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Editor’s note: this is the second in a two part series. Part I ran Yesterday.

Yesterday I pointed out that the U.S. Department of Justice, National Incident-Based Reporting System, announced last year that no national data collection effort addressing sexual abuse had ever included the abuse data on “young victims.” In fact, all sexual abuse of children under age 12 had been systematically purged by the national data collecting agencies.

Moreover, while 67 percent of all sex abuse victims are children under 18 years of age, with roughly 4 percent of males identified as either bi- or homosexual, this small cadre is largely responsible for NIBRS data finding 64 percent of all forcible sodomy victims to be boys under age 12, most under age 5. Given that, the problems inherent in homosexuals as guides and mentors to youth looms large.

The 348 percent increase in child abuse reports — using data from the American Human Association and NCANDS, 1990 to today — confirms the NIBRS boy-abuse data. Previously, the AHA documented a 1,028 percent increase in child sex abuse reports in six years from 1976 to 1982.

And, regression estimates for the year 2000 find a 4,169 percent increase in child sexual abuse. Even if the statistical data are lower by 1,000 percent, which is statistically unlikely, the increase is incendiary and establishes institutional malfeasance and/or amazing indifference by state-supported researchers and administrators toward children.

Meaning no disrespect to individual FBI agents and others who have been uniformly helpful in this research, the argument presented here is that our dearth of child sex-abuse data place responsible governmental agencies in serious question.

This is further complicated when agency data lump parental abuse with that of boyfriends of the mother and “caretakers” to create a child abuse epidemic requiring that bureaucrats protect children from their parents, beginning at ages 0-5.

In the opinion of this author, “social science data” — which trivializes the sexual war on children (and women) as this war is causally linked to the normalization of pornography and homosexuality — are inherently tainted.

The subversion of the purpose of the FBI Uniform Crime Report as the nation’s single most respected warning system for social health or sickness needs to be studied by independent lay and professional researchers.

Institutions and agencies responsible for child protection, post-1950, should be examined and compared to previous educational and judicial systems when crime, disease and dysfunction were hundreds or thousands of percentage points lower.
The evidence available from the sociosexual disease demographics (e.g., AIDS and other venereal diseases, "illegitimacy," divorce, rape, juvenile delinquency, child prostitution, pornography, etc.) establishes pre-1948 sexual conduct as measurably superior to post 1948 sexual conduct.

Ignoring the child sex-abuse data is only the tip of the iceberg, however. Since the American Psychological Association and the American Psychiatric Association have “gone soft” on pedophilia, we have seen an upsurge in attempts to normalize and legalize sex with children. In an outstanding investigative report, the Jan. 15 Boston Herald revealed data on the treatment of child rape victims in Massachusetts, based on the police data for 1999.

The paper reported that all those convicted of attempted child rape walked; three-fifths of those convicted of criminally injuring a child walked; 30 percent-plus convicted of indecent assault and battery of a child walked; and 20 percent of convicted child rapists walked.

Hence, recalling Justice Louis Brandies' warning that national conduct is evidence of national laws, our current violent sexual disorders confirm that the sexual laws put into place post-1950s have not been in “the best interests of the child.”

Read more at http://mobile.wnd.com/2001/03/8624/#PfKB0BdQM7hxjPSi.99