

## Civilizing Sexuality

### PART 1: A CULTURE OF SEXUAL ABUSE

#### Chapter 1

#### The Missing Commandments: Permission for Perpetrators

*Thou shalt not seize a woman and lie with her against her will; it is wickedness. Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy daughter; it is thine own nakedness. Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of a young girl or boy and lie with them; it is an abomination.*

Do you recognize these three verses? If you do, it's your imagination. You won't find these verses in the Bible. I call these prohibitions of sexual abuse the *missing commandments*. The Bible does not condemn the sexual abuse of children, nor does it condemn rape as a crime against a woman. Despite its lengthy prohibitions of incest, the Bible does not directly forbid father-daughter or father-son incest (although it does forbid sex with both a mother and her daughter). The Bible often fails to distinguish between sexual activity and sexual violence, and in some passages the Bible seems to condone sexual violence. I point this out not to criticize the Bible but simply to tell the truth about it. The Bible provides spiritual guidance for millions of people and has inspired many social reform movements. But it was written in a culture that had a moral blind spot toward sexual abuse, and Western society has inherited that blind spot. Unfortunately, ignoring sexual abuse allows it to flourish.

#### ***Sexual Abuse in the Bible and Religious Tradition***

Sexual abuse was not rare in biblical times; on the contrary, it seems to have been epidemic. One historian who specializes in the study of child abuse has concluded that most children in all cultures of the ancient world were sexually abused by their parents and other adults.<sup>1</sup> The incest taboo is the most universal code of sexual conduct, but it would be naive to think that incest is rare simply because it is forbidden. Incest is easy to keep secret, so most cases never become public, and the perpetrators are rarely punished. As an example of how sex with children was routinely accepted in the ancient world, the Talmud allowed a three-year-old girl to be betrothed by sexual intercourse—with her father's permission.<sup>2</sup> Intercourse with girls younger than three was matrimonially invalid but not a crime.

Women and children in the ancient world were considered the property of their husbands and fathers, as the Ten Commandments make clear: "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house; thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife, or his manservant, or his maidservant, or his ox, or his ass, or anything that is thy neighbor's" (Exodus 20:17). As property, wives, daughters, and servants had no right to refuse their master's sexual demands—rape was not a crime in those relationships. That should not surprise us, since only recently has marital rape become a crime in some American states. In the ancient world, and all too often today, women, girls, and boys have had to suffer sexual assault in silence. The Bible, like other writings from the ancient world, seems unaware of the suffering caused by child sexual abuse.

Because of women's status as property, the Bible does not condemn rape as a violation of a woman's rights—in fact, several Old Testament passages treat rape as an issue of a *man's* rights.

Deuteronomy 22:28–29 decreed that if a man raped an unbetrothed virgin, he was required to pay the bridal price to her father and marry her without possibility of divorce. The rapist was, in effect, a thief—he didn’t need the woman’s consent to have sex, but he should have obtained her father’s consent, and if caught, he had to make retribution to the father. Can you image being raped and then forced to marry your attacker?

Exodus 22:16–17 prescribes the same penalty for seduction of a virgin, showing that the Bible made no distinction between rape and consensual sex—both were violations of the woman’s father’s rights. Exodus specifies that the father (not the woman!) may refuse the marriage, but even in that case, the seducer has to pay, because the non-virginal woman no longer has any value on the marriage market. Deuteronomy forbids divorce between the rapist and his victim for the same reason—the woman is “damaged goods,” and no one else is likely to pay for her.

Two biblical stories seem to condone rape. In the story of Sodom (Genesis 19:1–11), Lot tried to protect two angels in his house from an angry mob by offering his two virgin daughters to be gang-raped by the mob. Fortunately for Lot’s daughters, the angels struck the mob blind and rescued Lot and his family from Sodom before the city was destroyed. The Bible does not condemn Lot for offering his daughters to be raped—after all, his daughters were his property to dispose of as he wished. Lot’s wife, however, was turned into a pillar of salt for failing to follow instructions on the journey from Sodom. Many conservative Christians today equate the attempted rape in the Sodom story with consensual homosexual activities, showing that there is still widespread confusion about the difference between sexual violence and sexual activities.

In a similar story in Judges Chapter 19, an old man offered hospitality for the night to a Levite (a member of the priestly tribe) and his concubine.<sup>3</sup> As the old man and his guests were eating supper, a mob from the tribe of Benjamin demanded that the old man bring out his guest. The old man refused, but said, “Here are my virgin daughter and his [the Levite’s] concubine; let me bring them out now. Ravish them and do whatever you want to them; but against this man do not do such a vile thing” (v. 24). The mob would not listen. “So the man seized his concubine, and put her out to them. They wantonly raped her, and abused her all through the night until the morning. And as the dawn began to break, they let her go” (v. 25). When the Levite woke up in the morning, he found his concubine lying on the doorstep and told her to get up, but she was dead. He put her body on his ass and went home. When the Levite got home, he cut his concubine’s body into twelve pieces and sent a piece to each tribe of Israel. This incident instigated a war of all the tribes against the Benjaminites.

What’s interesting is that the old man and the Levite, who acted so callously (by our standards) in allowing the gang rape and murder to happen, were held blameless. Feminist scholar Riane Eisler commented on the implications of this passage: “One half of humanity could legally be handed over by their own fathers and husbands to be raped, beaten, tortured, or killed without any fear of punishment—or even moral disapproval.”<sup>4</sup> The status of a concubine, even a freeborn woman, seems to have been not much higher than the status of a slave. The Bible did not address the issue of raping a slave, and presumably allowed it, since the slave was the master’s property. But the Bible did forbid killing a slave (Exodus 21:20–21). So apparently, raping the concubine was not the Benjaminites’ crime—they had her master’s consent for that—but killing her was a crime.

Although the Bible contains detailed laws against incest (Leviticus 18:6–18), nowhere does it explicitly forbid father-daughter or father-son incest. Leviticus 18:17 does forbid intercourse with both a woman and her daughter. This verse could be interpreted as implicitly disapproving of father-daughter incest without actually forbidding it. The authors of Leviticus appear to have been reluctant to deny a father's right to do whatever he wanted with his daughters. In practice, this ambiguity may have amounted to a "don't ask, don't tell" policy—if made public, father-daughter incest would have been frowned on, but when practiced discreetly in private, it was no problem.

The Bible's ambivalence toward father-daughter incest is exemplified by Genesis 19:30–38, which reads like an incestuous father's erotic fantasy: Lot had sex with his two daughters and got away with it because (1) they initiated it, (2) they wanted it, and (3) he was so drunk he didn't know what was happening. These three classic rationalizations are still used by child molesters today. Some offenders get drunk before assaulting their victims so they can forgive themselves later, and they typically claim that their victims wanted to have sex with them.

Lot's daughters became pregnant, and their children founded the Moabite and Ammonite tribes. One biblical scholar speculates that this story may have been "a derogatory reference to the origins of [Israel's] traditional enemies."<sup>5</sup> What this commentator is saying in scholarly language is that the Bible is not condoning incest—it's just telling a dirty joke. Nevertheless, it's a joke that says a lot about the mentality of its authors. The only punishment Lot receives for his incest is the ridicule of later generations, which is a pretty light sentence. I wonder how many fathers throughout history failed to get the joke and read this Bible passage as an example of how to get away with incest?

Nowhere in the Old or New Testaments is the sexual abuse of children categorically forbidden. In fact, in Numbers Chapter 31, Moses seems to command it. God told Moses to take revenge on the Midianites. Moses did this by going to war and ordering the slaughter of all the men, boys, and non-virgin women; but he ordered, "All the young girls who have not known a man by sleeping with him, keep alive for yourselves." (Numbers 31:18). Picture the scene: In a frenzied rage, the Israelite soldiers slaughtered all the Midianite men, boys, and women. No one was left but a group of screaming, terrorized girls. How could the soldiers determine which girls were virgins?

The Israelites could not have assumed that girls below a certain age were virgins, because children of all ages were used as sex objects. The Talmud cites this passage in a discussion of the Jewish practice of betrothing three-year-old girls by sexual intercourse, describing the Midianite girls of this age as "fit for copulation."<sup>6</sup> The soldiers could not expect honest answers if they simply asked the girls if they were virgins; it wouldn't take long for the girls to figure out that if they said no, they would be killed. No, to fulfill Moses' command, the soldiers probably followed time-honored traditions of warfare by raping all the girls, killing the non-virgins, and keeping the (former) virgins as concubines, wives, or slaves.

Deuteronomy 21:10–14 provided rules for treatment of an enemy captive taken as a wife. These rules might seem more humane than the picture I have just described, until you realize that the captive/wife may have been a little child. How could she experience sex with an enemy soldier as anything but rape? Verse 14 says, "But if you are not satisfied with her, you shall let her go free

and not sell her for money.” Where could she go? She no longer had a family or a man to support her. Most probably she would fall into slavery or prostitution.

A Hebrew man was allowed to sell his daughter as a slave, according to Exodus 21:7–11. Remember that the daughter could have been a little girl, and would have been required to have sex with her master. Verse 10 specifies what her new master must do “if he takes *another* wife,” which shows how little difference there was between a slave and a wife—sometimes a distinction was made, but here the terms are interchangeable.

The Bible’s blind spot toward sexual abuse has been perpetuated throughout the history of Christian moral teachings. Sexual abuse has always been common, but churches have rarely spoken up to prevent it.<sup>7</sup> This tradition continues in today’s churches. For example, the fourteen-volume *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, published in 1967, contains no article on rape; didn’t the editors consider it a matter of serious moral concern? The encyclopedia has a five-page article on children’s literature, but no article on child sexual abuse. There are three articles on incest, but they treat it as a legal and historical issue rather than an everyday problem. Similarly, in *Baker’s Dictionary of Christian Ethics*, published in 1973 by a team of evangelical scholars, the short article on incest deals only with biblical examples and makes no mention of incest in our society. The dictionary does have a short entry on rape, but no mention of child molestation, even in a long article on moral issues concerning children.

Throughout this book, I will argue that our traditional sexual morality expresses a warped value system. Traditional moralists expend great energy trying to prevent various types of voluntary sexual activities which often do no harm to the participants, but they usually ignore sexual aggression, which can result in serious psychological damage. If you’re a churchgoer, this statement is probably validated by your own experience. Just think back over all the sermons and lessons about sex you’ve heard in your life—how many have dealt with sexual abuse?

Moralists’ silence on sexual abuse has three principal effects: (1) it gives tacit permission to perpetrators of sexual abuse; (2) it gives their victims no grounds for objecting to the mistreatment they suffer; and (3) it gives everyone the false impression that sexual abuse is an unusual occurrence. In fact, sexual abuse may be happening next door to you or across the street—or even in your own home.

### ***The Epidemic of Sexual Abuse***

In 1985 the Los Angeles Times Poll, in a detailed nationwide survey of 2,626 adults, found that 27 percent of the women (1 out of 4) and 16 percent of the men (1 out of 6) remembered having been sexually abused as children.<sup>8</sup> Other surveys, using other methodologies and definitions of child sexual abuse, have found rates as high as 62 percent for females and 31 percent for males,<sup>9</sup> and some researchers believe that actual rates are even higher, especially for boys.<sup>10</sup> The U.S. Justice Department’s Bureau of Justice Statistics reported that in 1992, girls under 18 were the victims in 51 percent of rapes reported to police, and 16 percent of reported rape victims were girls under 12. One out of five rape victims under 12 were raped by their fathers, and 96 percent were raped by family members or acquaintances.<sup>11</sup>

A random survey of 930 adult women in 1978, funded by the National Institute of Mental Health, found that 24 percent of the women had experienced a completed rape, and 31 percent had experienced an attempted rape. When the categories were combined, 44 percent had experienced

at least one completed or attempted rape.<sup>12</sup> Only 12 percent of the completed rapes and 16 percent of the attempted rapes were committed by strangers; roughly half were committed by husbands, lovers, or dates.<sup>13</sup> When the results of this survey were published a few years later, they confirmed an independent demographic estimate that 20 to 30 percent of girls who were 12 years old in 1980 would suffer a violent sexual attack sometime in their lives.<sup>14</sup>

In a nationwide survey of 2,972 male college students, 25 percent reported that they had engaged in some form of sexual aggression.<sup>15</sup> And in a series of studies asking male college students how likely they would be to rape if they could be assured of not being caught, an average of 35 percent indicated some likelihood of raping;<sup>16</sup> in one study the figure was as high as 51 percent.<sup>17</sup>

Sexual abuse is not only widespread, it is widely accepted. A nationwide study of junior-high and high school students found that 85 percent of the girls and 76 percent of the boys had experienced some form of sexual harassment at school.<sup>18</sup> A survey of 1,700 sixth- to ninth-grade students shows how poorly they are being educated about sexual morality and how accepting they are of abuse:

- 80 percent said a husband has a right to force his wife to have sex
- 70 percent said a man has a right to force sex on his fiancée
- 61 percent said it is all right for a man to force a woman if they have had sex before
- more than half said it is all right for a man to force sex on a woman if she led him on, if she got him sexually excited, or if they have been dating a long time.<sup>19</sup>

In other words, most students surveyed considered marital rape and date rape to be normal and morally acceptable. They believed that sexual assault crimes are usually committed by strangers (only 20 percent actually are),<sup>20</sup> and they believed that rape victims are responsible for being assaulted.

Taken together, these last two surveys suggest that a substantial number of young Americans have not experienced and do not expect to experience respect for their sexuality. For them, sexual abuse seems to be just a part of life. But if these youngsters accept sexual abuse as normal, what does this predict about their future behavior?

### ***Pedophile Priests: The Tip of the Iceberg***

Over the past two decades, the Catholic Church has been reeling from the widely publicized scandals of priests molesting children and teenagers. Catholic bishops have covered up many of these cases, sometimes with the cooperation of police and prosecutors, allowing abusive priests to evade criminal penalties and continue molesting children. Until recently, the church has, in effect, considered ruining a priest's career to be more serious than ruining a child's life.

A study commissioned by the American Catholic bishops found that 10,667 children were allegedly sexually victimized by 4,392 priests during the years 1950 to 2002.<sup>21</sup> Of all these priests, a subgroup of 149 were responsible for abusing 2,960 of the victims. Widespread sexual abuse by priests has also been reported in Canada, Ireland, Australia, Britain, France, Germany, Mexico, and Poland.<sup>22</sup> A survey of American Catholic nuns found that at least 40 percent had

suffered some form of sexual trauma during their lifetime; the perpetrators included male relatives, priests, and other nuns.<sup>23</sup>

At first, loyal Catholics insisted that such incidents were aberrations, but as the evidence of abuse and cover-ups accumulated, this argument lost credibility. It is now clear that sexual abuse is an institutional problem in the Catholic Church. Priests, however, are just the tip of the iceberg. Widespread sexual abuse perpetrated by the clergy of other faiths and by lay believers in traditional sexual morality and sex role stereotypes has not received the public attention that it deserves. Many reports in the scientific and professional literature (see Chapter 2 and the Appendix) indicate that rapists, child molesters, incestuous parents, and sexually motivated murderers are typically very conservative in their sexual and social values and sometimes more religious than average—suggesting that in many cases traditional morality is a contributing factor in sexual abuse rather than a deterrent. At the First International Conference on the Treatment of Sex Offenders in 1989, there was broad agreement that Western societies with repressive sexual attitudes and traditional male/female roles are more likely to have high rates of all forms of sex crimes.<sup>24</sup>

There have been many published reports of sexual abuse by religious people. Evangelical scholar Virginia Mollenkott has described several cases:<sup>25</sup>

- An evangelical minister was committing incest with his granddaughter. His family knew what was going on, but never confronted or reported him.
- A deacon in an evangelical church repeatedly raped his wife's sister, who was a child. When the girl asked for help, the man denied what he had been doing, and she was bullied into pretending that it was all her own imagination. The deacon continued to abuse the child.
- A woman told her evangelical minister that her husband was committing incest with their little daughter. The minister said her husband's behavior was traceable to her own shortcomings. He advised the wife to try to be sexier for her husband, not to interfere with his incestuous activities, and to pray for his enlightenment.

In another case, a fundamentalist minister initiated a sexual relationship with his nine-year-old daughter. The girl and an older sister repeatedly sought help from their mother, but she refused to intervene. Thirteen years later, the older sister finally called a rape hotline when she discovered her own seven-year-old daughter and the sister's three-year-old had been molested by the grandfather. The caller's fifteen-year-old brother had also tried to seduce her daughter.<sup>26</sup> In this family, sexual abuse was a traditional family value.

The churches' blind spot toward sexual abuse involves more than neglect or omission; it involves active denial. One couple who were active in their mainline Protestant church sexually and physically abused their daughter throughout her childhood, prostituting the girl for money and photographing her in various sexual acts, including as a victim of sadism. When the girl grew up she sought pastoral counseling, but all she got was disbelief.<sup>27</sup> The typical religious approach to

sexual abuse seems to be, “If we ignore it, maybe it will go away.” But by turning their backs on sexual abuse, the churches have allowed it to flourish.

A psychiatric report on sex murderers concluded that one of the contributing factors in sex murder is preoccupation with sexual morality, including sexual guilt, inhibitions, and rejection of sex as impure.<sup>28</sup> Two case studies illustrate this dynamic:

- One morning an 18-year-old boy drove a 15-year-old girl to an isolated place where he tore off her clothes, strangled her with a belt, and dragged her body into the bushes. He went to school that afternoon, and in the evening he attended a Billy Graham rally. When the boy’s role in the murder was discovered, neighbors described him as a nice, quiet kid who was too deeply religious to go out with girls. In later interviews, the murderer described his disapproval of the girl’s flirtatiousness and seductive behavior with boys. While riding in his car, the girl had started playing with the zipper on her skirt. The boy said he became anxious and angry because “she disappointed me,” but after the murder he felt relieved. He did not feel he had committed a crime until several days later, when the body was discovered.
- A 22-year-old man stabbed his girlfriend to death in his car, kissing her while he was stabbing her. After driving around with the dead body for a while and considering suicide, he finally surrendered to the state police with a note, “Gladys and I sinned.” The sin was that they had been having sex together. He justified the murder as a way of washing away their sins, saying that when he asked the Lord for guidance, he thought of Abraham’s sacrifice of Isaac. The murderer recited what he thought was a verse from the New Testament: “To be carnally minded is death ... to be spiritually minded is peace and joy.”<sup>29</sup>

Sex murders, of course, are relatively rare. More common examples of “morally” motivated sexual sadism have appeared in letters to “Ask Beth,” a syndicated advice column for teenagers:

- In one letter, a 14-year-old boy said his “old-fashioned” parents told him masturbation was immoral. His mother said if she caught him masturbating, she’d disown him. She did catch him early one morning, and proceeded to beat his bare bottom with her wooden hairbrush. When his father came home, he took the boy’s bedroom door off its hinges. The boy was required to sleep naked and uncovered for the next month, and the parents also watched him in the shower.<sup>30</sup>
- In another letter, a 14-year-old girl who goes to a very strict religious school said she was caught stealing from a teacher’s desk and was sent to the punishment office for “maximum

correction”—undressing and holding onto an overhead bar while being strapped. The girl refused to undress, so the punishment counselor got three male ministers who held the girl while the female counselor stripped her naked. The ministers held the screaming girl while she was strapped. The letter ended, “Will I ever stop crying about this?”<sup>31</sup>

In both of these cases, the adults used morality as an excuse to indulge in voyeurism and sexual sadism. Because the buttocks are an erogenous zone, beating someone’s bare backside constitutes sadistic sexual battery. “But spanking is a traditional punishment,” you might object. That’s exactly my point—some of our traditions are abusive.

Sexual sadism is not at all rare. In 1994 an American teenager, Michael Fay, was convicted of vandalism in Singapore and sentenced to be caned six times on his bare buttocks by a martial arts expert—a punishment that would leave him physically and psychologically scarred for life. Caning is classified as torture by Amnesty International and the U.S. State Department. But on radio talk shows, in telephone surveys and TV polls, and in letters to newspapers, the Singapore government, and Fay’s congressman, many Americans agreed with the punishment—ignoring Fay’s claim that his confession was coerced—and said we should have sentences like that in America.

In the early 1980s, the Moral Majority and other right-wing groups tried to pass legislation called the Family Protection Act. The bill would have prohibited federal efforts to stop child abuse, legalized spanking, cut off federal aid for abused wives, and prohibited federally supported schools from buying or preparing any educational materials that would “denigrate, diminish, or deny the role of differences between the sexes.” It was a bill designed to legally ensure men’s ability to dominate women and children. But the power to dominate includes the power to abuse, both physically and sexually.

There is no doubt that our religious traditions preach love and forgiveness, and that physical and sexual abuse violate our religious ideals. Jesus treated women and children as the equals of men. Historically, Christianity played a major role in ending the social acceptability of infanticide and in establishing orphanages for abandoned children. Women in religious communities achieved a level of independence that would have been impossible in secular life before modern times. Christianity has been a major force in establishing the rights of the individual in society. But religion cannot play a positive role in solving the problem of sexual abuse until we stop ignoring the dark side of our traditions and values.

### ***A Failure to Socialize Sexuality***

The issue of sexual abuse often arouses demands for extreme punishment: “Lock them up and throw away the key,” or at least track them for life and notify the communities where they live. This reaction is based on the false assumption that sexual abusers are a rare breed of psychopaths or moral monsters, and that we have enough prisons to hold them all. But if you apply the results of sexual abuse prevalence surveys to the United States population, there are tens of millions of sexual abuse victims, which means there must be a corresponding number of perpetrators.<sup>32</sup> These perpetrators are, for the most part, ordinary people whom most of us would never suspect



of being sex offenders. In the 1985 Los Angeles Times survey cited above, half of the perpetrators were described as authority figures.<sup>33</sup>

If rape and child molestation were rare occurrences, we could perhaps understand them adequately by understanding the psychological maladjustment of the perpetrators. But because sexual aggression is commonplace, we have to consider both individual psychology and social psychology if we want to understand the problem and deal with it successfully. We need to understand how some social forces—families, peer groups, institutions, communications media, widely shared attitudes and beliefs—foster sexual aggression or fail to discourage it.

One positive effect of the pedophile priest scandal is that it has begun shifting our attention away from individual perpetrators to the institutional and social conditions that allow abuse to happen. The question of why so many priests became sexually abusive should lead us to ask that question about all perpetrators. Why do people sexually abuse others, and how can we prevent them from becoming abusers in the first place?

The causes of sexual aggression (which will be discussed in Chapter 2) are complex and varied. But there does seem to be one valid generalization we can make: *Sexual aggression can be understood as a failure to socialize sexuality.* The one thing that almost all sex offenders have in common is that they have grown into adulthood without the social skills and positive attitudes necessary to satisfy their sexual and emotional needs in consensual, mutually satisfying relationships.

Most sex offenders are involved in consensual sexual relationships, but these relationships are typically superficial and emotionally unsatisfying, and the offenders do not understand why. According to W. L. Marshall, one of the leading researchers and therapists treating sex offenders, what is missing from their relationships is intimacy. “Sexual offenders,” Marshall says, “have failed to develop the appropriate skills and self-confidence necessary to form effective intimate relations with adults.”<sup>34</sup>

Intimacy skills, which I will discuss later in this book, are not instinctive—they have to be learned. From this perspective, sexual abuse is not just an individual’s offense against society; it is also society’s failure to equip that individual with the skills he or she needs to live in society. Sexual abuse is, ultimately, a failure of child rearing and education.

Unfortunately, in America, guided by a morality that has a blind spot for sexual abuse, we do everything we can to *prevent* the socialization of our children’s sexuality, which in turn limits their capacity for intimacy. Abstinence-based sex education does not help children learn *how* to behave sexually, it just tells them *not* to behave sexually. By forbidding the erotic play which, as I will show later, is a necessary part of children’s psychological and social development, traditional morality prevents many children from developing the intimacy skills they will need as teenagers and adults to satisfy their sexual and emotional needs constructively. The result in some cases is anti-social sexual behavior. If we teach children that sex is obscene, we should not be surprised if they grow up and behave obscenely.

Sexual abuse is a social and cultural problem, not just an individual or family problem. Locking up a few individuals, or a lot of them, will not solve the social problem. Social problems need social solutions. Instead of hysteria and punishment based on ignorance and denial, we need more scientific research, education, treatment, and prevention. We also need profound changes in

our attitudes toward sexuality, especially children's sexuality. Because religion plays such an important role in American society, a change in religious attitudes toward sexuality is needed to break the cycle of sexual abuse.

---

<sup>1</sup>DeMause 1991.

<sup>2</sup>Rush 1980:17.

<sup>3</sup> A concubine was a sexual partner, often a slave, who was part of a man's household but not part of his family; she and her children had no right of inheritance. Some men had both wives and concubines for sexual variety. Others, like St. Augustine, took a concubine for sexual satisfaction while they were waiting to find a wife from a richer and more powerful family. In the early centuries of Christianity, some men had both a wife and a concubine. It was not until the Council of Toledo in 397 that an official policy was set: a Christian man could have a wife or a concubine, but not both.

<sup>4</sup>Eisler 1987:100.

<sup>5</sup>Maly 1968.

<sup>6</sup>Rush 1980:17–18.

<sup>7</sup> Rush, Florence. 1980. *The Best Kept Secret: Sexual Abuse of Children*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

<sup>8</sup>Finkelhor et al. 1990. The margin of error was 3 percent.

<sup>9</sup>Finkelhor et al. 1986:19.

<sup>10</sup>DeMause 1991:135–136; Lawson 1993.

<sup>11</sup>Associated Press, "In Reported Rapes, 51% of Victims Under 18," San Francisco Chronicle, June 23, 1994.

<sup>12</sup>Russell 1984:35.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid., 60–61; see also Kilpatrick et al. 1988:340.

<sup>14</sup>Johnson 1980.

<sup>15</sup>Koss and DiNero 1988.

<sup>16</sup>Malamuth 1981.

<sup>17</sup>Malamuth, Haber, and Feshbach 1980.

<sup>18</sup>"School harassment 'epidemic,'" San Francisco Examiner, June 1, 1993.

<sup>19</sup>Linda Ellerbee, "What Your Kid Doesn't Know About Rape," San Francisco Chronicle, September 1, 1991. The survey was conducted by the Rhode Island Rape Crisis Center.

<sup>20</sup>Kilpatrick et al. 1988; Russell 1984:60–61.

<sup>21</sup> *The Nature and Scope of the Problem of Sexual Abuse of Minors by Catholic Priests and Deacons in the United States: A Research Study Conducted by the John Jay College of Criminal Justice* (Washington, D.C.: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, February 27, 2004).

<sup>22</sup> Associated Press, "Priests' sex scandal reaches around the globe," San Francisco Chronicle, April 20, 2002.

<sup>23</sup>Review of Religious Research, December 1998. [full citation to come]

<sup>24</sup>Reiss 1990:164–165.

<sup>25</sup>Mollenkott 1982.

<sup>26</sup>Summit and Kryso 1978:245–246.

<sup>27</sup>Quoted in Pruitt 1987:94.

<sup>28</sup>Revitch 1965.

<sup>29</sup>Ibid., 647–648.

<sup>30</sup>“Ask Beth,” San Francisco Chronicle, December 10, 1989.

<sup>31</sup>“Ask Beth,” San Francisco Chronicle, December 22, 1991.

<sup>32</sup>The Los Angeles Times Poll (Finkelhor et al. 1990) reported that 27 percent of women and 16 percent of men nationwide had been sexually abused as children. Multiply those figures by a U.S. population of 250 million (125 million of each sex), and you have 34 million female and 20 million male survivors of child sexual abuse. These numbers are not guesses. They are based on a scientific survey of a random, demographically representative national sample. The survey results are conservative—because of methodological limitations, the survey was more likely to under-report sexual abuse than to over-report it. But the grand total—54 million sexual abuse victims—probably sounds unbelievable to you. It sounds unbelievable to me, too, even though I’ve studied the issue thoroughly enough to know that it’s true. The reason for our disbelief is a psychological defense mechanism called denial, which I will discuss in Chapter 4.

<sup>33</sup>Finkelhor et al. 1990.

<sup>34</sup>W. L. Marshall, “Intimacy, Loneliness and Sexual Offenders,” *Behaviour Research and Therapy* 27(5): 491–503.