</sup>

In cross-cultural studies, anthropologists have found three factors that influence the frequency of rape in various societies: rigid gender roles with male dominance, negative attitudes toward females, and acceptance of violence.<sup>22</sup> In rape-prone societies, women hold less power and authority and do not participate in public decision making; fathers are indifferent, aloof, cold, and stern, and are not involved in the care of infants and children. There is more sexual segregation in rape-prone societies. In rape-free societies, women participate in all aspects of social life—religion, politics, and economics. Rape-free societies are characterized by sexual equality and complementarity.

Acceptance of violence includes everything from spanking children to enjoying violent sports to supporting capital punishment. Two studies of child molesters' childhoods found that between 40 and 55 percent of them had been physically abused by their parents.<sup>23</sup> In three other studies, between 38 and 56 percent of rapists had been physically abused by their parents.<sup>24</sup> Among Western nations, the United States has both the most violence on television and the highest incidence of rape. In societies where violence is rare and women are treated respectfully as equals, rape is also rare.<sup>25</sup>

Physical punishment teaches children to associate violence and invasion of physical boundaries with love. This confusion makes it possible for some rapists to believe that they are doing something good to their victims by forcing sex on them. When traditional religion promotes the physical punishment of children, it is promoting disrespect for physical boundaries—a key element of sexual abuse.

Cross-cultural studies have also shown that violence is high in societies where pain is inflicted on infants, and children's sexual activities are restricted; and that violence is low in societies where physical affection is lavished on infants, and children's sexual activities are accepted as normal.<sup>26</sup> That finding suggested that there is an inverse relationship between pleasurable physical contact

and violence, and that relationship has been confirmed in other studies. A comparison of preschoolers and adolescents in France and the United States found that in France children are more physically affectionate with their peers—leaning against, stroking, kissing, and hugging each other—while in America, children are less affectionate but show more self-touching and more aggressive verbal and physical behavior.<sup>27</sup>

There is a biological basis for the relationship between touch deprivation and violence. Violent individuals have an underaroused central nervous system and a neurotransmitter/neurohormone profile of lower norepinephrine, serotonin, and cortisol, and elevated dopamine and testosterone. Massage therapy has been effective in reducing violence in adolescents, perhaps by providing positive stimulation of the nervous system and by reducing dopamine and increasing serotonin levels.<sup>28</sup>

From the evidence I have just presented (and other studies too numerous to discuss here<sup>29</sup>), we can infer that some aspects of American social conservatism promote violence in general and sexual aggression in particular. Belief in traditional male/female gender roles is one of the core beliefs of American social conservatives.<sup>30</sup> In the early 1980s the Religious Right promoted federal legislation called the Family Protection Act that would have legalized physical punishment of children, prohibited federal efforts to stop child abuse, cut off federal aid for abused wives, and prohibited educational materials that “denigrate, diminish, or deny the role of differences between the sexes.” And conservatives campaigned vigorously and successfully against the Equal Rights Amendment to the Constitution.

To understand the complicated ways in which beliefs can lead to violence, we need to understand the process and results of male gender socialization, since most violence and sexual assaults are committed by men. (Sexual aggression by women is discussed separately below.)

### **Male Gender Socialization and Sexual Aggression**

Let’s look at one of our fundamental assumptions: Which sex is naturally more emotional, males or females? If you’re like most Americans, you’d answer “females,” but you’d be wrong. A dozen studies have shown that male babies are more emotionally reactive and expressive than females: they show more joy and anger, fussiness and crying, more vocalizations, and more gestures toward the mother than girls.<sup>31</sup> But boys and girls are treated differently by their parents, caregivers, and peers. Infant girls are held and touched more than infant boys, and physical affection is often withdrawn completely from boys at an early age. Boys are pushed to adopt adult coping styles prematurely, before they’ve had a chance to develop strong egos. Boys are expected to show independence and toughness and to suppress their desires for comforting, closeness, and nurturing. As a result, boys learn to “tune out, suppress, and channel their emotions,”<sup>32</sup> while girls are encouraged to be expressive. The unemotional male is entirely a social construct, and to play their assigned role, men have to cut off access to a major part of their humanity.

Psychologist Ronald Levant describes several negative consequences of male emotional socialization.<sup>33</sup> First, while men develop “action empathy,” which allows them to predict what

other people will *do*, they do not develop as much emotional empathy, which would allow them to perceive how other people *feel*. Socialization also alienates men from their own emotional life, so that many have trouble recognizing and naming their own emotions, much less expressing them. Men experience more aggression from adults and peers than women; but because they are not allowed to express vulnerable emotions like sadness or fear, they channel those emotions into anger and aggression. Finally, preadolescent boys have to suppress feelings of affection or tenderness toward their mothers, girls, or other boys, in order to avoid being teased about being a mama's boy, having a girlfriend, or being gay. This suppression of affection, along with an inability to read their own and other people's emotions, makes intimacy very difficult for boys and men.

As a result, many teenage boys and adult men channel all their needs for closeness and caring into sexuality, which is approved and encouraged by their peers. As Finkelhor and Lewis observe, "In sexual interactions, a man can be touched, a man can be nurtured, a man can be clingy, a man can be close. These needs are acceptable in a sexual context. To fulfill them in this way does not diminish his manliness. The result is that when all kinds of natural human emotional needs arise, men are more likely to try to fulfill them in a sexual context."<sup>34</sup>

We can see now that several characteristics of sex offenders—lack of empathy, emotional loneliness and lack of intimacy, and the use of sex for non-sexual purposes—are common results of our society's normative male gender socialization. From this perspective, it's amazing that sexual aggression is not even more common.

To understand the depth of this problem, it's important to realize that male gender socialization is often traumatic. Psychologist David Lisak gives a good example from his observation of a three-year-old boy and his father in a playground.<sup>35</sup> They are standing by a spiral slide, but the boy looks apprehensive. The father says, "Come on Eric, don't be scared. It's just a slide." The boy backs away, and the father says, "Don't be a sissy, Eric. Just get on up there and do it." That really frightens the boy, who is now on the verge of crying. The father becomes angry: "Don't be such a crybaby. If you're going to cry, I'm not going to hang around with you." As the father walks off, the boy slumps to the ground, crying and sobbing, overwhelmed by his father's rejection, humiliation, and abandonment, and his own shame of being afraid—all the consequence of expressing a perfectly ordinary human emotion, fear.

This is the kind of emotional trauma American boys face every day of their lives. Expressing fear, sadness, affection, or any other emotion associated with vulnerability can result in rejection and humiliation. As a result, many boys suppress these emotions, deny their presence, and eventually repress them to the point that they have no conscious awareness of them. As they grow into adolescence and adulthood without the ability to experience intense emotions (other than anger, which is socially approved), they are also unable to experience the intense emotional connection that is a natural part of a sexual relationship. When sexuality is separated from emotion, Lisak observes, it becomes just a physical sensation, and a woman "can be experienced as pure object; as a source of sexual gratification whose experience of the encounter has no reality."<sup>36</sup>

Experiencing abuse can lead a person to become either less empathetic or more empathetic, which is why some adults who were abused as children go on to become abusers themselves, and others do not. Abused individuals who receive the emotional support that allows them to fully feel the painful emotions resulting from abuse can go on to heal those emotions and become more empathetic towards other people's suffering. But abused individuals who repress their own responses to abuse have no empathy for their own suffering, and as a result have no empathy for other people's suffering. Witnessing another person's distress, these individuals feel upset and anxious rather than empathetic. If another person's distress triggers a man's suppressed feelings of vulnerability, his masculine identity is threatened, and he may respond with anger and aggression to restore his feeling of being in control. This explains why the abuse of infants is often triggered by their crying, and why the vulnerability of a woman or child may incite a man to sexual assault.<sup>37</sup>

Victim/perpetrators cannot imagine their victim's suffering because they have not been allowed to experience their own suffering. Some rapists are so deficient in empathy, they even imagine that their victims had perceived them as kind, gentle, friendly, or good lovers.<sup>38</sup> One rapist who used a bayonet to threaten his victim stated, "At the time I didn't think it was rape. I just asked her nicely and she didn't resist.... I just felt like I had met a friend."<sup>39</sup>

Looking at another aspect of traditional gender roles, there is evidence that male avoidance of child care makes both incest and rape more likely. Studies of incest have found that stepfathers are more likely to sexually abuse their daughters than natural fathers, possibly because they were not involved in taking care of the girls as infants. Even among natural fathers, avoiding child care, especially during infancy, weakens the incest taboo. In one survey, incestuous fathers were less likely than non-abusive fathers to have diapered, washed, and dressed their infant daughters, fed them and put them to bed, played with them, comforted them, and given them affection.<sup>40</sup>

A study of rapists by David Lisak and Susan Roth found that rapists were paternally deprived—during their childhood, their fathers were physically or emotionally absent, either having abandoned their families or being too devoted to their careers to spend time with their sons. Lisak and Roth suggest that rapists' hostility toward women comes from an intense struggle to separate from their mothers, and that their fathers had abdicated their role of guiding their sons through the separation process (a function performed at puberty by initiation rituals in tribal cultures). Although the rapists felt ambivalent about their mothers, they felt more anger toward their fathers. This finding is consistent with other studies that link inadequate fathering with juvenile delinquency and antisocial behavior. Lacking a strong father to identify with, rapists and other criminals compensate for their gender insecurity with machismo and aggression.

The traditional roles of father as breadwinner and mother as child raiser imply that the father has no obligation to be directly involved in caring for his children. By promoting traditional, rigid gender roles, religious and social conservatives are inadvertently contributing to incest and rape.



## Female Sex Offenders

Because of our stereotype of women being nurturing caregivers, it is hard for us to imagine women perpetrating sexual abuse, but it does happen more often than we think. The offenders may be mothers, stepmothers, grandmothers, sisters, aunts, babysitters, teachers, nuns, or neighbors, and the victims may be girls or boys. Sexual abuse, which is generally easy for a man to get away with, is even easier for a woman. Boys are usually too embarrassed to report abuse, even after they've grown up. Girls who report abuse by a woman are often not believed. Sex between an adult woman and a boy, especially a teenager, is often assumed to be consensual and harmless, but the case histories of rapists who had been molested by women shatter this misconception.

One serial rapist remembered an aunt fondling his penis on several occasions while she was bathing him. He also remembered visiting the home of friend at around age 11 or 12 and finding his friend's mother lying on a couch, naked and drunk. The woman called the boy over to her, moved his hand across her body, and put it between her legs. The boy found this exciting, inserted his fingers into her vagina, and kissed her buttocks. At that, she slapped him, which startled and frightened him. He ran from the house feeling "scared to death," afraid that his parents would be told, knowing he had done something wrong but also that he wanted it. He felt upset, confused, and scared—the same feelings he has every time he rapes.<sup>41</sup>

Another man who raped an elderly woman had been sexually initiated by his mother at about age eight, when she had him perform oral sex on her. This activity continued until he was sixteen years old. "I knew it was wrong," the man said. "I didn't want that, but that was the only way I could feel close to my mother—the only time I felt anyone would touch me—so I did it."<sup>42</sup>

Still another rapist was molested when he was about thirteen by an older teenage babysitter. The babysitter pulled down his pants and masturbated him, then lay down and put him on top of her. "It was painful," the man reported. "Her pubic hair was sharp, and it felt like spikes were cutting and sticking me. I was shaking and trembling. It scared the hell out of me. I didn't tell anybody about it, but after that, I told my mother I didn't want a baby-sitter anymore, and I stayed by myself."<sup>43</sup>

While it is generally agreed that females make up a small percentage of sex offenders, there are wide discrepancies in the statistics. In various surveys, females have been reported as perpetrators in 14% to 24% of the offenses against boys and 1% to 13% of the offenses against girls.<sup>44</sup> Although the percentages may be low, the actual number of incidents is high. If we accept that about 20% of American adults were sexually abused as children,<sup>45</sup> and assume that 10% of the abusers were women, that would mean more than 4 million victims of female sexual aggression—hardly an insignificant number. The issue of female offenders has received too little attention from researchers and children's advocates.<sup>46</sup>

From the little research that has been done, we know that female offenders share many traits with male offenders: anger, fear, low self-esteem, and impaired empathy. Most were themselves sexually abused as children. But there are also some differences between male and female

offenders: more females than males offend along with another person (usually male); females tend to be less violent; they are more likely than males to know their victims; and the duration and frequency of the abuse are usually less for females than for males.<sup>47</sup>

One group of researchers identified three types of female sex offenders. The *teacher/lover offender* seduces an adolescent boy who she hopes will love, accept, and be kind to her in ways that adult males do not; but most often the boy eventually lashes out in hurtful or rejecting ways. The *intergenerationally predisposed offender* is herself an incest victim and is hungry for love and attention. The *male-coerced offender* is typically a traditional housewife who feels passive and powerless and is coerced by her husband into molesting a child.<sup>48</sup>

From this typology, we can see that female sex offenders fit perfectly in their traditional gender role of dependence and passivity. The first two types do not have the assertiveness necessary to find an adult who can share their love and satisfy their emotional needs, so they turn to sex with children. The third type does not have the assertiveness necessary to leave a husband who forces her to do things that she knows are wrong; she feels that a loveless marriage is better than no marriage at all. While this typology is not comprehensive—it does not include, for example, older sisters molesting younger brothers—it does demonstrate how traditional gender role socialization can push women as well as men toward sexual abuse.

### **Identification with the Aggressor and Reenactment of the Trauma**

An important psychological dynamic involved in the cycle of sexual abuse is called identification with the aggressor and reenactment of the trauma. This syndrome explains why some sexually or physically abused children grow up to become child molesters or abusers themselves. It also explains why it is difficult or impossible for many victims to escape abuse.

The experience of abuse is overwhelming and terrifying to children. Paralyzed by fear and unable to do anything to stop the unbearable experience, children may go into a kind of hypnotic trance, cutting off their own sensations and emotions (a process called dissociation) and submitting like a robot to their aggressor's demands. This phenomenon is called identification with the aggressor because the child submerges his or her own identity and internalizes the aggressor's desires as if they were his or her own. "The aggressor is right," the child thinks, "and I am wrong." By blaming themselves for the abuse, children replace feelings of helplessness and vulnerability with an illusion of control. Psychiatrist Donald Nathanson describes the emotional logic of this syndrome:

The child is faced with two contrasting alternatives: a frightening awareness that these parents are incapable of love, implying that they actually might not provide protection from danger; or the creative but false theory that his or her parents are really okay and that their unpleasant behavior is the reasonable response of good people to a bad or defective child. Clearly, logic most often commands the second choice, which offers far greater emotional safety than the harsher reality. Children will adopt a sense of themselves as being personally defective in order to explain away parental failure.<sup>49</sup>

Although abuse is overwhelming, identification with the aggressor preserves the belief that adults know what they're doing, which gives children at least a minimal sense of security. But at a deeper level, the victim's feelings of helplessness and terror remain, even into adulthood, stored unconsciously as body memories. These repressed feelings make some abuse survivors prone to emotional hyperarousal or hypervigilance; that is, they react to even mildly stressful situations as if they were emergencies. Hyperarousal interferes with rational thinking and prevents resolution of the original trauma. It also impels people to engage in familiar behavior patterns, even if they cause pain. Abuse survivors often try to neutralize their hyperarousal with addictive behaviors. Ironically, reenactment of the abuse restores calm because it is familiar behavior, it activates the hypnotic trance, and it often involves a person one is closely bonded to. Therefore, some people become addicted to reenacting the abuse.

There are two ways to reenact traumatic abuse: you can repeatedly be the victim, a common pattern among girls and women; or you can become the aggressor, a common pattern among boys and men. In the second scenario, the abuse survivor experiences stress, goes into hyperarousal, and looks for relief in some familiar behavior. A child may remind the survivor of his or her abuse, and he or she reenacts the abuse with the child in order to reduce tension. But now, instead of just identifying with the aggressor, the former victim *is* the aggressor; instead of having the illusion of control, the perpetrator really is in control. This control gives intense emotional satisfaction to perpetrators, but the satisfaction doesn't last, and they must keep repeating the abuse to maintain emotional equilibrium. This strategy provides temporary relief, but it does not heal the underlying psychological wounds, and it inflicts new wounds on new victims.

Early and effective counseling of children who are sexually abused could prevent them from becoming abusers themselves. But treatment is impossible if the abuse is not reported, and most children are afraid to talk about sexual abuse. As we just discussed, children most often blame themselves for abuse. The fact is, most children are afraid to talk with adults about *any* of their sexual experiences. According to our traditional moral and cultural norms, children are not supposed to *have* sexual experiences. Adults attach so much shame, fear, and guilt to sex that children cannot discuss even the most normal sexual feelings and behaviors, much less the shame-loaded incidents of abuse. As a result, child sexual abuse usually goes untreated, and some of the abused go on to become abusers. Traditional values draw a curtain of shame and secrecy around children's sexuality, and that secrecy perpetuates the cycle of abuse.

Inadequate sex education in traditional families also makes children more vulnerable to sexual abuse. Children cannot attempt to avoid or report sexual abuse if they do not know what it is. They cannot report abuse if they do not have an adequate vocabulary of body parts and sexual activities. They cannot report abuse if they are not comfortable talking to adults about sex—which means the adults in their lives have to be comfortable talking to children about sex. They cannot report abuse if adults have not taught them the difference between healthy and permissible sexual activities and abusive activities.

If children all taught that *all* sexual activities are forbidden, they will blame themselves for sexual abuse,<sup>50</sup> and this misattribution of responsibility is often reinforced by adults. One girl revealed to her teacher, a nun, that her father was molesting her. "Sister said I was going to hell

because I had lost my virginity,” the girl said, “and then she urged me to tell my father no.”<sup>51</sup> It’s hard to imagine how a girl who had been told by a religious authority that she is condemned to hell could find the courage to stand up to her father and refuse his sexual demands. What the nun really taught her was, “If you dare to talk about sex with an adult, you will be humiliated, condemned, and emotionally destroyed. You cannot trust adults to protect you.”

A traditional, restrictive sexual upbringing subverts children’s ability to trust their own perceptions and judgments regarding sexuality. When children are taught that sexual activities that feel good are just as wrong as sexual activities that feel bad, they are left with no basis on which to make judgments. Right and wrong become divorced from personal experience. Traditional morality teaches children that masturbation, which feels good, is morally bad; but spanking, which feels bad, is morally good. This morality leaves children helpless to judge for themselves what is sexually right or wrong. They become totally dependent on what adults—including child molesters—tell them. Sex with an adult authority figure may feel bad, but it must be good if the adult says so.

Traditional morality teaches children to be sexually obedient, not to stand up for their rights. It’s no wonder that children face more danger of sexual abuse in sexually strict families than in sexually permissive families.<sup>52</sup> Children who are taught that they must always obey, that they do not have rights over their own bodies, and that their own sexual feelings do not matter, are rarely able to resist or report abuse. For these children, all sexual experiences are shameful, and all of them must be hidden from adults. One possible explanation of why so many child molesters are religious is that sexually abused children from religious families are the least likely to report the abuse, are the least likely to receive treatment, and therefore are the most likely to become abusers as adults.

### **Equating Love and Affection with Sex**

In sexually restrictive cultures like ours, physical affection is generally avoided because it could arouse sexual feelings. Conservative religious teachings have often cautioned that touching is a source of sexual temptation. We make exceptions for spouses, lovers, and children, and some of us greet friends with ritualized hugs. Otherwise, we interpret physical affection as a form of seduction or foreplay. Physical affection between male friends, which is commonplace in many other cultures, is interpreted as homosexuality by many Americans. But the need for touch and physical intimacy is a basic human need that is distinct from the sex drive, even though the two needs are very closely related.

When affection becomes habitually equated with sex, and a person can obtain affection only through sex, the desire for affection and intimacy can be confused with the desire for sex. Our unspoken rule, “Don’t touch, except for sex,” ends up promoting what it was intended to prevent. Thus the desire for a child’s affection can become a desire for sex with the child, as illustrated in this story, which I have paraphrased from a longer narrative told by Blair and Rita Justice in their book *The Broken Taboo*.<sup>53</sup>

*Barbara was the daughter of Sunday school teachers who prayed with her and taught her about morality. When she was three years old, her father began fondling her after her bath. This quickly progressed to kissing her body and performing cunnilingus on her. Her father called this “the love game,” and played it with her as often as five times a week.*

*When she was a few years older, Barbara got into mild sex play with neighborhood boys, but she saw this as “nasty,” not like what she did with her father because he loved her. Her father brought her presents and gave her special privileges denied to her brother and sister. When she was seven, he started having her kiss his penis and put it in her mouth. When she was eight, he attempted intercourse, but it hurt her too much and she stopped him. They continued having oral sex.*

*When Barbara’s breasts started developing, her father began kissing her breasts, which repulsed her. Eventually she realized how inappropriate “the love game” was. She wanted to end the game but couldn’t. The incest continued until she was 16. She told her mother and several other people about the incest, but they did nothing. She then told a juvenile officer, but refused to press charges because she insisted that she and her father loved each other. The juvenile officer began counseling her parents and sent her father to a psychiatrist, but nothing changed at home. Barbara’s father still wanted to have sex with her, so she quit high school and left town.*

Our society’s romantic ethic, which has been absorbed to some extent by our religious morality, says that love justifies and purifies sex. Both men and women have used this belief as a rationalization for cultivating and expressing sexual feelings toward children.

Moral inhibitions regarding fornication, adultery, and masturbation also make some adults turn to incest or child molestation.<sup>54</sup> They regard sex with adults as dirty and sinful, but see sex with a pure and innocent child as acceptable. Sexual interaction with adults requires open acknowledgment and expression of one’s sexual desires, so people who are ashamed of their sexual desires may prefer to satisfy them secretly with children.

Here are two examples of moral inhibitions that led to child sexual abuse:

An [incestuous] exhibitionist failed to use masturbation as an alternative outlet to his exhibitionism because he had fundamentalist religious views about the sinfulness of the practice. His religious advisor warned him that masturbation led to all other forms of sexual perversion.<sup>55</sup>

“Bill” [an incest offender in group therapy] ... explained that he was often very sexually turned on and he needed an outlet beyond his wife. The group leader asked him why he didn’t masturbate to relieve himself instead of having sex with his daughter. Bill was taken aback by that suggestion and blurted out: “No, not me! The way I was raised made it clear that masturbation was bad for a boy and even worse for a grown man. I sure as hell wasn’t going to do that.”<sup>56</sup>

In cases like these, child sexual abuse is a direct result of traditional morality’s warped value system, which condemns consensual sex for pleasure but ignores sexual aggression.

Traditional morality also encourages incest inadvertently by emphasizing that sex belongs in the family. Many offenders take this teaching very literally. A man I know was bathed by his mother until he was fourteen years old, and she always inserted a finger into his anus “to make sure it was clean.” He was also forced to perform oral sex on his father on many occasions. The parents were leading members of their rural Catholic community: they lived across the street from the church, where the boy regularly served at Mass, and the priest had dinner at their home every week.

The members of incestuous families are bonded to each other in emotionally destructive ways, but they rationalize that they are simply a close-knit family—and that is how they appear to outsiders.

### **The Adversarial Script for Sexual Interaction**

Our culture has created an adversarial script that portrays women as sexually reluctant and coy, and men as seducers.<sup>57</sup> This stereotype makes it difficult for women to openly express their sexual feelings and desires. Dating couples have to figure out each other's sexual intentions by guessing the meaning of clues. Men have been raised to believe that women always resist sex to avoid the appearance of being promiscuous, always say no when they really mean yes, and want men to dominate them and show that they are in control.

One study found that 39 percent of college women offered token resistance even when they wanted sex, especially if they thought the men were traditional and wanted some resistance.<sup>58</sup> When female resistance is expected as “part of the game,” so is male pressure, which may explain why people who have the most rigid standards of female behavior also have the narrowest definition of rape. The adversarial script gives men a ready excuse not to believe women who say no, and rapists make the most of this excuse, especially when “clues” such as a woman's clothing, flirtation, or reputation are interpreted as indicating her willingness to have sex.<sup>59</sup>

The adversarial script is another example of how gender role stereotypes promote sexual abuse. Rape is sometimes a result of the clash between the feminine mystique of flirtatiousness and the masculine mystique of aggressive conquest. To prevent rape, we need sexual equality, so that both women and men will be allowed to say both yes and no. Only then will the words be taken seriously.

### **Religious Sexual Abuse Myths and Rationalizations**

Two sexual abuse myths have been widespread among religious leaders: (1) that sexual aggression is exclusively a moral issue and is not symptomatic of deep-rooted psychological and social adjustment problems, and (2) that to stop sexually aggressing, all a person needs to do is repent and be forgiven, or accept Jesus Christ as one's personal savior. These myths deny the seriousness and difficulty of the problem. Repeat offenders, despite good intentions, are likely to relapse unless they participate in a long-term cognitive-behavioral treatment and relapse prevention program.<sup>60</sup>

Catholic bishops' belief in these two myths allowed them to cover up accusations against pedophile priests and to give these priests continued access to children for decades after their offenses were reported. Protestant leaders have also used these myths to ignore ongoing abuse in their congregations.

Because religious institutions have largely neglected their duty to teach and preach about sexual abuse, it has been easy for offenders to twist traditional religious teachings and concepts in defense of their behavior. In their book *Christianity and Incest*, Annie Imbens and Ineke Jonker discuss their study of nineteen women who were incest victims; eighteen came from religious families, and one from an anti-religious family with similar family dynamics.<sup>61</sup> The religious girls' Christian upbringing made them easy prey to sexual abuse in their extended families. Their images of women as inferior to men and of Jesus suffering submissively strengthened the abusers' power over them and made the women powerless. The women were expected to suffer in silence and forgive their offenders repeatedly, just as Jesus had done. Offenders used Bible passages or church-authorized texts to blame the abuse on the girls and to keep them quiet about it. Mothers were subservient to their husbands and felt powerless to prevent the abuse. The conspiracy of silence surrounding the incest made it difficult for the victims to work through and heal their experiences. At the time the book was completed, the majority of the offenders were still involved in their churches, half of them in official positions.

A study of fourteen clergymen who had sexually abused children revealed that their religious beliefs, rather than inhibiting their offending, had been distorted to facilitate it.<sup>62</sup> The clergymen's distorted beliefs included these: God would not let any harm come to the victim; their religious and charitable work compensated for the abuse; their status as clergy would prevent detection; God permitted or understood the abuse and would forgive them; being chosen by God for the ministry showed God's acceptance of their pedophile tendencies; and the absence of divine intervention to prevent the abuse showed that God accepted it. Since these clergymen were not receiving any contradictory messages from their clerical peers, it was easy for them to maintain their rationalizations and to molest children with little or no guilt.

### **Putting the Evidence in Perspective**

It should be clear by now that some traditional religious, moral, and social beliefs can be "risk factors," to use the social science jargon, for sexual abuse. But a single risk factor is never enough to explain such a complex phenomenon as sexual aggression—there are always multiple factors involved. Other risk factors that I have not discussed include child abandonment, a violent environment, drug and alcohol abuse, peer pressure, habitual use of violent and degrading pornography, emotional disturbances, and possibly hormonal abnormalities, although the latter hypothesis is not well supported by experimental evidence to date.<sup>63</sup> By not discussing these factors, I do not mean to imply that they are not important. I am simply focusing on factors that I think have not received enough attention.

It's also important to remember that behavior is more important than beliefs, and for better or worse, discrepancies between ideology and behavior are commonplace. It would be a mistake to think that children are at risk for sexual abuse simply because they are being raised in a religiously conservative family. There are many conservative families in which the parents are loving and affectionate, and children are certainly better off in those families than they would be in a liberal family with cold and aloof parents. It's the emotional communication in the family, or the lack of it, that makes the difference.

Having said that, I must also point out that I did not find a single study that showed a correlation between liberal or progressive moral and social values and sexual abuse<sup>64</sup> (although one study did find that children from nonreligious families were more likely to be molested by strangers,<sup>65</sup> a finding I have not seen replicated elsewhere). Is there a conspiracy among liberal scientists to blame sexual abuse on conservatives? I don't think so. The overall impression I get from reading the literature on sexual abuse is that most scientists and psychologists are reluctant to mention, much less criticize, religious and moral beliefs. This reticence may come from a desire not to offend people, and researchers who receive government funding may also fear that controversial findings could result in a loss of funding. It took me months of tedious digging to assemble the list of studies in Appendix A. If there were a liberal conspiracy on this issue, my work would have been much easier.

I am convinced that the links between traditional values and sexual abuse are not coincidental. One of the key differences between conservatives on the one hand and liberals and libertarians on the other, is their attitude toward individual sexual rights. Liberals and libertarians believe that sexual behavior should not be limited by society except when it threatens harm to others, while conservatives believe that sexual behavior should be strictly limited by the traditional moral code. In the next chapter I will argue that the traditional moral code, because it does not respect individual rights, particularly the developmental needs of children, is intrinsically abusive.

---

<sup>1</sup>Renvoize 1982:86.

<sup>2</sup> The study by Kathryn B. Anderson et al., "Individual Differences and Attitudes toward Rape" is a statistical synthesis of 72 previous studies. I included those 72 studies in the count but did not list them individually in Appendix A.

<sup>3</sup>However, a study of date rapists found that they were very active sexually. Their sexual frustration came not from a lack of willing sexual partners but from their unrealistically high expectations; see Kanin 1985.

<sup>4</sup>David Finkelhor, *Sexually Victimized Children* (New York: Free Press, 1979). See also Jane F. Gilgun, "Sexually Abused Girls' Knowledge About Sexual Abuse and Sexuality," *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 1(3): 309–325 (1986).

<sup>5</sup> W. L. Marshall, "Intimacy, Loneliness, and Sexual Offenders," *Behaviour Research and Therapy* 27(3): 491–503 (1989); W. L. Marshall and H. E. Barbaree, "An Integrated Theory of the Etiology of Sexual Offending," in W. L. Marshall, D. R. Laws, and H. E. Barbaree, eds., *Handbook of Sexual Assault* (New York: Plenum Press, 1990), pp. 257–275; Gail Ryan, "The Families of Sexually Abusive Youth," in Gail Ryan and Sandy Lane, eds., *Juvenile Sexual Offending*, rev. ed. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1997), pp.136–154.

<sup>6</sup> Ryan, "The Families of Sexually Abusive Youth."

<sup>7</sup> Ruth Stout-Miller, Larry S. Miller, and Mary R. Langenbrunner, "Religiosity and Child Sexual Abuse: A Risk Factor Assessment," *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse* 6(4): 15–34 (1997). This study also found that persons sexually abused by a non-relative were much more likely to come from homes with little or no religious involvement, a result I have not seen replicated elsewhere.

<sup>8</sup> Marshall and Barbaree, "An Integrated Theory of the Etiology of Sexual Offending."

<sup>9</sup> Gail Ryan, "Incidence and Prevalence of Sexual Offenses Committed by Juveniles," in *Juvenile Sexual Offending*, pp. 10–16.

<sup>10</sup> W. L. Marshall, "Intimacy, Loneliness, and Sexual Offenders," p. 497.

<sup>11</sup> W. L. Marshall, "Intimacy, Loneliness, and Sexual Offenders," p. 498.

<sup>12</sup> Juliet L. Darke, "Sexual Aggression: Achieving Power through Humiliation," in *Handbook of Sexual Assault*, pp. 55–72.

<sup>13</sup> Kathryn B. Anderson, Harris Cooper, and Linda Okamura, "Individual Differences and Attitudes Toward Rape: A Meta-Analytic Review," *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin* 23(3): 295 (1997); David Lisak, "Male Gender



---

Socialization and the Perpetration of Sexual Abuse,” in Ronald F. Levant and Gary R. Brooks, eds., *Men and Sex: New Psychological Perspectives* (New York, John Wiley & Sons, 1997), pp. 156–177.

<sup>14</sup>Russell 1984:118–119.

<sup>15</sup>Ibid., 537.

<sup>16</sup>Marolla and Scully 1986:339.

<sup>17</sup>Ranke-Heinemann 1990.

<sup>18</sup>Judith Lewis Herman, “Sex Offenders: A Feminist Perspective,” in *Handbook of Sexual Assault*, pp. 177–193.

<sup>19</sup>Scott 1982.

<sup>20</sup>Finkelhor and Lewis 1988:74–75. See also Kevin Howells, “Some Meanings of Children for Pedophiles,” in Mark Cook and Glenn Wilson, eds., *Love and Attraction: An International Conference* (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1979).

<sup>21</sup>Groth and Birnbaum 1978; Money 1980:83; Money 1986:73.

<sup>22</sup>McConahay and McConahay 1977; Sanday 1981.

<sup>23</sup>Tingle et al. 1986; Bard et al. 1987.

<sup>24</sup>Burgess et al. 1988; Tingle et al. 1986; Bard et al. 1987.

<sup>25</sup>Marshall and Barbaree, “An Integrated Theory of the Etiology of Sexual Offending.”

<sup>26</sup>James W. Prescott, “Body Pleasure and the Origins of Violence,” *The Futurist* 9(2): 64–74 (1975).

<sup>27</sup>T. Field, “Violence and Touch Deprivation in Adolescents,” *Adolescence* 37(148): 735–749 (2002).

<sup>28</sup>Ibid.

<sup>29</sup>For example, on the harmful psychological and social effects of physical punishment, see Philip Greven, *Spare the Child* (New York: Vintage Books, 1992). On the connection between cultural acceptance of violence and the incidence of rape, see Larry Baron, Murray A. Straus, and David Jaffee, “Legitimate Violence, Violent Attitudes, and Rape: A Test of the Cultural Spillover Theory,” in Robert A. Prentky and Vernon L. Quinsey, eds., *Human Sexual Aggression: Current Perspectives*, *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, vol. 528 (New York: The New York Academy of Sciences, 1988.) Appendix A of this book includes numerous studies linking traditional values and sexual abuse.

<sup>30</sup>George Lakoff, *Moral Politics: How Liberals and Conservatives Think*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002).

<sup>31</sup>Ronald R. Levant, “Nonrelational Sexuality in Men,” in *Men and Sex: New Psychological Perspectives*, pp. 9–27.

<sup>32</sup>Ibid, p. 16.

<sup>33</sup>Ibid, pp. 17–19.

<sup>34</sup>Finkelhor and Lewis 1988:73–74.

<sup>35</sup>David Lisak, “Male Gender Socialization and the Perpetration of Sexual Abuse,” in *Men and Sex: New Psychological Perspectives*, pp. 156–177, quotations from p. 160.

<sup>36</sup>Ibid., p. 163.

<sup>37</sup>Ibid.

<sup>38</sup>Scully 1988.

<sup>39</sup>Scully and Marolla 1984:535.

<sup>40</sup>Parker and Parker 1986.

<sup>41</sup>Burgess et al. 1988:289.

<sup>42</sup>Groth 1979:99.

<sup>43</sup>Groth, 188–189.

<sup>44</sup>David Finkelhor and Diana Russell, “Women As Perpetrators,” in David Finkelhor, ed., *Child Sexual Abuse: New Theory and Research* (New York: Free Press, 1984), pp. 171–185; David Finkelhor, Gerald Hotaling, I. A. Lewis, and Christine Smith, “Sexual Abuse in a National Survey of Adult Men and Women: Prevalence, Characteristics, and Risk Factors,” *Child Abuse and Neglect* 14: 19–28 (1990).

<sup>45</sup>Finkelhor et al., “Sexual Abuse in a National Survey of Adult Men and Women.”

- 
- <sup>46</sup> Christine Lawson, "Mother-Son Sexual Abuse: Rare or Underreported? A Critique of the Research," *Child Abuse & Neglect* 17: 261–269 (1993).
- <sup>47</sup> Kathryn T. Jennings, "Female Child Molesters: A Review of the Literature," in Michele Elliott, ed., *Female Sexual Abuse of Children* (New York: Guilford Press, 1994), pp. 219–234.
- <sup>48</sup> Jane Kinder Matthews, Ruth Mathews, and Kathleen Speltz, "Female Sexual Offenders: A Typology," in Michael Quinn Patton, ed., *Family Sexual Abuse: Frontline Research and Evaluation* (Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1991), pp. 199–219.
- <sup>49</sup> Donald L. Nathanson, *Shame and Pride: Affect, Sex, and the Birth of the Self* (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1992), pp. 340–341.
- <sup>50</sup> Gilgun 1986.
- <sup>51</sup> Pruitt 1987:51.
- <sup>52</sup> Renvoize 1982:105.
- <sup>53</sup> Justice and Justice 1979:68–69.
- <sup>54</sup> Neil Frude, "The Sexual Nature of Sexual Abuse: A Review of the Literature," *Child Abuse and Neglect* 6: 211–223 (1982).
- <sup>55</sup> Frude 1982:214.
- <sup>56</sup> Reiss 1990:55.
- <sup>57</sup> Reiss 1990:158–164.
- <sup>58</sup> Muelenhard and Hollabaugh 1988.
- <sup>59</sup> Scully and Marolla 1984:534–535.
- <sup>60</sup> W. L. Marshall and H. E. Barbaree, "Outcome of Comprehensive Cognitive-Behavioral Treatment Programs," in *Handbook of Sexual Assault*, pp. 363–385; William D. Pithers, "Relapse Prevention with Sexual Aggressors: A Method for Maintaining Therapeutic Gain and Enhancing External Supervision," in *Handbook of Sexual Assault*, pp. 343–361.
- <sup>61</sup> Annie Imbens and Ineke Jonker, *Christianity and Incest* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992).
- <sup>62</sup> Adam Saradjian and Dany Nobus, "Cognitive Distortions of Religious Professionals Who Sexually Abuse Children," *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 18(8): 905–923 (2003).
- <sup>63</sup> S. J. Hucker and J. Bain, "Androgenic Hormones and Sexual Assault," in *Handbook of Sexual Assault*, pp. 93–102.
- <sup>64</sup> In the second phase of my literature review in 2003, I downloaded 10,030 citations and abstracts concerning sexual abuse from the PsycINFO psychological research database. I then searched the records for a long list of relevant keywords, including "liberal" and "progressive."
- <sup>65</sup> Ruth Stout-Miller, Larry S. Miller, and Mary R. Langenbrunner, "Religiosity and Child Sexual Abuse: A Risk Factor Assessment," *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse* 6(4): 15–34 (1997).