Critical Reviews of the "GRACE Final Report" on Bob Jones University

Martin Bobgan

This volume is a compilation of three articles, two of which were published in 2015 and one in 2017.

Scripture quotations are taken from the Authorized King James Version of the Bible, except as otherwise indicated.

Critical Reviews of the "GRACE Final Report" on Bob Jones University

Copyright © 2019 Martin Bobgan
Published by EastGate Publishers
4137 Primavera Road
Santa Barbara, CA 93110

ISBN 978-0941717-29-8

All rights reserved. No portion of this book may be reproduced in any form without the permission of the Publisher.

Printed in the United States of America

Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter!

Isaiah 5:20

Table of Contents

Introduction.....7

Article 1 A Critical Review of the "GRACE Final Report" on Bob Jones University 9

Article 2 How the LGBTQQI Activist Community Victimized the BJU/BJA by Means of a Flawed GRACE Report Survey.....89

Article 3 Bob Jones University Not Guilty as Charged by GRACE.....103

EndNotes.....107

Introduction

A concerned pastor sent me a copy of the 301-page "GRACE Final Report," which accused Bob Jones University and its chancellor of abusing students. I read the entire report. I also read many of the numerous media reports that amplified those abuse allegations without proof. I found that, as a result of the biased international media coverage, this grievously flawed GRACE report could be the beginning of the end for Bob Jones University and Bob Jones Academy (BJU/BJA).

After I completed the first lengthy article and made it available, more needed to be done. As I say in the second article, "This victimization of BJU/BJA has been systematically and scrupulously carried out by the worldwide Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer, Questioning, and Intersex (LGBTQQI*) activist community as they ganged up on BJU/BJA and its chancellor, Dr. Jones III, with seemingly no one coming to their defense." The third brief article gives a conclusive verdict from the Greenville Police Department on the charges by GRACE against BJU and its chancellor: **"Bob Jones University Not Guilty as Charged by GRACE."** The three articles on the "GRACE Final Report" on Bob Jones University (BJU) follow unaltered.

* At the time of writing these articles the favored acronym in the homosexual et al community was LGBTQQI; thus I used that acronym in my articles.

Article 1

A Critical Review of the "GRACE Final Report" on Bob Jones University

Addendum

The 301-page GRACE Final Report is available at: http://www.sccadvasa.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/Final-Report.pdf. **I urge readers who believe as I do that there has been a great miscarriage of justice in GRACE's recommendation regarding Dr. Jones III to email Chancellor@bju.edu.**

Introduction

I received a copy of the "GRACE Final Report: For the Investigatory Review of Sexual Abuse Disclosures and Institutional Responses at Bob Jones University," hereafter referred to as the "GRACE Report" [1] or "GRACE" when referring to the investigatory team. GRACE, an acronym for "Godly Response to Abuse in the Christian Environment," is an organization formed to educate Christians "to recognize and respond to the sin of child abuse."[2] Bob Jones University (BJU) retained GRACE as "an ombudsman to review the university's

responses to sexual abuse disclosure" (p. 10). The investigation began on January 10, 2013, and the Final Report was submitted on December 11, 2014 (p. 9) **with a blatantly biased recommendation on Dr. Bob Jones III.**

Because I knew about GRACE's position on the integration of psychological counseling theories and therapies and the Bible, I decided to read GRACE's lengthy report. As I read through the long document, I could see that their perspective on abuse is not purely biblical. GRACE has been heavily influenced by those with a psychological view of human nature and on how to help people change and grow. Since the ministry in which I am involved was formed for the purpose of exposing these psychological theories that have invaded Christianity and to warn Christians of these detrimental ideas that have undermined and polluted the understanding of God's revealed Word, I believed I needed to evaluate the Grace Final Report.

The ministry of which I speak is Psychoheresy Awareness Ministries, which my wife and I, with the encouragement and help of like-minded believers, launched in 1993. The purpose of this ministry is to alert Christians regarding the dangers of integrating psychological counseling theories with the Bible. We coined the word *psychoheresy* which means using a psychological substitution or addition to the Word of God in matters of the soul where God has already spoken. It is placing faith and confidence in the unproven and unscientific psychological opinions of men instead of in the Lord and His Word. Psychoheresy occurs when Christians do not believe in the sufficiency of God's Word for the soul/spirit issues of life. The ministry website provides books and

articles that document information regarding the evils of mixing the ways of the world with what God has already revealed in His Word.[3] When believers mingle these psychological theories and therapies devised by men with God's Word they dishonor God and deceive themselves.

My Background

Before commenting on GRACE's **ill-conceived recommendation on Dr. Jones III**, I need to disclose my background as it reveals my ability to do an independent review of the GRACE Report. I have four university degrees, two in mathematics. My doctorate is in educational psychology, and when we moved to California I was eligible to be licensed as a clinical psychologist and later as a marriage and family therapist. I served 35 years as an administrator at Santa Barbara City College, which has been designated as the "#1 Community College in the Nation."[4] I was Vice President, Continuing Education, and am Emeritus since I retired. Under my leadership my division of the college had over 50,000 different individuals enrolled annually; there were over 350 adjunct and some full-time faculty; there were also deans and coordinators who reported to me; and there were over 50 classified employees, some full-time; in addition, classes were held at 90 community locations. The campus credit total enrollment is currently 23,000 students, including 12,000 full-time students. Over the years I was involved in accreditation, which involves an extensive review of all aspects of the college. I was also an adjunct instructor at the University of California, Santa Barbara, as well as at three other major universities, where I taught graduate courses. While public colleges and universities are not the same as private colleges and

universities, there are many similarities. In addition, my wife and I have coauthored 21 books and written over 300 articles, many of which deal with psychotherapy and counseling. We have been ministering to individuals, couples, and families for over 40 years, including 16 years at a church where we ministered and trained others to do likewise. Our ministry has a generic Statement of Faith and I have ministered in churches representing a variety of doctrinal positions from Arminian to Calvinist and from Premillenialist to Amillenialist. Because of this, the ministry we direct does not recommend any particular church, denomination, or school. Thus, my coming to the defense of Dr. Jones III should not be considered an endorsement of BJU.

ABWE

Less than a month after GRACE began their investigation of BJU, the Association of Baptists for World Evangelism (ABWE) replaced GRACE as an investigative firm. I strongly recommend going to the URL in the footnote and reading the entire article.[5] The article reports:

> ABWE replaced G.R.A.C.E.— the victims' advocacy organization—with a new investigative firm in mid-February of 2013, after determining G.R.A.C.E.'s investigation was flawed and would not find the truth…. ABWE replaced G.R.A.C.E. with an independent investigative firm.

ABWE explains:

> We firmly believe that a truly independent investigation should be conducted in a way that is con-

sistent with the highest standards of the industry. The process of collecting evidence should be objective, and key interviews should be recorded and based on unbiased and open-ended questions that seek facts….

ORIGINAL STORY: Following lengthy deliberation and prayer, ABWE today replaced G.R.A.C.E.— the victims' advocacy organization—with a new investigative firm. G.R.A.C.E. was hired by ABWE in May 2011 to independently investigate the tragic child abuse by former missionary Donn Ketcham in Bangladesh more than 20 years ago, and ABWE's subsequent handling of the situation. ABWE board members and executives discovered that G.R.A.C.E.'s investigative process was "fatally flawed" and would not find the truth, nor advance the cause of reconciliation with the victims….

"We made this decision with great reluctance, and after repeated attempts to reach an agreement with G.R.A.C.E. about how to proceed in an independent investigation that would ensure objectivity, address our concerns, and be in accordance with industry best practices," said Larry Green, Chairman of ABWE's Board of Directors. "Unfortunately, the flaws in the investigative process that were brought to light were so significant that to continue with G.R.A.C.E. would hinder, rather than help us achieve the primary goals for the investigation in the first place—that of discovering

> the complete truth and facilitating biblical reconciliation with the victims"….
>
> ABWE specifically requested G.R.A.C.E. demonstrate its commitment to complete independence and autonomy in an investigation by basing all conclusions on a commonly accepted legal standard of proof. ABWE's Board of Directors considered this issue for investigations into other cases of child abuse in its 85-year history, and chose to adopt two common civil standards: clear and convincing evidence and preponderance of the evidence. G.R.A.C.E. has refused to do that, despite ABWE's urging.[6]

The GRACE Report on BJU contains some of the same failings as occurred with ABWE. I encourage readers to read the eight statements regarding what ABWE believes about GRACE and compare them with my critique of the GRACE Report on BJU that follows.

Bob Jones University

The GRACE Report reveals that "Counselors at BJU generally appear to place a high degree of emphasis upon determining the root cause of problems" (p. 61). We call this approach "problem-centered counseling." This kind of counseling is too reflective of psychological counseling and that is why we have been critical of the biblical counseling movement[7] and the work of Walter and Trudy Fremont, whose book and work are criticized in the GRACE Report. In fact, we wrote a critical review of the Fremonts' book *Becoming an Effective Christian Counselor;*[8] where the brunt of our criticism had to do with their methodology based on problem-centeredness.

We quoted from cases presented in the Fremonts' book and critiqued their counseling from a biblical perspective. However, I know nothing about their counseling of alleged sexual abuse/assault victims other than what I read in the Grace Report. I say this to demonstrate that I am not evaluating the GRACE "Investigatory Review" with a pro BJU bias. However, I am much impressed by President Steve Pettit's letter to the students in which he says:

> BJU is a unique educational institution. Our faculty provide you a world-class education that will prepare you well for whatever ministry or vocation the Lord calls you to. Our graduates prove this everyday as they serve the Lord in churches, Christian schools, mission fields and other professions around the world. It's no coincidence our graduates are sought after—100 percent of premed students who applied to medical school in 2014 were accepted; 84 percent of our accounting students had a job in their field or were accepted at a graduate school before they graduated this past year; senior engineering students average a 95 percent pass rate on the Fundamentals of Engineering exam; our nursing students regularly outperform national and state pass rates on the NCLEX; and in 2013, 80 percent of chemistry seniors scored in the 70th percentile or higher on the ACS Diagnostic of Undergraduate Chemistry Knowledge. These achievements demonstrate clearly the quality and value of the education you receive as a BJU student.[9]

Pettit's added comment reveals the godly intentions of BJU, as he says, "In addition our faculty and staff are here to disciple and encourage you well beyond your academic studies. Above all else, they want to help you live your life in a way that pleases God."[10]

GRACE

Before responding to the report, I first wish to comment about GRACE itself. GRACE has an integrationist view, which is a Bible-plus-psychology orientation. This is reflected in its "Partnerships," its investigations, and its recommendations. **By *psychological*, I mean clinical psychology and its psychotherapies.** GRACE's partnerships include the American Association of Christian Counselors (AACC) and Diane Langberg & Associates.[11] The AACC has about 50,000 members, consisting of licensed psychotherapists, unlicensed counselors and a variety of other members. We[12] have demonstrated AACC's integrationist position in a series of articles titled "The American Association of Christian Counselors: A Sham and a Shame."[13] **They are guilty of psychoheresy in that they do not believe in the sufficiency of Scripture for the issues of life normally counseled by psychotherapists and have substituted or integrated the psychological wisdom of men for what God has already provided in His Word.** Diane Langberg & Associates is headed by Diane Langberg, a clinical psychologist with a large staff of psychologically trained therapists. Her web site says, "Dr. Langberg is chair of the Executive Board of the American Association of Christian Counselors," and, along with another clinical psychologist, serves on the GRACE Board of Directors.[14]

A couple of years ago we did an article titled "New Tribes Mission & the Grace Report."[15] That GRACE Report exposed alleged sinful and criminal activities that occurred at the Fanda New Tribes Mission (NTM) boarding school in Senegal. The report received extensive media coverage. Because GRACE is mental health counseling oriented, they recommended "a perpetually standing fund of $1 million" for "mental health counseling" in addition to other treatments! We were opposed to this recommendation for it would lead NTM down the psychoheresy path, where they had never been before, and that is exactly what it did.

We mention GRACE's mental health counseling commitments, beliefs, and recommendations because that represents a point of view in the Christian spectrum of beliefs and practices, which is contrary to the history of BJU, as well as to BJU's commitments, beliefs, and recommendations through their teachings and practices. BJU believes in the sufficiency of Scripture for the issues of life normally counseled by mental health professionals; conversely, Grace **does not** believe in the sufficiency of Scripture for the issues of life normally counseled by mental health professionals. I recommend that any institution considering using GRACE first consider where GRACE stands with respect to the use of mental health professionals before using them. Unfortunately, in most cases it would not matter. However, in the case of BJU, it did influence the evaluations and recommendations.

BJU is a fundamentalist university and glad to be; GRACE, its board members, and probably their investigatory team are **not fundamentalists in the same sense** and are probably glad not to be. Fundamentalist organi-

zations would best be served by an investigatory team that would be theologically and functionally compatible with them as BJU's fundamentalist faith sets a framework for all their godly intentions and influences all levels of the organization. **GRACE and BJU are theologically and functionally a mismatch.**

GRACE seems to have little realization of BJU's fundamentalism and little appreciation for what that means. These are fundamentalist Christian families sending their students to a fundamentalist Christian university. What the *Student Handbook* spells out is what the parents want and expect their students to follow and for BJU to implement. Also it is what these students should expect, having signed the covenant at the end of the *Student Handbook*.

Conflict of Interest

We subscribe to a number of psychiatric and psychotherapeutic journals online and in print. At the end of many articles there is a disclosure statement where there may be a conflict of interest. I called the *New England Journal of Medicine*[16] and spoke with their editorial department and then read the journal's "Conflict of Interest Policies."[17] I have also read many research studies that have similar disclosures. I belong to a medical clinic; my primary care doctor is a writer. If he wrote an article about another local clinic that would put that clinic in a bad light so they would lose patients that may come to his clinic (just as BJU may lose students), he would need to refrain from publishing such an article. If my doctor did publish his article and were to recommend that the board impose "personnel action" upon the other clinic's

medical director (who is like a president), it would be considered a blatant conflict of interest!

Basyle (Boz) Tchividjian is the "executive director of GRACE" (p. 9) and a "Professor of Law, Liberty University School of Law."[18] Tchividjian, knowing the extent and sensitivity of the GRACE Report, should have anticipated that the wide publicity of the BJU GRACE Report would be detrimental to BJU, of which BJU would be uninformed. While it was known that Tchividjian is a professor at Liberty University (LU), what was not known by BJU was even the remote possibility of the extremity of the accusations and the recommended "personnel action upon Dr. Jones III." Because of the past experience of GRACE, such possibilities would have been known by Tchividjian. **LU competes with BJU for students**. Because of the GRACE Report and the headlines connecting BJU with sexual abuse victims, BJU will lose prospective students, some of whom will no doubt go to LU and some may eventually end up in Tchividjian's classes! Every student that BJU loses and LU gains amounts to about $30,000 per year for tuition, fees, room, and board.[19] **For a four-year program that's a $120,000 gain for every student who goes to LU who might have gone to BJU! With this obvious and costly conflict of interest, the GRACE Report should have been private!!**

GRACE Team

GRACE reports that "The GRACE team has included mental health professionals specializing in cases of child abuse, current or former child abuse prosecutors, and clergy experienced in addressing many of the spiritual

questions posed by victims of sexual abuse" (p. 8). Two major errors in the formation of the team are the absence of a chancellor or president of a fundamentalist university or college like BJU and the use of "mental health professionals." These are major reasons for some of the weaknesses of the report and specifically for GRACE's **fallacious recommendation regarding Dr. Jones III**. The absence of a team member who is in a role similar to Dr. Jones III led to some of the flaws in the GRACE Report and specifically to their **faulty recommendation on Dr. Jones III**.

Tchividjian, being an attorney, would be familiar with the expression "trial by a jury of one's peers." One legal website refers to it as "A fair and impartial trial by a jury of one's peers is a sacred right guaranteed to every citizen under the laws."[20] This "sacred right" was not granted to Dr. Jones III as the "investigatory review" moved to a trial of Dr. Jones III. Tchividjian may say that the GRACE investigation was not a trial, but **GRACE both tried and convicted Dr. Jones III absent any peer of Dr. Jones III on the GRACE team, thus denying him his sacred right.**

GRACE Questionnaire

"The confidential online survey…was accessed a total of 933 times, and GRACE received an approximate total of 342 completed surveys…. Of the 342 completed surveys, 127 indicated that they did not wish to communicate with GRACE further, and 215 said they wished to communicate with GRACE again" (p.14). GRACE, for reasons indicated, said, "Grace extended in-person interview requests to approximately 73 survey participants.

Fifty-four accepted GRACE's request for an interview. Approximately 50 participants self-identified as victims of abuse, 43 of whom met with GRACE in person" (p. 15).

GRACE began the survey by saying, "This confidential questionnaire is part of an **independent** investigation to examine the response of Bob Jones University and Academy to issues related to sexual abuse" (p. 239, bold added). **One should not equate "independent" with "objective." Independent means independent of BJU but not necessarily objective, as was discovered by ABWE. The conclusions and recommendations, especially about Dr. Jones III, are those of GRACE.**

Hearsay

There are a number of major weaknesses in the "Confidential GRACE Questionnaire." One major weakness, which affects responses to other questions, is in several of the possible answers.

In **Question 2**, "What is your relationship to Bob Jones University/Academy? (check all that apply)," several of the spaces provide as possible answers: "Friend or family member of current or former student"; "Friend or family member of current or former staff/employee…"; "Friend or family member of current or former faculty/administration" (p. 240).

In **Question 3**, "Please answer this question based upon your own experience or your knowledge of another's experience of sexual abuse (Check all that apply)," one possible answer is: "I know someone who is a survivor of child sexual abuse/adult sexual assault that

had/has a connection with Bob Jones University or Bob Jones Academy" (p. 240).

In regard to **Question 11**, "How would you describe the general attitude toward victims of child sexual abuse communicated by representatives of Bob Jones University/Academy such as administrators, faculty members, and other staff members?," **Question 12** seeks to know what Question 11 was based upon: "Personal experience/s and/or observations"; Experience/s and/or observation/s of friends or family members"; "Unknown sources/Hearsay" (p. 242).

The first problem with all such possible answers is that it involves **hearsay** information, which is defined as "unverified information heard or received from another; rumor."[21] **All such questionnaires completed by all third parties should have been rejected.** How dramatically the responses on the questionnaire from third parties affected the outcomes only GRACE would know, but it is certainly a major flaw in the investigation. Also, with all of the responders, other than those who signed release forms, GRACE has no evidence that the third parties who completed the questionnaire were what they claimed to be.

GRACE reports:

> Of the 601 respondents with BJU affiliation, 381 or 63.4 percent also identified themselves as either a survivor of child and/or adult sexual abuse, a person who knows a sexual abuse survivor affiliated with BJU, and/or someone who has first-hand knowledge of BJU's teaching and practices about sexual abuse (Refer to Table 2)" (p. 26).

In Table 2 one of the responses is, "I know someone who is a survivor of sexual abuse who has/had a connection with Bob Jones University or Academy" (p. 35). There are 171 respondents listed, all of whom should have been eliminated because of the possibility of **third-party hearsay** being involved. Consider the possibility of one person informing numerous friends and relatives about having suffered some form of sexual abuse (even verbal), complaining about "BJU's teaching and practices about sexual abuse," and then encouraging these individuals to participate in the survey. If such were the case, there would be much skewing of the results based on one individual's alleged experience. In other words, one person's complaints could have been multiplied and treated as many.

"Open-Ended Questions"

The GRACE Report reveals:

> The interviewer asked open-ended questions for all witness interviews and permitted all witnesses to provide any additional comments and feedback believed to be pertinent to the investigation or to ask team members any questions (p. 17).

GRACE failed to give BJU the list of the open-ended questions! There would have been no harm, but only helpfulness to those at BJU. The questions used by GRACE would not have violated any privacy needs for the witnesses but would have exposed the open-ended questions to public scrutiny, **which may be the very reason they were not shared**. Because BJU and the public are not privy to the content of the open-ended questioning by the GRACE team, only the team can know how

their open-ended questions could have affected the answers.

The expression "open-ended" suggests that the witnesses were allowed "to talk in a way that is not planned or controlled."[22] This gives the idea that, because their questions were open-ended, they were not controlled. **The fact is that open-ended questions are under the control of the questioner in many ways and are thus controlled.** A simple example is that of Carl Rogers, who has had more influence with psychotherapists than any other major psychological theorist.[23] Rogers developed a technique of treatment called "nondirective" or "client-centered" therapy. It is nondirective in that the therapist does not lead the client's attention to any topic or material. The client chooses. It is client-centered in that it proposes to allow the client to have his own insights and to make his own interpretations rather than looking to the therapist to provide the insights and interpretations.

Carl Rogers, in his nondirective therapy, claims that he does not influence or directly control the client in any way. It is a non-directive approach, because the person expresses herself any way she chooses. However, Jay Haley says: "Actually nondirective therapy is a misnomer. To state that any communication between two people can be nondirective is to state an impossibility."[24] Without intending to do so, a counselor will communicate some response and thus influence the client's thoughts, words, and actions.[25] Two independent studies, conducted ten years apart, showed that Rogers himself was, in fact, a directive counselor.[26] His response to his clients affirmed or avoided what they said and therefore reinforced or extinguished certain things they said. If

Rogers cannot be nondirective, it is certainly unlikely that any other psychotherapist or interviewer can refrain from being directive in one way or another, and **it is doubtful that the open-ended system by the GRACE team was not controlled by them, which could have influenced the results**.

Also, the open-ended questions could have included **leading questions**. One encyclopedia describes a "leading question" as "a question that suggests the particular answer or contains the information the examiner is looking to have confirmed,"[27] such as, "How badly were you hurt by being suspended by BJU?" or "Did you think that you received fair treatment when you received demerits at BJU?" As Tchividjian would know, "The rules of evidence and court procedure do not generally permit a lawyer to ask leading questions during direct examination."[28] **Such questioning, if it did occur, would certainly stimulate the types of witness answers in the report. ABWE reports that GRACE "Has asked clearly leading questions to interviewees, demonstrating what appears to be a strong bias in one direction"** (bold added).[29] This is completely hidden in the GRACE Report on BJU because they never revealed what questions were asked.

The GRACE team did have a point of view and knew what they were looking for. They were in control and their various responses to the witnesses could have encouraged some to amplify their answers in order to please their receptive audience. The GRACE team could have easily, though naively, encouraged the witnesses to exaggerate and embellish. After all, it is a well-known fact that conversations in psychotherapy between thera-

pists and clients reflect the theoretical orientation of the therapist. Freudian clients conform to Freudian ideology and thinking; Adlerian clients conform to Adlerian ideology and thinking, etc. Freudians are not purposely cloning themselves in their clients and Adlerians the same, etc. GRACE interviewers were not purposely cloning themselves in the interviewees. It just works that way "naturally" (Jer. 17:9). Because of its "investigatory" approach, interviewees may have thought that GRACE was **not** looking for positive statements about BJU, even though some were given (p. 18).

Witness Responses

GRACE lists a variety of locations where witness interviews were conducted, but did not indicate how the witnesses were segregated to prevent witnesses from speaking to one another (p. 17), which could truly contaminate the results. The case of ABWE reveals:

> …it was reported that G.R.A.C.E. housed them in the same hotel and allowed the witnesses to compare stories BEFORE the interviews, thereby tainting the testimony so much that it would not have been admissible in a court of law according to former VA Attorney General Mark Earley.[30]

Please be aware that BJU has its hands tied behind its back with respect to answering any of the witness responses, because by law all student records are confidential. Therefore the veracity of the student complaints cannot be challenged by BJU. Thus there is no way for anyone to know the exact truth behind what the witnesses said to GRACE.

GRACE reveals that:

> After the report was written, the GRACE team **blinded the document** with a confidential key to protect the identities of those who communicated with GRACE and are not named in this report. GRACE has utilized a system to mask the identities of those individuals who are not named in this report. **Each individual does not retain the same number throughout the report**…. Therefore no assumptions should be made about the identity of a witness based upon the numerical identification listed. Some documents were also blinded to preserve confidentiality (p. 21, bold added).

GRACE blinded the references, but that was not necessary. Instead it provides an obstacle for detailed research. All that would be needed to help set the record straight would be to use the same reference number for the same witness throughout the report. GRACE needs to go beyond merely stating it is to "protect the identities." GRACE needs to prove the need for their method, as **there is no logical reason for it, except that it conveniently hides both the number of witnesses who complained and the number of complaints each witness made absent their identities, which shields this important and needed information from BJU**. If GRACE used only the witness statements given in their report, it is unlikely that such a system would reveal the identity of any of their witnesses. The few instances where it might reveal the identity of the alleged sexual abuse/assault victims could easily be remedied by masking where needed.

GRACE says:

> After each in-person or phone interview, GRACE sent the witness a copy of his or her interview notes for review. Each witness could review the interview notes for accuracy to ensure that the notes fairly, accurately and completely reflected the interview session.… Upon the witness's final review of their interview notes, GRACE requested each witness to sign an attestation form approving the interview notes (p. 19).

The footnote to the above statement says, "Some witnesses did not return signed attestations" (p. 19). Here again, GRACE is blinding the numbers. What does "some" mean? "Some" usually means three or more. Was it five or ten? **It does matter, as it may significantly reduce the number of those who believe they have been harmed by the system.**

Although such witnesses did not return their "signed attestations," the footnote further says, "In very few instances have we used some information from interviews in which the witness did not return a signed attestation" (p. 19). Without a signed attestation there should have been no use of any information from them! In addition, what does "few" mean? "Few" usually means more than one. However, none should have been used. And, what does "some information" mean? Again, "some" means three or more, but no information should have been used. **GRACE violated their own restriction, so what was used must have been choice quotes to support their claims, absent the necessary attestations!**

GRACE reveals that "a number of other [four] survey takers were vocal in support of BJU" (p. 31). Yet GRACE only included a few of these, and, because of the way GRACE has referenced their interviewed witness responses, with few exceptions, it is not possible to tell the number of the "approximately 40 sexual abuse/assault victims" who gave positive responses and those who gave negative responses and where there may have been both positive and negative responses from the same witness. We can see from the above that there were at least four positive witness responses, leaving 46 alleged sexual abuse/assault victim witnesses. Then subtract "Some witnesses [who] did not return signed attestations" and the new total is known only by GRACE. Because GRACE used different reference numbers for the same witness, one should not conclude that there were 46 sexual abuse/assault victims (less "some" from the above) who gave negative responses. **Only GRACE would know the exact numbers and that fact is hidden by "blinding" the results. Blinding hides the possibility of knowing if a small number of witnesses produced the bulk of all the complaints!**

A person who had a legitimate complaint in part of the interview may have had something positive to say that was left out of the report. **All the comments made by the interviewees were not available to BJU, but could have been by masking out any identity information. This is often done in many research studies and reports.** By blinding the results in the manner they chose, GRACE could pick the statements used and control the content included in their report with no way for anyone else to check the accuracy. How much the

GRACE team may have forwarded all the complaints and not all of the compliments needs to be kept in mind when considering the results.

As a result of GRACE's referencing system, it is not possible to tell if most of the negative witness reports came from just a few individuals or from many. Grace is unwilling to reveal this. In addition, it is not possible in all cases to know if a witness response was made by an alleged sexual abuse/assault victim or someone else. That is important, but mostly hidden. All of the above problems are compounded by the fact that the GRACE Final Report is blinded unnecessarily to such an extreme and unneeded extent that they have not even reported the number of males and females who completed the survey or who were interviewed. **And a most serious omission is the absence of the types of sexual abuse/assault reported by each of the genders.**

BJU/BJA employs 1250 individuals. However, GRACE says, "Therefore, this report has limited the specific naming of any individuals to a limited number of BJU employees who had the greatest impact on the handling of abuse disclosures" (p. 22). Regardless of the rationalization used by GRACE to casually, generically, and repeatedly refer to unnamed administrators and faculty leaves all employees guilty by association.

GRACE named four faculty members, which made it convenient to collect all the statements made by each identified person. The four faculty members listed are Dr. Walter Fremont (deceased), Dr. Bob Wood, Dr. Jim Berg, and Dr. Gregory Mazak (pp. 245-251). GRACE was highly critical of the teachings of the first three men, but not of Mazak. **I want to make it clear that I am**

not defending Fremont, Wood, or Berg. However, after collecting into one document, printing, and then reading what Mazak said, I conclude that what he said was biblical, regardless of how any student might have responded. The importance here is that Mazak is listed along with the other three men, which results in guilt by association, without disclosing that Mazak's teachings were biblical. **This is a place where GRACE could have shown some grace!**

Alleged/Questionable

We wrote our first article on alleged sexual abuse/assault victims in 1993 and have followed various court cases on this subject over the years. *The Child Maltreatment 2012* report indicates about ten times more children suffer neglect and physical abuse than sexual abuse.[31] The worst and saddest victims are those who suffer all three. Anyone who ministers over a period of time will hear from those who have experienced all of the extremities of life and need sympathy, support, and most of all what God would have for them in such dire circumstances. We have personally ministered to victims and reached out in compassion to them. In our investigation of abuse cases, we have also become familiar with relevant research and literature.

Without underestimating the suffering of true victims, I do question the GRACE Report itself regarding its choice of which information to disclose and how to present it, especially because of potentially dire consequences. Serious accusations have been made by GRACE about "Sexual Abuse Disclosures and Institutional Responses at Bob Jones University" and carried by the na-

tional media. **The result of the GRACE Report could be the demise of BJU as an institution, which would subsequently end the careers and employment of 1250 individuals. Besides a dramatic loss of students there could be a substantial loss of support.** Like all universities, BJU depends on income from donations, wills and trusts. What will happen to these over the unnecessary public release of the questionable GRACE Report? GRACE unnecessarily withheld important and useful information that would not endanger the identities of the "approximately 40 abuse/assault victims." It is for these reasons that I will shortly be asking questions.

The word "alleged" means "Represented as existing or as being as described, **but not so proved**" (bold added).[32] The word "alleged" is used often with the word "perpetrator" throughout the GRACE Report, even though some have documentation to prove they are guilty. Except where there is documentation to the contrary, the "approximately 40 abuse/assault victims" in the GRACE Report should be labeled as "alleged." Therefore, where the GRACE report fails to supply documentation for proof, we use the adjective "alleged." GRACE has blinded in many ways, not only the full report, but also any detailed information about the alleged sexual abuse/assault victims.

On pages 15, 26, 38, and 40 of the GRACE Report, the number of alleged sexual abuse/assault survey takers is inconsistent. However, I have chosen to use GRACE's survey results on pages 15 and 26. Summarizing, I conclude that there were 150 current or former university or academy students (90% of 166) in the "Abuse Survivor Subgroup" (p. 26), of which 50 were to be interviewed

by GRACE (p. 15). Therefore another 100 (?) alleged sexual abuse/assault survey takers were not interviewed by GRACE.

While the student witnesses interviewed by GRACE may have revealed their treatment as alleged sexual abuse/assault victims at BJU, the 100 other students merely completed the survey, which would not indicate their treatment as alleged sexual abuse/assault victims. Thus GRACE would not know the details of those 100 victims or what their sexual abuse/assault was. GRACE defines child sexual abuse as "any sexual activity—verbal, visual or physical—upon a minor (a person 17 years of age or younger)" and adult sexual assault as "any type of sexual contact of an adult (a person 18 years of age or older) where consent is not freely given or obtained, and it is accomplished through force, intimidation, violence, coercion, manipulation, threat, deception, or abuse of authority" (p. 26). One can see the wide range of sexual abuse/assault from verbal to violence and rape. Such victims deserve our deepest sympathies and kindest responses. However, although all sexual abuse/assault is sinful and painful, it is important to clarify that the level of sexual abuse/assault and harm varies over the spectrum of possibilities.

The GRACE Report of interviewees includes some extreme cases, but one should not conclude that the extreme cases represent the majority of cases. GRACE has not only blinded the identities of the interviewees, but also blinded the known details of what alleged sexual abuse/assault was reported in the interviews, which could make a significant difference on how one sees their testimonies and the needed BJU responses.

There would be a huge difference between a verbal sexual abuse victim and a victim of rape. **Not noting such distinctions and not reporting the type of abuse experienced by the interviewees are major weaknesses in the GRACE Report.** There would be no reason not to report the number of each variety of sexual abuse/assault on the part of the interviewees, since such information need not expose their identities. **Not revealing the varieties of alleged sexual abuse/assault experienced by the witnesses and presenting only a few dramatic cases can easily lead readers to an erroneous conclusion**, i.e., that there has been a whole host of extreme sexual abuse/assault cases, such as rape, when there may have been only a few. To dramatize their case against BJU, GRACE highlights some worst-case scenarios, but these are not necessarily the norm.

GRACE says:

> The survey was confidential but not anonymous. GRACE requested names and contact information in the survey in order to identify a subset of respondents for comprehensive case reviews including in-depth, in-person interviews (p. 27).

The "names and contact information," as well as other personal information were provided by the interviewees to GRACE. GRACE was granted access to the student records if the student signed a waiver.

By GRACE's figures 150 (90% of 166), "Current or former university or academy students…reported personal histories of child or adult sexual abuse" (p. 26). GRACE stresses that all information was provided by "voluntary witnesses" (p. 20). Of course, anyone could

have accessed the "Confidential GRACE Questionnaire" and responded to it. However, aside from those who signed release forms for GRACE to access their BJU/BJA records, all of the rest of the survey takers are **questionably** BJU/BJA students or others mentioned above. But the ones who would not sign release forms after up to three hours of being interviewed by GRACE are doubly questionable. Also, because the sexual abuse/assault testimonies were accepted at face value, i.e., not proven, they are also questionable.

Other than the students who signed a waiver, GRACE cannot say for sure whether those surveyed who indicated that they were sexual abuse/assault victims:

> (1) were full-time, part-time, extension, or online students, which would influence their ability to make quality judgments about the institution;
>
> (2) had been academic drop-outs or been suspended from BJU/BJA, which might influence their testimonies as such individuals might have a negative view of BJU/BJA, which could affect their statements;
>
> (3) were at BJU/BJA for a brief period of time;
>
> (4) "discovered" their sexual/abuse assault in counseling or believed it to have occurred after reading a book, which has often happened.[33]

GRACE would not always know or be able to answer all the questions that arise from such possibilities. But, in such cases, testimonies would truly require a questionable label.

It is likely that some of the alleged sexual abuse/assault victim testimonies of both the 50 scheduled for interviews and the 100 (?) other survey takers could truly be labeled "questionable," unless documentation exists to prove otherwise. **GRACE apparently unilaterally accepted all the alleged sexual abuse/assault victim witness testimonies as true statements without investigating to discover those that are questionable or the varieties of abuse. It is unfair to the sexual abuse/assault victims who suffered violence to lump their cases into one general category covering the whole spectrum!**

LGBTQQI

I found on the internet an alleged sexual abuse/assault victim interviewed by GRACE who was subsequently interviewed by the media as follows:

> Jeffrey Hoffman, who spoke to GRACE investigators about abuse he suffered as a child by someone who worked at BJU at the time, said he was gratified to hear [President] Pettit's apology but hopes another is forthcoming…. Hoffman was born on the Bob Jones campus and attended school there through his first semester of his freshman year at BJU.[34]

I went to Hoffman's website and found him explaining why he became the "executive director of a fledgling gay rights organization." He says:

> So why do I find myself preparing to lead a group of LGBTQQI [Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer, Questioning, and Intersex] and af-

> firming former students and alumni of Bob Jones University down Fifth Avenue next month in our first-ever participation in New York City's Pride March? [35]

Hoffman then goes on to explain why in a diatribe against BJU and then declares, "I am not a fundamentalist. I cannot be a fundamentalist. God does not want me to be a fundamentalist."[36]

Hoffman describes the situation before the "GRACE Investigatory Review" started and prior to their survey. He says:

> Slowly, a group of lesbian and gay survivors coalesced as one by one we cautiously came out to each other in private messages or in the survivor groups. Then some bisexual people joined us, trans people came out, some questioning people would private message me or another of my colleagues here at [bjunity.org].[37]

It is clear that the LGBTQQI activist community was greatly galvanized to support GRACE's efforts and would be a strong motivation, through social networking, for them to volunteer for the GRACE survey and also to desire to be interviewed. This raises a question about the number of alleged sexual abuse/assault victims in the Grace Report who were LGBTQQI individuals who allegedly suffered because of their sexual orientation. **I would guess a goodly number of them after having visited numerous LGBTQQI websites.** Interestingly, every LGBTQQI website that mentioned both the GRACE Report and BJU agreed on two matters. First, they were all strongly supportive of the GRACE Report,

and, second, they were all condemnatory of BJU. One wonders if individuals from the LGBTQQI group were interviewed by GRACE, what they would look like if all the facts were gathered with respect to what alleged sexual abuse/assault was experienced.

GRACE would have some idea of the number of LGBTQQI individuals who were interviewed and what their alleged sexual abuse/assault was. **GRACE could have made that known without revealing the identities of the individuals, but failed to do so. This matters because of the vast polarity in theology between BJU and the LGBTQQI community, which could affect their testimonies. Because of the contentious difference in theological beliefs between LGBTQQI individuals and BJU and the fact that such individuals would likely be openly antagonistic to BJU because of their lifestyles, GRACE should have eliminated them as potentially hostile witnesses. At least BJU should know the number of such witnesses.**

Hoffman dramatizes his own situation and that of other LGBTQQI individuals. However, his alleged sexual abuse testimony is questionable for two reasons. **First**, his own sexual orientation could dramatically affect his evaluation of BJU. BJU and those who say they suffered because they were LGBTQQI have diametrically different biblical views. The biblical position of BJU is as follows:

> Bob Jones University believes that any form of sexual immorality—such as adultery, fornication, homosexuality, bisexual conduct, bestiality, incest, pornography, or any attempt to change one's biological sex—is sinful and offensive to

> God. God's inerrant and infallible Word, the Holy Bible, is unambiguous in its declaration that sexual sin, such as those named above, is an offense to our holy God. We believe God offers redemption and restoration to all sinners who will repent of their sin and seek His mercy and forgiveness through Jesus Christ— but that those known to be unrepentant practitioners of sexual sin cannot remain in a Christian assembly. Allowing them to remain in an unrepentant state, whether they be students, faculty, staff or volunteers, brings God's displeasure on the institution and forfeiture of His blessings. Further, we believe that Christian marriage has only one meaning and is defined by God in His Word and that His Word limits the definition of marriage to the joining of one man and one woman in a single, exclusive union. God the Creator ordains sexual intimacy to occur only between a man and woman who are lawfully married to each other. Sexual relations apart from such marriage is a sin which God will judge. Adherence to God's definition of marriage and the practice of acceptable moral conduct as the Bible defines it is expected of all who study at or are employed by Bob Jones University.[38]

In order to dramatize this difference, I quote Dr. John MacArthur's teaching on Romans 1:18-32. The following is from the transcript of his sermon:

> What you see in Romans chapter 1 is the sequence of what happens when God abandons a nation. First, verse 24 says, He gives them over to "the lust of their hearts to impurity," sexual

> sin, the dishonoring of their bodies among them. When God abandons a society, the first thing that happens is it becomes pornographic. It becomes obsessed with sex, obsessed with fornication, adultery, every kind of sexual behavior. We have gone through that already in the sexual revolution a couple of decades ago.
>
> The second thing that happens when God abandons a culture is found in verse 26, "God gave them over to degrading passions...their women exchanged the natural function for that which is unnatural...in the same way also the men abandoned the natural function of the woman and burned in their desire toward one another, men with men committing indecent acts and receiving in their own persons the due penalty of their error." At the end of that verse, "Receiving in their persons the due penalty" is the diseases that come consequent to homosexual behavior. And as you know, they unleashed on the world the horror of AIDS.
>
> But what it's saying here is that when God abandons a nation or a culture under His wrath, there will be a sexual revolution followed by a homosexual revolution. And we are living in this very condition.

MacArthur further says:

> Our responsibility is to tell people about the Kingdom of God and who can be in the Kingdom of God and who is excluded from the Kingdom

> of God. That's the ministry of the church; that's what we do; that's what every preacher must do. And I'm not the one who makes the terms. I am only the one responsible to God to proclaim what God has revealed. And I'm here to tell you that if you advocate a life of sexual sin, adultery, fornication, effeminateness, or homosexuality, you will not inherit the Kingdom of God. What that means is, you're on your way to hell, not heaven. This is the spiritual kingdom of those who are in Christ. The church is made up of people who were like this. Please notice, here's the good news, verse 11, "Such were some of you."[39]

Did the GRACE team, all of whom are professing Christians, affirm or warn the known LGBTQQI sexual abuse/assault victims about their possible eternal fate? **Because of the biblical condemnation of the LGBTQQI immoral sexual activity and the chasm that exists between them and BJU, such witnesses should have been excluded.**

Second, the reader is told nothing about what alleged sexual abuse/assault Hoffman and other LGBTQQI individuals might have suffered at BJU. Was it verbal related to biblically warning them about their sexual orientations or something more serious? However, Hoffman clarifies this for us in the following:

> So, what compelled me in 2012 to become an activist for gay rights?
>
> The abusive system that fundamentalism has become. The young man I know who attempted suicide after a "counseling session" at BJU. The

> young woman I know who survived a rape only to be expelled from school for having "spiritual problems." The middle-aged man who recently confided to me that he has never had a meaningful intimate relationship in his entire life. The memory of the near-daily rants from the chapel platform that echo in pulpits across the United States; those rants that drove me to despairing self-hatred and suicidal thoughts. The many people I have known over the years who received ungodly, hurtful counsel from BJU Administrators. The knowledge that the **homophobic hatred** that has seized so many within Christian fundamentalism is going to continue to destroy lives unless someone steps in and pulls them out of the fire…"[40] (bold added).

I have read Hoffman's testimony repeated similarly by others in various ways by various LGBTQQI individuals, including their invective "homophobic hatred," which is their shibboleth and can be seen repeated throughout the various sites. How much of this unbiblical, ungodly language did GRACE hear without having concern for their souls?

Having worked with activist groups on the right and the left, I say the obvious. Some individuals in activist groups on the right and on the left actually lie in their zeal to accomplish their goals. Some of the ones who were LGBTQQI individuals or fellow travelers, who merely completed the questionnaire and were not personally interviewed by GRACE, may have lied as a means of attacking BJU/BJA for what they regard as "homophobic hatred." They may have lied about being students at BJU/

BJA and/or lied in answer to the questionnaire questions. **Neither GRACE nor BJU/BJA would know for sure whether or not the questionnaire-only completers and those who did not sign the release form actually attended BJU/BJA or were ever sexually abused/assaulted victims, which is another major flaw in the GRACE Report.**

Question 13 in the "Confidential GRACE Questionnaire" asks, "Have you personally witnessed a representative of Bob Jones University /Academy make comment/s you found to be **inappropriate** regarding matters related to sexual abuse?" (Bold added.) This question is one more reason why those LGBTQQI individuals should be excluded as witnesses. While "sexual abuse/assault" is different from sexual orientation, there is a middle ground. The LGBTQQI individuals would know that the teaching at BJU/BJA would condemn such practices and be direct about the fate of such individuals, i.e., they would not inherit the kingdom of God. It's at the juncture of BJU beliefs and LGBTQQI accusations of "homophobic hatred" that the BJU teaching would be regarded by LGBTQQI individuals as very "inappropriate" and regarded as abuse of their sexual orientation and therefore "sexual abuse." After all, their very souls are at stake!

From their accusations and remonstrations against BJU on their websites, the LGBTQQI groups would likely be happy if the GRACE Report were to end the existence of BJU. But, the biblical antidote is found in Pettit's words quoted earlier: "Above all else [we] want to help you live your life in a way that pleases God." God will certainly bless such godly intents and efforts,

regardless of the "principalities," "powers," "rulers of the darkness of this world," and "wickedness in high places" (Eph. 6:12).

After searching the internet and visiting numerous LGBTQQI oriented sites, I conclude: that GRACE has had the overwhelming support of the LGBTQQI community; that this nationally connected LGBTQQI group supported the reinstatement of GRACE, which had been terminated by BJU; that LGBTQQI oriented BJU former students, such as Hoffman, were roused to offer to be interviewed by GRACE; and that many of those BJU LGBTQQI individuals alleged to be sexual abuse/assault victims and those friendly to their causes were among those who responded and desired to be interviewed.

As an interesting side note: after Tchividjian's GRACE team did their "Investigatory Review" that drew the support of LGBTQQI groups across America, his sister, Jerushah Tchividjian Armfield, moderated a BJUnity panel discussion of LGBTQQI panel members who are former BJU students, who expressed views that were contrary to BJU's biblical beliefs regarding various sexual orientations. In support of LGBTQQI individuals, Armfield says, "I want people to see and experience the love, grace and mercy of the Jesus I see in the scriptures."[41] If the LGBTQQI panelists were among the group interviewed by GRACE, that would add several more individuals whose testimonies should have been rejected.

In a recent blog Tchividjian refers to Philip Yancey's book *Vanishing Grace* and says:

> Yancey further contends that the success of movements for human rights, civil rights, women's rights, minority rights, gay rights, disability rights and even animal rights "reflects a widespread empathy for the oppressed that has no precedent in the ancient world; classical philosophers considered mercy and pity to be character defects, contrary to justice. Not until Jesus did that attitude change."[42]

Since he did not qualify his paraphrasing of Yancey, I assume that Tchividjian supports "women's rights" and "gay rights" as being in the same category as the other rights mentioned. "Women's rights" often include the choice for abortion and "gay rights" often include marital and adoption rights. Women's rights and gay rights are two conjoined causes in that those who support either typically support both. Tchividjian does not clarify where he stands on these issues, which may partly explain GRACE's strong support in the LGBTQQI community and possibly his support of using such individuals as witnesses.

Erin Burchwell

In addition to Jeffrey Hoffman, I found Erin Burchwell, who was also interviewed by GRACE. An interview with station WYFF4 with Burchwell reports the following:

> She grew up on Bob Jones campus and attended BJU in the late 90s. She says that's when a male graduate student assaulted her on and off campus over a 2 year period.

> "He did not rape me, so it can't be considered a rape case," Burchwell said. "But he molested me multiple times. I mean, probably 40 or more times."
>
> Burchwell claims when her parents finally reported the assaults to university administrators, they were told not to go to the police….
>
> Spokesman Randy Page said the university has no knowledge of any crimes against Burchwell on campus.[43]

Burchwell's testimony raises many questions. I assume that during the "2 year period" Burchwell was an adult. I also assume that she was an intelligent adult as she even completed a four-year degree at BJU. It is clear from her own testimony, "He did not rape me." Question: What was the alleged sexual abuse/assault, as this would make a great difference. Be aware that "40 or more times" of either unwanted sexual remarks directed at her or unwanted kissing would constitute sexual abuse/assault. Without knowing what the male graduate student did, it is hard to respond to Burchwell's accusation.

If Burchwell had been violated more seriously for "over a 2 year period…40 or more times," why did she not report it? She had 40 opportunities over the two years to do so. And why did Burchwell's parents wait two years before reporting the "40 or more times" of alleged sexual abuse/assault against their daughter?

Burchwell's testimony was repeated numerous times in the media, but not once did anyone ask her what the alleged sexual abuse/assault was and why she did nothing about the "40 or more times" for "over a 2 year period."

Without having answers to these questions there is no way one can respond, except to wonder why she would put herself "40 or more times" into such an environment where the same person could allegedly sexually abuse/assault her? Even her accusation almost 20 years later with no on-campus evidence is questionable. **Burchwell is an excellent example of the failing of GRACE to identify the type of alleged sexual abuse/assault that occurred with each witness.**

Thirty-Plus Years / "Almost Four Decades"

The GRACE Report investigation covers "over more than a 30-year time period" (p. 27) for the alleged sexual abuse/assault victims, but "almost four decades" for all the other witnesses. GRACE reports: "Bob Jones University currently enrolls approximately 3,000 students" (p. 6). On their website, GRACE reveals that "1 in 4 women and 1 in 6 men have been sexually abused as children."[44] During the thirty-plus years in which witnesses allegedly experienced sexual abuse/assault, there were over 50,000 students at BJU and Bob Jones Academy (BJA). The breakdown of genders has been about 55% female and 45% male. Based upon these figures there were over 27,500 females and 22,500 males attending BJU and BJA over a period of more than 30 years. Therefore, according to the GRACE statistic, there would have been 6875 alleged sexual abuse/assault female victims and 3750 alleged sexual abuse/assault male victims for a total of 10,625 alleged sexual abuse/assault victims attending BJU and BJA during the period covered by the GRACE Report.

When I first read the headlines and articles from the media, I thought this might be a run-away disaster of a huge number of complaints of "sexual abuse disclosures and institutional responses at BJU," rather than having to do with "approximately 40 abuse/assault victims"[45] interviewed, plus others (100 [?], p. 26) who only completed the survey. Grace may say that there were many more who did not report, but that is conjecture. It is known and axiomatic that those students who felt hurt by the system at BJU and BJA would most likely want to be heard. Under "Investigation Updates" (p. 12) the Report reveals:

> GRACE utilized various methods in attempting to inform any prospective participants about the investigation and encouraging them to take the online survey. GRACE focused its efforts on notifying current and former students, current and former employees, and friends and family members of individuals associated with the university. To that end, GRACE posted the investigation announcement on the GRACE website, Facebook page, and Twitter account. GRACE also requested various BJU related community groups to post the investigation announcement on various social media pages (p. 13).

GRACE details other extensive and intensive means of obtaining participants. Since the announcements would attract serious attention because of their **gossip-sounding overtones**, all who learn of it, including graduates and current students, would no doubt share it with others. Those who believe they were mistreated would most likely respond.

It remains that, according to GRACE's figures, there would have been over more than a 30-year time period about 10,625 BJU/BJA students who were alleged sexual abuse/assault victims, of whom "approximately 40" were interviewed plus others (100? p. 26) who merely completed the survey. And, the number of those who provided the bulk of the complaints may be considerably fewer, but that is hidden.

Julie Valentine Center

GRACE highly recommends the Julie Valentine Center for training and consultation (pp. 226, 229, 231). GRACE says: **"It is recommended that BJU refer all counseling for sexual abuse victims attending BJU to outside licensed and trained trauma counseling such as the Julie Valentine Center"** (p. 227, bold added). I called the Julie Valentine Center and learned that they are not a Christian organization and that there is no known Christian counselor there. The person who answered my questions said they "offered therapy by licensed professionals." Also, she did not know if any of their "licensed professionals were Christian."[46] Julie Valentine Center is a secular organization that is clinical psychology-psychotherapy oriented providing the kind of counseling (psychotherapy) to which BJU has never sent their students based on sound biblical reasons. **It is amazing that GRACE, after 22 months of work at BJU, never discovered this obvious and well-known fact and that they were insensitive enough to recommend a non-Christian psychotherapy–oriented organization!** This insensitivity on the part of GRACE is reflected in other parts of their report and recommendations.

Student Handbook

The end of the *Student Handbook* reads:

> By my choice to enroll as a student in Bob Jones University and having read the student handbook, I will strive to abide by all the policies in the handbook. I commit to do the following:
>
> - Exercise a spirit of humility, love, consideration and forgiveness while living in community with fellow students, faculty and staff; help create a campus environment conducive to spiritual growth through my attitude and actions; and encourage fellow students to keep their commitment to this covenant.
> - Apply myself wholeheartedly to academic studies and maintain the highest integrity standards in representing my work as my own.
> - Meet prescribed class and non-class attendance requirements.
> - Make spiritual growth and local church involvement high priorities.
> - Guard my Christian testimony both on and off campus, including how I regard and interact with friends of the opposite gender, exercising wholesome communication and avoiding gossip, and refraining from immorality or the use of alcohol or drugs.

- Honor the Lord in how I use discretionary time and select/participate in entertainment options that honor Jesus Christ and edify others. This includes using social media responsibly and avoiding sensuality on the Internet or in publications.

- Dress modestly, neatly and appropriately and honor BJU's dress code.

- Treat university property and that of fellow students with respect and honor regulations designed to protect individual and facility safety and security.

- Engage in gospel ministry through outreach ministries and other means as opportunities arise.[47]

After reading the entire *Student Handbook* the students sign and add the date. This is a student **covenant**. A *covenant* is:

> 1. A binding agreement.
>
> 2. A condition in a contract such as a deed or lease, nonperformance or violation of which gives rise to a cause of action for breach.
>
> 3. A contract.[48]

According to GRACE, "Students must read the university's policies each year, commit to knowing the rules, and adhere to them by signing the 'Bob Jones University Student Covenant'" (p. 147). I assume the students have read the *Student Handbook*, have agreed to it,

and will take seriously what it says, or why would they have signed it? And, if they do not take it seriously, what does that say about anything they sign in the future? Also I assume that GRACE would want the students to take it seriously and to be conscientious about following it. This begs the question as to why prospective students would sign the covenant, enroll as students at BJU, and some of them bitterly complain when they have earned demerits or been suspended when they were in violation. Within the *Handbook* is the "Disciplinary System" with the "Heart of Discipline at BJU," which contains the "Demerit System."[49] This is a very clear, understandable, and easy-to-know system. The students know the rules and what is expected of them. In addition there is an appeal process for the demerits. The *Handbook* does provide "Grievance Procedures."[50] **Prior to the current *Handbook* there was always a way to appeal academic or "Student Life" concerns**.[51]

BJU Women's Dress Code

Because of the wonderfully mild weather in Santa Barbara, some female students at my former campus appear mostly unclad. Are they sexually provocative? Yes! But do they realize it? No! They would be shocked by such a pronouncement. Women do not understand the "dynamics" of how their bodily appearance can sexually stimulate a man. BJU cannot be held responsible for any woman receiving the requirements of the women's dress code as blame versus cautions that are in their best interests.

GRACE says:

> BJU administrators deny charges that the university places blame upon a woman for man's lust toward her. However from the time of the university's founding, focus upon a women's dress has been a point of significant concern (p. 50).

I fault anyone at BJU who has been proven to have placed "blame upon a woman for a man's [exercising] lust toward her," but I fault GRACE for having a problem with BJU's dress code. Throughout the Grace Report are various quotes and examples of how BJU carries out their concerns about women's dress.

We have for several years collected information for a hoped-for future book on modesty. In it will be a series of dress styles over a period of time, which will reveal what we all know, i.e., the public undressing of the female body. One clear conclusion that we have come to in our research is that **women have no idea of how their "public undressing" can affect a man sexually**. In other words, women are not the best judge of this issue. They do need to be educated on this matter. Men are often sexually aroused when women naively "publicly undress" to be "cute" or "sexy," not realizing that beyond a certain point a woman will be sexually arousing to a man.[52] Men are responsible not to continue or pursue lustful thoughts towards a woman (Matt. 5:28). Women are responsible for the fact that what they look like can sexually stimulate a man (1 Tim. 2:9-10). Also, men and women should not cause one another to stumble (Rom. 14:13). **It is interesting that GRACE quotes Matthew 5:28, but not 1 Timothy 2: 9-10, which is a reflection of their imbalanced and biased approach.**

There are two subjects here conflated into one. Yes, the "focus upon a women's dress has been a point of significant concern" at BJU, and biblically speaking it should be. However, no one should place "blame upon a woman for man's [exercising] lust toward her." BJU is rightfully concerned and GRACE is rightfully critical of any harmful statements that were proved to have been said by some staff. However, the institution as a whole should not be blamed for what individual staff members say, unless the words are said by Dr. Jones III, himself. GRACE seems to have overlooked the fact that fundamentalist dress is part of a fundamentalist university and **I compliment BJU as an institution for their consistency as they should not be condemned for maintaining their biblical principles. Instead, GRACE should be criticized for attacking them.**

In Defense of Dr. Jones III

I do not know Dr. Jones III, in whose defense I will be coming, or anyone else at BJU.[53] **However, I am in disagreement with GRACE's recommended "personnel action upon Dr. Jones, III." GRACE has erred grievously and egregiously in this ill-supported recommendation. GRACE's ignorance and naiveté about college governance and the delegation of responsibility would be forgivable if their report were private, but when they impugn the reputation of Dr. Jones III publicly with their insupportable reasoning, it is appalling!**

The following is GRACE's condemnation of Dr. Jones III, which I will discredit:

> Robert (Bob) Jones, III: As President of BJU during much of the time that was the subject of this investigation, Dr. Jones, III is **ultimately responsible** for many of the difficult findings of this investigation. Dr. Jones, III has also repeatedly demonstrated a significant lack of understanding regarding the many painful dynamics associated with sexual abuse. Due to the central role Dr. Jones, III played in the many issues outlined within this report, it is recommended that **the university impose personnel action upon Dr. Jones, III** (p. 231, bold added).

The footnote to the above reads: **"'Personnel action" includes, but is not limited to, termination, suspension, probation, transfer, remedial education and training, or any other form of corrective action consistent with transforming the employee's teaching, conduct, or overall disposition regarding sexual abuse matters"** (bold added).

Be aware of anyone who carte blanche, with deficient evidence, and with insufficient experience in college governance blames college and university chancellors or presidents for what transpires at levels below them. Particularly be wary of anyone who has no idea of the gory and glory of the office of chancellor or president and condemns without sufficient proof.

The chancellor or president of any university or college is "ultimately responsible" for all that occurs under his administration, but should only be cited if he had knowledge before or afterward that an action of his would result in dire detriment to faculty, students, and others and had failed to take appropriate

action. As I will demonstrate, this is not true in the case of Dr. Jones, III! I repeat, it is unfortunate that no one on the GRACE team is or has been a college or university chancellor or president, who would understand the expression "chain of command" and how it works in a college or university, in spite of GRACE's references to it (pp. 138, 148, 187, 252).

I now discuss the various interchanges that occurred between Dr. Jones III and GRACE investigators. Before doing so, I searched the 301-page document for students who referred to Dr. Jones III by name and criticized him. I found only two, to which I will respond later.

In Loco Parentis

A definition of *in loco parentis* follows:

> The term ***in loco parentis***, Latin for "in the place of a parent" refers to the legal responsibility of a person or organization to take on some of the functions and responsibilities of a parent….. it allows institutions such as colleges and schools to act in the best interests of the students as they see fit, although not allowing what would be considered violations of the students' civil liberties.[54]

Public colleges and universities follow the legal requirements of the law. However since students, with few exceptions, are adults, *in loco parentis* differs at the post-high-school level. Although the GRACE Report is about BJU, the survey included Bob Jones Academy (BJA). Their website states: "Bob Jones Academy, located in Greenville, S.C., is a Christian school offering Pre-K through 12th grade education."[55] *In loco parentis* differs at the Pre-K through 12th grade from the post-

high-school level. Any complaints covering BJA must be viewed through the application of *in loco parentis* for Pre-K through 12th grade.

GRACE discusses BJU's use of discipline, counseling, and counseling records. They say, "GRACE observed that the conflation of discipline and counseling records means that the confidentiality of some counseling records is compromised" (p. 130). In addition there existed combined roles of counseling and discipline (p121). **The error in BJU's former system is that neither prospective students nor parents were informed of the implications of the counseling, discipline, and record keeping practices at BJU prior to enrollment. If they had known, I doubt they would have objected to it.** I believe a poll of parents would reveal a preference for the former system once *in loco parentis* is explained. As long as advance notice is given to prospective students and their parents, *in loco parentis*, as described by Dr. Jones III is far more biblical than the GRACE recommendations.

How serious is this "conflation" of discipline and counseling? **First and most importantly, the alleged sexual abuse/assault victims were penalized, but never penalized or falsely accused for what they did not do. If they had, that would be serious, but it never happened! The demerits or suspension were what the alleged sexual abuse/assault victims knew about in advance and for which they had signed a covenant. They rightfully deserved the demerits and/or suspensions that they rightly received, which is the most important part of how the alleged sexual abuse/assault victims were treated. Being a sexual abuse/as-**

sault victim is tragic, but for GRACE to equate that awfulness in any way to the conflated counseling/discipline that occurred at BJU is compounding the tragedy by adding another layer of victimhood and thus re-victimizing the sexual abuse/assault victims! In fact the ABWE report states, "One of the victims stated to ABWE that she felt that she was 're-victimized by G.R.A.C.E'."[56]

When Dr. Jones III was asked about the counseling-discipline arrangement, he saw no conflict in it and said, "We are there *in loco parentis*. So if the Dean of Students acts *in loco parentis*, he would be a disciplinarian when he needs to be and a counselor when he needed to be just like a parent" (p. 121). Dr. Jones III also remarks, "We are all there *in loco parentis* like most schools used to be and now very few are" (p. 128).

Dr. Jones III is correct. In contrast to 50 years ago, "very few are" functioning *in loco parentis* as has been the case at BJU. There are at least two things to consider with respect to the operation of *in loco parentis*. The first is the negative effect on some students. The second is the positive effect of this system on other BJU students when the *in loco parentis* operates properly. For example, GRACE reports that "The university, thus, placed a victim of childhood sexual abuse on probation, who expressed her struggles with the counselor and disclosed this information in a confidential setting" (p. 123). There are two issues here. One is placing "a victim of childhood sexual abuse on probation," and the other disclosing "information in a confidential setting." The fact is that the student deserved probation and actually "described her experience with the Women's Counselor positively and

offered many affirming remarks" (p. 122). Her covenant with the university requires probation and, in spite of the lack of confidentiality, there was a happy ending. The Dean of Women reported that "She's doing great and we are meeting with her regularly. After one semester of probation, the Dean of Women sent the victim a letter removing her probationary status" (p. 124). There are probably many other such happy endings where the student was placed on probation by the *in loco parentis* system.

BJU has "not made any changes to [their] discipline/counseling system at GRACE's request."[57] The system of counseling and discipline recommended by GRACE for sexually abused victims is that the information given be kept confidential, short of legally required reporting, and that no matter what is reported, no demerits or suspension should occur. In other words, GRACE recommends that sexual abuse victims should not receive demerits or be suspended for such violations as doing drugs or alcohol or stealing, etc. **Thus, one would be able to violate biblical commands and break one's covenant with BJU and not receive demerits or be suspended in such cases!** I am opposed to this carte blanche "free pass" approach recommended by GRACE, as I will shortly show in the case of Reference 777, **where the application of this principle as recommended by GRACE would have forced BJU into unbiblical compromise.**

While I agree that there must be confidentiality with respect to alleged sexual abuse/assault victims and that the system was used without advance notice to prospective students and parents, it is not an evil or wicked system that merits "personnel action upon Dr. Jones III."

GRACE cannot hold Dr. Jones III responsible for how his *in loco parentis* plan is wrongly implemented by others of which he is **not** knowledgeable. **Reading all the references in the GRACE Report to Dr. Jones III, I conclude that he acted in good faith with the best interest of the students, including the alleged sexual abuse victims**. GRACE reports:

> In discussing how BJU reportedly handles victims' disclosure of sexual assault, Dr. Jones, III stated, "Well nobody who is a genuine victim of rape would ever be expelled. She would be dealt with with great compassion and a desire to help her put her life back together. It would not be a discipline matter for the university. She would receive no discipline for that. That would be unheard of." Other BJU officials similarly remarked, "…our intentions have been to help people and not to hurt people" (p. 151).

Dr. Jones III says,

> If we cause … pain, if we can do anything in retrospect to ease that pain, we are ready; we want to…. It is not a perfect campus, but it is the best we know how. If our best has not been good enough, then we want to hear from those that we failed with so we can make it right the best we know how. That is where we are. That is us (p. 184).

This is a far cry from GRACE's mean and monstrous recommendation for "personnel action" against Dr. Jones III.

Cause Célèbre

Reference 777 is the prime cause célèbre[58] of the GRACE report and is their boiler-plate view of all the other cases. Before discussing the details of Reference 777, I begin with the following verses:

Old Testament:

> Psalms 25:10: All the paths of the LORD are **mercy and truth** unto such as keep his covenant and his testimonies.
>
> Psalms 85:10: **Mercy and truth** are met together; righteousness and peace have kissed each other.
>
> Proverbs 3:3-4: Let not **mercy and truth** forsake thee: bind them about thy neck; write them upon the table of thine heart: So shalt thou find favour and good understanding in the sight of God and man.
>
> Proverbs 16:6: By **mercy and truth** iniquity is purged: and by the fear of the LORD men depart from evil.

New Testament:

> John 1:14-17: And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of **grace and truth**. John bare witness of him, and cried, saying, This was he of whom I spake, He that cometh after me is preferred before me: for he was before me. And of his fulness have all we received, and **grace for grace**. For the law

> was given by Moses, but **grace and truth** came by Jesus Christ.
>
> John 8:31-32: Then said Jesus to those Jews which believed on him, If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed; And **ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free**. (Bold added)

Dissociating mercy from truth is an incomplete picture of God's love and distorts biblical teachings. GRACE has accepted and adopted this psychologically distorted biblical message because GRACE is integrationist, i.e., GRACE believes in the Bible plus the psychological wisdom of man where God has already spoken in His Word.

The case of 777 is that of a female student, about whom GRACE reports:

> In the mid-2000s, a disclosure of a rules violation to Student Life staff resulted in a victim's "withdrawal at the request of the administration." In this instance, 777 disclosed to her Assistant Prayer Captain, the Resident Counselor, and her Resident Supervisor that she "had been abused by her pastor since she was 15 years old and was expecting a child in January." 777's pastor, who was married with children, came to Greenville on several different occasions while she attended BJU. During these occasions, she said they went to Spartanburg and stayed in a hotel together. During one of the pastor's visits when she was 20 years of age, she became pregnant….

Please note that GRACE says that they "stayed in a hotel together" rather than "fornicated." GRACE goes on to say:

> Due to these dynamics, 777 told GRACE, "I had to break rules to go off campus, but **I didn't feel like I had a choice in the matter.**" According to administrative officials, 777 was asked to withdraw at the request of the administration for lying on the overnight passes….
>
> Several months after 777 left BJU, she called Dr. Berg to ask if she could be allowed to take her final exams since she had been very near the end of the semester. This request was denied. 777 stated that in the letter to her prayer group that she "**loved being loved and needed**" and "[the pastor] said he wouldn't make it if I walked away and he would walk out on his family and the church if I left. So, I stayed and kept my mouth shut." 777 also stated that Dr. Berg said, "it was some sort of consensual relationship," so he would not allow her to take her finals (pp. 153-154, bold added).

GRACE says, "777's rules violation needed to be put in its context. She was the victim of a large scale campaign of abuse by a shepherd who preyed on his sheep. She needed compassion and grace but received neither" (p. 160). I agree with GRACE that "777's rules violation needed to be put in its context," which is exactly what I will do. Let the reader decide whether 777 should have been given only "compassion and grace" or whether the required withdrawal was justified. **Should the Bible rule or GRACE's opinions? This one case of 777 is**

the litmus test of the integrity of the GRACE Report and its rash recommendation on Dr. Jones III! First, all rules are made with the understanding that there may be exceptions. **This is not a case where an exception is needed!** 777 is a sad case of a woman who at age 15 was preyed upon by her pastor. But, the story did not stop there. The relationship continued until she was 20 years old, at which time she was impregnated by the pastor. **She admitted her part in the fornication/adultery when she said she "loved being loved and needed."** 777 was for two years as an adult at BJU self-deceived and conscienceless about, first and foremost, violating the Word of God about the family, which is God's plan for mankind. When taken in its entire context, the case of 777 sounds like the Last Days of 2 Timothy 3: "This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves" (vv. 1-2a).

777 said of her five-year relationship, **"I didn't feel like I had a choice in the matter,"** but God has given each one of us a conscience and God will hold each one of us responsible for our own lives! At BJU 777 was an adult with adult responsibilities, including following rules regarding lying. GRACE's claim that for five years of being preyed upon by her pastor, she deserves BJU to consider 777 as having a diminished capacity[59] will not fly before the Bible, because that denies the spiritual capacity of believers to overcome by the grace of God, the Word of God, and the indwelling Holy Spirit.

GRACE's view of those sexually abused individuals appears to be more like the psychic determinism of Freud than the hope and power of the Spirit found in the Bible! Instead of victimizing sexually abused victims

more by emphasizing their damaged condition, the fellowship of godly brothers and sisters can minister faith, hope and love through the Word of God and the work of the Holy Spirit. Note that GRACE's antidote for the alleged sexual abuse/assault victims is their highly recommended Julie Valentine Center, i.e., psychological counseling, whereas BJU eschews such worldly forms of counseling. **The measure of every word read in the GRACE Report about alleged sexual abuse/assault victims and BJU should be: Who holds up the Bible and all it contains to these individuals who have been sexually abused victims and who re-victimizes them through having them revive the past and refocus on their victimhood?**

The Freudian-like psychological, fated-for-failure ideas that GRACE seems to have reminds me of a book about the early lives of eminent people, titled *Cradles of Eminence*. The authors, Victor and Mildred Goertzel, report on the early environments of over four hundred eminent men and women of the twentieth century who had experienced a wide variety of trials and tribulations during their childhood.[60] It is surprising and even shocking to discover the environmental handicaps that have been overcome by individuals who should have been psychically determined failures according to Freudian formulas. Instead of being harmed by unfortunate early circumstances, they became outstanding in many different fields of endeavor and contributed much to mankind. What might have been environmental curses seemed to act, rather, as catalysts to spawn genius and creativity. This book is not an argument for poor upbringing; it is an argument against psychological determinism.

A person need not be trapped in any of life's circumstances, for the Bible offers a new way of life. Put off the old man; put on the new. Jesus said to Nicodemus, "Ye must be born again," and He said elsewhere that new wine could not be put into old wineskins. Jesus offers new life and new beginnings. One who is born again has the spiritual capacity to overcome old ways and develop new ones through the Holy Spirit and the sanctification of the believer. One wonders why so many have given up the hope of Christianity for the hopelessness of psychological determinism.

777 signed a covenant; she knew the rules and signed knowing them. GRACE wants to have her excused for repeated lying, as an adult, to go out to a hotel to fornicate with her pastor several times, but that is not a biblical view because it lacks the truth part of the Bible. 1 Corinthians 6:9-10 says:

> Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, Nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God.

I counted at least a dozen ways from the *Student Handbook*, including drinking alcohol and doing drugs, that could have 777 suspended, but not according to GRACE standards. It appears from the tenor of the report that, if the pastor additionally had 777 doing alcohol or drugs or violating any of the other BJU standards for which she signed a covenant, GRACE would want her to

be excused because of her preyed-upon condition. **However, if 777 had violated the law in any way, because of her relationship with the pastor, the law would have held her liable, and GRACE should know that!**

In reading the *Student Handbook*, I find that Chapel service attendance is required Monday through Thursday; Sunday service and Sunday School attendance at a local church are also required. Thus, if 777 had attended BJU for two years she would have heard over 400 Bible messages while there, plus whatever additional Bible teachings occurred in class sessions. BJU is a fundamentalist environment with the Bible as the center of the teaching and preaching. Add to this that, over the five-year adulterous relationship with the abusing pastor, 777 had a mother and/or father, perhaps some siblings, friends at home and at BJU, and mature Christians to whom she could have turned during that period of time, but did not! And, what about deceiving her parents, who may have mortgaged their house to send her to BJU for two years? 777 has violated Ephesians 6:2: "Honour thy father and mother; (which is the first commandment with promise;) That it may be well with thee, and thou mayest live long on the earth."

BJU, in holding her to the rules, did her more biblical good than GRACE. 777 rejected the wooing of the Holy Spirit and turned away from numerous possibilities during her time at BJU and followed her flesh to the detriment of the pastor's wife and children and the deception of her parents. However, according to GRACE, she deserved better than being held to the rules at BJU. But her own parents and the pastor's wife and children deserve better than that

and God enables much better than that in His children when they seek Him. GRACE says, "She needed compassion and grace but received neither." **As I have shown, that is a false accusation against BJU, which is unfortunately spread throughout the GRACE Report to other cases and a major weapon of their fierce, but fallacious, attack on Dr. Jones III**.

Let's consider what could have happened under GRACE's recommendation if 777 stayed at BJU and did not get pregnant at twenty, but continued there for several more years working on an advanced degree. By GRACE's recommendation 777 would be free to fornicate absent any discipline because she was, according to GRACE, deceived. Then during 777's last year, prior to receiving her advanced degree, she became pregnant, having by then many years of an adulterous relationship with the same pastor. GRACE's recommendation would mean that she would not be asked to withdraw from BJU. Even after, by that time, having heard over 1,000 Bible messages plus messages heard in her classes, she would still not be considered responsible for her ongoing fornication/adultery due to her being a preyed-upon sexual abuse victim, according to the GRACE ill-advised system. **That is not a biblical view!**

777 is a prime example of the issue and problem with GRACE, as their psychological integrationist view controls their conclusions at times, and **their contorted conclusions are what led to the indictment against Dr. Jones III. 777 reveals the psychological integrationist gulf that existed from the beginning between GRACE and BJU and resulted in the kangaroo-court-like excoriating recommendation on Dr. Jones III.**

"Reporting and Involvement of the Law"

GRACE reports:

> When GRACE told Dr. Jones, III that mandatory reporting laws had been in place since the 1970s, he stated, "Okay. Well from that time onward if there was mandatory reporting requirements, then obviously they should have. If it didn't get reported, that is bad. It may not have been deliberate, they may have just not have realized it." Dr. Jones, III also stated that, because he does not handle these kinds of "things in the file on a day-to-day basis, those people are expected to know those things, and I expect them to follow the requirements of the law" (p. 184).

This is a chain of command issue where staff are hired and required to follow the laws. Any failure to do so rests upon the employees, but any failure to correct, once a failure is known by Dr. Jones III, rests upon him, which is not the case here and did not happen elsewhere according to the GRACE Report.

GRACE declares:

> Dr. Jones, III appears to have taken the position that sexual abuse need not be reported to the police when it is not mandated by law to be reported. Unfortunately, this position has resulted in needless suffering by those who came to university officials for help. For instance, one victim of sexual abuse continued to be vulnerable to sexual abuse in her home and eventually attempted suicide. Another victim of adult sexual assault continues to contemplate her self-worth,

> her faith in God, and has panic attacks. Another adult victim of a sexual offense has concluded that BJU officials believe she is a liar and suffers with depression. Reporting sexual offenses should be based upon more than legal principles driven by a legislative mandate (p. 193).

Accusing BJU the way that GRACE does should be based more on producing facts than providing dramatic snippets of stories to which BJU cannot respond. GRACE refers to the need for "unsurpassed compassion" from BJU towards alleged sexual abuse/assault victims (p. 193). However, **I do not see "unsurpassed compassion" towards BJU from GRACE with respect to fairness and fullness in presenting the whole stories instead of small pieces of them. The false façade of protecting the witness has nothing to do with a requirement to make justifiable accusations absent names so that justifiable explanations can be offered by BJU!**

GRACE says of Dr. Jones, III's response to their concerns regarding "reporting and involvement of the law": "Dr. Jones III stated that the university does not involve the law when it is unnecessary to do so, but will when an issue is 'deserving of the law's attention or mandated by the law to do [so]'" (p. 183). GRACE further reports:

> GRACE received some complaints that perhaps BJU did not want to report these types of situations because they would draw negative public attention that might affect its reputation. To this, Dr. Jones, III responded, "[w]ell naturally, you don't want unnecessary negative attention to be

> brought. But we have historically, if somebody has stolen, if somebody is a shoplifter, anything like that is taken to the police. Anything that requires the law to be involved, the law is involved in. Not just about sexual abuse, but about anything." … Dr. Jones, III also remarked, "[w]here a law has been broken, we deal with the law enforcement… You are always going to handle something short of the law if you can in good conscience and there is no demand of the law for something to be handled by the law. But anything that is deserving of the law's attention or mandated by the law to do, you turn it over to the law." (pp. 277-8)

Perfectly said! However, GRACE, lacking a team member with Dr. Jones III's level of administrative experience, would not know that.

Clery Act

As the GRACE Report indicates, there are federal and state laws that are mandated to be followed (pages 163-177), and BJU has followed those laws! The Clery Act is a "federal law that requires colleges and universities across the United States to disclose information about crime on and around their campuses."[61] At the Clery website there is a long list of potential offenses that are mandated to be reported. Also, there is a long list of colleges and universities that have been found in violation. I went to their website and looked to see if BJU was listed among the guilty colleges and universities. BJU was not there. However, Liberty University (LU),

Tchividjian's school, was on the list as it had been cited and fined under the Clery Act.[62]

The original complaint record (2006) states, among other items, that "Specifically, the complainants allege that the University failed to treat the April 2005 incident as a reported forcible sex offense." For this and other violations, LU was fined $165,000, later reduced to $120,000, which LU paid.[63] Dr. Jerry L. Falwell Jr. is very familiar with the details and signed the agreement to pay, but there was no "personnel action" imposed upon him or his father *in absentia*, who was Chancellor/President at the time, but is deceased.

If I conducted an "Investigatory Review of Psychoheresy at Liberty University," the institution would be guilty of not believing in the sufficiency of Scripture for the issues of life normally counseled by psychotherapists and also guilty of substituting the psychological wisdom of men for what God has already provided in his Word. Psychoheresy at LU is a significant, but subtle, Last Days' deception about which God's people have been warned (Matthew 24). However, I would not recommend personnel action against Dr. Jerry L. Falwell Jr. or *in absentia* against his father, even if they are guilty of what Dr. Jones III is falsely accused.

In response to my questions, the BJU office of public relations said: "BJU has never been cited for being in violation of any laws, whether federal (including Title IX or Clery) or state laws, relating to child sexual abuse or adult sexual assault."[64] BJU public relations office further states:

In the GRACE report—the term "abuse" is used. In their report, GRACE uses the term "abuse" when they are actually referring to adult sexual assault. In footnote 2 on page 26 of the final report, GRACE states, "Unless otherwise specified, GRACE has adopted the broader definition of sexual abuse that subsumes child sexual abuse and adult sexual assault." As an educational institution, we have to look at legal definitions of abuse and assault rather than definitions provided by the American Psychological Association and used by GRACE throughout the report.

For child sexual abuse, all Bob Jones Academy and Bob Jones University employees are mandatory reporters. While state law would deem only certain employees as mandatory reporters, we felt it was important to go above the requirement of state law and make each employee a mandatory reporter.

For adult sexual assault, we are bound by federal law. One of those laws provides that unless reporting is mandated by law institutions of higher education are to provide adult student victims the option to (1) notify proper law enforcement authorities, including on-campus and local police; (2) be assisted by campus authorities in notifying law enforcement authorities if the victim so chooses; and (3) decline to notify such authorities. This wording comes from the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA). For BJU officials to report adult assault without the consent of

> the victim would violate her rights. We would always encourage a victim to report and would assist them in doing so. Under South Carolina law, if we have reason to believe minors may be in danger, then it would be a mandatory reporting situation. This could be the case if there are younger siblings at home or if the person's professional career (pastor, teacher, etc.) has them in regular contact with minors.[65]

BJU has not had one Clery Act violation as occurred at Liberty University, Tchividjian's school!

GRACE's research on "Sexual Disclosures and Institutional Responses" at BJU goes back "almost four decades." "Almost four decades" goes back a number of years prior to the Clery Act, which was signed into law in 1990. Unfortunately few of the witness complaints are specifically dated. Therefore the reader cannot see if the witness experiences occurred pre- or post-Clery Act.

"Case #5" (Off Campus)

Case #5 is among a group of cases that occurred "Prior to 2010." Case #5 is about "a BJU student [who] engaged in possible criminal behavior with minor boys who were attending the Bob Jones Academy in the mid-2000s…. A number of the boys expressed concern that the BJU student was 'perverted,' and wanted 'nothing to do with him'" (p. 288). GRACE states:

> The reports indicated the adult BJU student's range of suspicious and/or potentially criminal activity with minors: requesting that minors pose for nude photographs, taking minors off campus,

> asking repeatedly for a minor to measure his sexual organ, requesting to masturbate and/or watch others masturbate, and making specific statements about engaging in sexual activity (p. 288).

GRACE reports:

> After BJU officials concluded their own investigation, the alleged perpetrator was required to withdraw at the request of the administration for a period of one year and did not return to BJU to complete his university education. There is no indication that BJU reported any of the alleged criminal activities of this student to any outside law enforcement agency (p. 288).

Aside from "taking minors off campus" we are not told if any of the other accusations on the list actually happened. I assume that they did not happen or this would have been an immediate reporting. GRACE indicates that, since the "alleged perpetrator's actions appeared to be 'predatorial in nature,'" the case should have been reported to the law (p. 289). Case #5 apparently is not a case about any sexual abuse or harm that actually occurred, but rather about possible sexual abuse that, according to GRACE, should have been reported.

GRACE interviewed Dr. Jones III, who stated, "**I am not sure** there is anything. I am not an expert on the law, but whether there is something here clear enough that absolutely this should have been turned over to law enforcement. I can't say that. I can't say that absolutely should have been. That is a judgment call" (p. 289, bold added). Of course, "I am not sure" means that Dr. Jones III is not certain. In response to whether this case should

have been referred to the law, Dr. Jones III indicated that "law enforcement makes that judgment. But this is not such a case as that" (p. 289). Earlier I quoted GRACE as saying:

> Dr. Jones, III also stated that, because he does not handle these kinds of "things in the file on a day-to-day basis. those people are expected to know those things, and I expect them to follow the requirements of the law" (p. 184).

When Dr, Jones III was asked about another case, he said,

> I expected everybody to follow-through on every report that they got to find out the veracity of it and to deal with whatever the truth was and to get to the truth. That is the way we operate…. Public Safety People… know what they are supposed to do (p. 277-278).

I conclude that Dr. Jones III is not certain, but he was sharing what he thought, since there are others who are expected to know and to do what the law requires.

Any college or university top administrator would have simply explained that Dr. Jones III would not decide what actually happens in such cases; the decision making is delegated to others. There is a chain of command. The lead administrator does not handle such things, as Dr. Jones III says, "on a day-to-day basis," but there are "people [who] are expected to know these things" and they are expected "to follow the requirements of the law." **Dr. Jones III is neither the Public Safety Officer nor the Dean of Women! Likewise, the same is true**

for Falwell Sr. and Falwell Jr. at Liberty University. GRACE may be experts on certain matters, but they are amateurs when it comes to college governance! I repeat, if GRACE had had a university chancellor or president on their team, this would have been simply explained to them.

At the end of reporting on Case #5, GRACE says:

> Dr. Berg said of the incident, "[k]nowing what we know today, we blew it…I don't have any defense except that I was not thinking that way"…. Dr. Berg added, "[w]ell if I look back on it where I am now…[h]e would have been arrested and dealt with and expelled for commission of a felony (p. 289).

This elevating Dr. Berg's statement by GRACE is bizarre and ironic, to say the least! GRACE quotes Dr. Berg's response on page 289 to prove that Case #5 should have been referred to law enforcement, **when for 288 pages GRACE attempts to prove that Dr. Berg should not be trusted in the area of sexual abuse. Period!** GRACE concludes their recommendation on Berg by saying: "It is also recommended that Dr. Berg not be allowed to speak or **consult** on any issue related to counseling on or off campus" (p 231, bold added). Yet GRACE "consult[s]" with him on this issue and reveals that Berg is in disagreement with Dr. Jones III!

Two Accusations

It is alleged by GRACE that reporting to outside authorities should have been done at times and that there may have been an attitude on the part of some staff that such reporting could result in a bad reputation for the

school. However, there is no way to corroborate such accusations because of Grace's blinding the report. There are only two instances of a direct accusation by an alleged sexual abuse/assault victim against Dr. Jones III. One instance of an alleged sexual abuse victim is reported on page 33 and the other, Case #1, on pages 276-279. There is a similarity of the two cases, but I will respond to them separately.

"Case # 1" (On Campus)

The reader is told in the alleged sexual abuse/assault victim case that "Witness #1 (the victim) reported to GRACE that she attended BJU in the late 1980s and was sexually assaulted on campus while a student." She said she was assaulted in a practice studio by the perpetrator, a "former student." GRACE says, "After the assault, the victim stated that the alleged perpetrator attempted to kidnap her, but the victim escaped into a nearby campus building to hide as the alleged perpetrator drove away" (p. 276). GRACE then reveals, "After the rape, the victim wrote a letter to her boyfriend disclosing the incident." The footnote indicates that she did not reveal to her boyfriend "fully what happened" and that "the letter describes with significant and disturbing details the manner in which the alleged perpetrator came to campus, found her in the practice studios, pinned her to the ground, straddled her, and touched intimate areas of her body as she struggled to get away" (page 276). This incident and its aftermath raise questions. We are expected to believe that after being raped she got herself together and passed others on campus as she "escaped into a nearby campus building to hide." Why didn't she look shocked to others? Why didn't she ask for help?

Why wouldn't she divulge to someone the rape that was supposed to have just happened in the violent way she described?

Witness #1 says she was raped, but extraordinarily she did not report the rape to anyone at BJU or elsewhere at the time. Instead she wrote a "letter to her boyfriend disclosing [only part] of the incident." How long after the rape did she do this? How long before the boyfriend received the letter? How long did it take the boyfriend to turn over "Witness #1's letter to a BJU Public Safety Officer," who "did not recall the incident" (page 276)? Rapes are not easily forgotten, even by those to whom they are reported, and since rapes were unusual on the BJU campus, one would think the officer would have remembered a rape, even many years later.

GRACE describes the interchange between the Dean of Women and Witness #1:

> … the victim explained that though she did not explicitly disclose to the Dean of Women having been raped, she said she expressed fear to the Dean of Women that the attack may have caused her to become pregnant. Witness #1 also told GRACE that the Dean of Women said she needed to call her parents and "…said that it might be good if my parents made an appearance." Witness #1 said that the Dean of Women talked to them and "the way she talked was that 'we had a little incident on campus, everything is fine now,' and that she 'just thought they should know'" (p. 277).

This report is startling, to say the least, and raises more questions. Wouldn't the Dean of Women conclude a rape had occurred from Witness #1 telling her that "the attack may have caused her to become pregnant"? Did Witness #1 not tell her parents about her rape and fears? Would not a normal parent be terribly upset, want something done, and find out why something was not done immediately? The final responsibility to report to the law or explain why it was not reported belongs outside the chancellor or president's office. If it should have been reported and the Public Safety Officer did nothing about it, then he would be guilty, but not Dr. Jones III. In fact, if the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) were in place at the time, the Public Safety Officer could have been violating Witness #1's rights by reporting the alleged rape to law enforcement without her permission.

GRACE quotes Witness #1 saying, "I got a call slip to appear seven minutes after chapel." Question: Has Dr. Jones III ever requested to meet with anyone 7 minutes, 9 minutes, 11 minutes after or before any meeting?! Witness #1 continues:

> I didn't know how or why so many people knew…. The [T]hird was the one talking to me. He told me that I had a choice to make that I could be positive and trust in God or I could let the enemy take over my life. It was a simplistic either/or. **There wasn't compassion of how I was feeling right then.** I was glad he didn't lecture me. I really thought I was going to be **in trouble** (p. 277, bold added).

"[I]n trouble" for what? This last statement raises one more question about this entire incident. In trouble for being raped?!

Witness #1's remark, "There wasn't compassion of how I was feeling right then," begs the question, "Can a woman always tell when a man is being compassionate and do men always show their feelings?"[66] This issue is interestingly covered in psychotherapy research, which reveals that men do not normally express their emotions as women do. In fact, the need for expressing emotions and talking about them generally discourages men from seeking or participating in psychotherapy. *Psychology Today* discusses this topic in an article titled "Man's Last Stand: What Does It Take to Get a Guy into Therapy?"[67] According to the article, men are being cajoled or cudgeled into the counselor's office in greater numbers than ever before, and in the process they are being brainwashed to think womanly thoughts and to learn that, to save their marriages and salvage their other relationships, **they "have to become a woman"**[68] (bold added).

According to GRACE:

> Dr. Jones, III disclosed that he had **no memory of this particular situation or the chapel conversation with the victim**. Dr. Jones, III expressed, "…letting things drop that should be attended to is just not my style. Nothing irks me more. I expected everybody to follow-through on every report that they got to find out the veracity of it and to deal with whatever the truth was and to get to the truth. That is the way that we operate" (p. 277, bold added).

> When asked whether this case [#1] should have been reported to the local law enforcement Dr. Jones, III replied, "I don't know the case. I can't comment on it." But he claimed, "our public safety people know the law and work closely with our law enforcement, and we have a criminal justice program. They know what they are supposed to do." Dr. Jones, III also stated, "[i]f they were supposed to report this, then they better have reported it. And if they should have and didn't, I would be the first one to insist that they do. So, they're delegated the authority under [the] law to know what they are supposed to do, and if they were supposed to do it, they would have done it (p. 278).

Perfectly said, but imperfectly understood by GRACE through naiveté and not knowing the role and responsibility of a college or university chancellor or president.

Witness #1's testimony as provided by GRACE raises more questions than it answers. **Witness #1's story is unbelievable and should have been realized as such by GRACE. There is nothing in the Witness #1 case that would lead a rational person to recommend "that the university impose personnel action upon Dr. Jones III" (p. 231). However, Witness #1's story does raise the question of how many other unbelievable stories might have been told and believed during the investigation.**

Page 33 Witness Quote

On page 33 a witness says:

> I received a slip in my P.O. [Box] to report to the stage following a specific chapel service. At that time, Drs. Bob, Jr. and III told me that they were sorry such a thing happened but that I now had the choice to honor God by my response and not be selfish in sharing the experience with others and gaining inappropriate attention for the school.

While Witness #1 (in Case #1) had reported being raped to the GRACE team, the witness statement on page 33 cannot be evaluated. On page 33, preceding the above witness quote, there are three other witness quotes. All of the witness quotes seem to belong to the same witness. However, because of GRACE blinding their witness statements, each of the four has a different reference number and cannot be considered to have been said by the same person. Also, the above witness quote seems similar to what Witness #1 said, but we cannot conclude that either. Witness #1 is a woman who told GRACE she had been raped, but there is no mention of the witness quoted above of having been raped. **Thus it is doubtful that the woman quoted above had reported having been raped or "Drs. Bob, Jr and III" would not have responded in the abrupt, unsympathetic, and callous way she described.**

GRACE has negligently used the above witness statement without a subsequent response from Dr. Jones III. Thus, without any information provided regarding why the student was asked to appear and absent a re-

sponse from Dr. Jones III, it would be unreasonable to hold him guilty for anything related to the above witness quoted on page 33.

Summary: GRACE Report Failures

The GRACE Final Report has failed in a number of ways which are summarized here:

- **The first and greatest failure on the part of the GRACE Report is its atrocious and outrageous recommendation on Dr. Jones III.**
- The GRACE Report on BJU contains some of the same failings as occurred with ABWE.
- GRACE and BJU are theologically and functionally a mismatch, which influenced the resulting evaluations and recommendations of the Report.
- GRACE team's lack of having the same fundamentalist beliefs as BJU influenced their evaluations and recommendations.
- In contrast to BJU, the GRACE team follows a psychological integrationist position, which influenced its evaluations and recommendations.
- Because of the conflict of interest as it applies to Basyle (Boz) Tchividjian, the "executive director of GRACE," the Report should not have been made public.
- The GRACE team lacked a fair balance by not having a team-member who is in a role similar to Dr. Jones III.

- The "Confidential GRACE Questionnaire" permitted hearsay information from third parties, which could have dramatically affected the questionnaire results.

- GRACE failed to provide BJU with the open-ended questions used in their interviews, which may have contained leading questions.

- GRACE may not have segregated the witnesses they interviewed at the off-campus locations, which could have tainted their testimonies, as occurred with ABWE.

- GRACE unnecessarily scrambled the reference numbers so that it is possible that most of the accusations could have come from just a few individuals.

- GRACE unnecessarily did not reveal important witness data, which would not have revealed identities of the witnesses, such as: (1) number of each gender, (2) number of witnesses who were solely positive, (3) type of enrollment (full-time, part-time, extension, or online), (4) number of academic dropouts or suspensions, (5) length of time at BJU, (6) number of LGBTQQI individuals.

- GRACE failed to provide the type and level of sexual abuse/assault reported by each witness.

- GRACE failed to confirm whether or not the questionnaire-only completers and those who did not sign a release form actually attended BJU/BJA or were ever sexual abuse/assault victims.

- GRACE should have eliminated all LGBTQQI individuals from the Report, because they would be openly antagonistic to BJU for what they regard as "homophobic hatred."

- Referral to the Julie Valentine Center showed either ignorance or great insensitivity of the BJU stand on the Bible for ministry versus the psychological wisdom of man.

- A number of testimonies lacked authenticity, were therefore suspect, and thus should not have been used as evidence in the GRACE Report.

- Tchividjian needs to describe his belief in "women's rights" and "gay rights," as these beliefs could have influenced the acceptability of the volunteer witnesses and the evaluations and recommendations made by GRACE.

Conclusion

The worst part of the GRACE Report is the seemingly smug and self-righteous, overblown, undeserved indignation against BJU. The idiom, "People who live in glass houses shouldn't throw stones" applies here. **GRACE's psychological integrationist views are far more detrimental to the church at large than BJU's mere conflation of counseling and discipline.**

For GRACE to indict Dr. Jones III on the shaky evidence they provide is shabby enough, but to publicize this to the entire world is unconscionable. Contrary to what GRACE claims, they are in gross error in their reckless recommendation regarding Dr. Jones III. It is said

that "The evidence demands a verdict," but in the case of Dr. Jones III, "The verdict demands evidence." I have gone through the evidence by reviewing each instance in which Dr. Jones III is mentioned in the GRACE Report and find the evidence unclear, unconvincing, unavailable or unbelievable at times. **The verdict is in: Dr. Jones III is not guilty as spuriously and sanctimoniously recommended by the GRACE Report!**

GRACE has revealed some allegedly biblical, but not legal, shortcomings at BJU, but no student was proven to be falsely accused or falsely penalized in the counseling/discipline conflation. **In the described cases, every student was disciplined according to their signed covenant with BJU!** The number of alleged sexual abuse/assault victims who complained is unknown due to GRACE's intent, and the many serious complaints may have been made by just a few alleged sexual abuse/assault victims.

We are living in the Last Days prior to the Lord's return. Jesus spoke about those days in Matthew 24 where there would be much deception. One of the Last Days' deceptions is what we call "psychoheresy." GRACE is a psychoheresy organization that promotes a Bible-plus package elevating the psychological opinions of man where the Lord has already spoken in His Word. Unfortunately most contemporary churches in the English-speaking countries have fallen for the foolish, fallacious, and spiritually fraudulent psychological substitute for the sufficiency of Scripture for the issues of life, which we call "psychoheresy." Few people realize how culture-bound psychotherapeutic theories and practices actually are and how foreign our psychological society is to other

cultures around the world and especially to our forefathers of the faith.[69]

I hope and pray that Bob Jones University does not fall victim to GRACE's shocking and spiritually scandalous suggestions and solutions to remedy any deficiencies and particularly that the BJU Board rejects and reacts against GRACE's proposed persecution of Dr. Jones III. While psychoheresy is the primary reason I took on this task, the auxiliary reason was because of the outright, outrageous, and outlandish recommendation against Dr. Jones III, whom I do not know.

Addendum

The 301-page GRACE Final Report is available at: http://www.sccadvasa.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/Final-Report.pdf. **I urge readers who believe as I do that there has been a great miscarriage of justice in GRACE's recommendation regarding Dr. Jones III to email Chancellor@bju.edu.**

Article 2

How the LGBTQQI Community Victimized BJU/BJA

So why have I taken on the task of reading and responding to the 301-page GRACE Report and the 89-page Bob Jones University (BJU) student handbook and am now writing a second article? As I revealed in my original article, "A Critical Review of the 'GRACE Final Report' on Bob Jones University," the GRACE Report survey is frightfully flawed and therefore could be completed by anyone worldwide, whether a valid respondent or not. [1] The undeserved worldwide condemnation of BJU/BJA (Bob Jones Academy) and the indiscriminate incrimination of Dr. Bob Jones III resulted in the victimization of BJU/BJA. **This victimization of BJU/BJA has been systematically and scrupulously carried out by the worldwide Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer, Questioning, and Intersex (LGBTQQI) activist community as they ganged up on BJU/BJA and its chancellor, Dr. Jones III, with seemingly no one coming to their defense.** I will now expand on this

ill-conceived GRACE Report survey with its ill-gotten results that could direct prospective students away from enrolling in BJU/BJA and instead enrolling at Liberty University, where Basyle (Boz) Tchividjian (the head of GRACE) is a professor: **a blatant conflict of interest!**

I suggest reading my original article, as it contains additional details not found here that discount the validity of the GRACE Report. In order to clarify my background, I repeat from my article about the organization I head:

> Psychoheresy Awareness Ministries has a generic Statement of Faith and I have ministered in churches representing a variety of doctrinal positions from Arminian to Calvinist and from Premillenialist to Amillenialist. Because of this, the ministry we direct does not recommend any particular church, denomination, or school. Thus, my coming to the defense of Dr. Jones III should not be considered an endorsement of BJU.

Also, I say in the original article:

> While psychoheresy is the primary reason I took on this task, the auxiliary reason was because of the outright, outrageous, and outlandish recommendation against Dr. Jones III, whom I do not know.

Additionally, I am not a personal friend of anyone at BJU/BJA or, to my knowledge, of anyone who attended BJU/BJA.

The "GRACE Final Report: For the Investigatory Review of Sexual Abuse Disclosures and Institutional Responses at Bob Jones University," will hereafter be referred to as the "GRACE Report" [2] or "GRACE" when referring to the investigatory team. GRACE, an acronym for "Godly Response to Abuse in the Christian Environment," is an organization formed to educate Christians "to recognize and respond to the sin of child abuse."[3]

GRACE conducted an intensive and extensive search for individuals to survey regarding "Sexual Abuse Disclosures and Institutional Responses at Bob Jones University" (p. 1). GRACE also did a thorough job of advertising the availability of the online survey throughout the entire world. In this article I revisit and further document and clarify one of the major undoings of the GRACE Report and the involvement of the LGBTQQI activist community in doubly damaging and therefore sabotaging the results. I expand on both beyond my original article to dramatize the fact that the GRACE Report, though well intentioned, was **scientifically and statistically speaking ill implemented and therefore should have been rejected by BJU!**

Statistically Invalid GRACE Report

GRACE states in the first sentence of their Confidential Questionnaire that their purpose is "to examine the response of Bob Jones University and Academy to issues related to sexual abuse" (p. 239). The title page of the "GRACE Final Report" amplifies this purpose by stating that it is "For the investigatory review of sexual abuse disclosures and institutional responses at Bob Jones University." I repeat from my original article, BJU/BJA had

not violated the Cleary Act, which is a federal law protecting students who report alleged sexual abuse/assault acts. And **while alleged sexual abuse/assault victims were penalized at BJU/BJA, they were never penalized or falsely accused for what they did not do, but only for violating their signed covenant before becoming students.** The penalties, which GRACE unnecessarily and undeservedly highlighted throughout its report, apply to all BJU students who violate the same student rules. Excuse the alliteration, but the pitifully petty paroxysms of perverse remarks by students and others recorded in the GRACE Report are merely pathetic and petulant pronouncements that should not have been made or recorded, **because every one of them involved a violation of their signed Student Handbook covenant to obey the rules.**

As noted in my original article, during the thirty-plus years, from which volunteer witnesses were surveyed, there were over 50,000 students at BJU/BJA. Statistically speaking, GRACE needed what is called a **"stratified sample,"** described as follows:

> In statistics, stratified sampling is a method of sampling from a population. In statistical surveys, when subpopulations within an overall population vary, it is advantageous to sample each subpopulation (stratum) independently.[4]

GRACE did not want to hear from over 50,000 individuals, but only from a **stratified sample** of those BJU/BJA persons who would be able to respond to questions about "sexual abuse disclosures and institutional responses at Bob Jones University."

The "Confidential GRACE Questionnaire" used in the investigation contained 21 questions. Prior to Question 1, GRACE stated: "Please note that the GRACE Investigative Team requires that any person taking this survey provide their name and a form of contact information at the end of the survey in order for the survey to be submitted" (p. 239). GRACE reported, "During the course of the investigation, the survey was accessed 933 times and GRACE received an approximate total of 342 completed surveys" (p. 14). While there were 342 persons who completed the questionnaire and others who did not complete it, only 215 questionnaire takers "said they wished to communicate with GRACE again." **Up to this point no one was required to provide a means of contact for GRACE in spite of their note prior to Question 1.** However, the 215 were told, "we will require that you provide us either your phone or email address in order to follow-up with survey takers for the purposes of interviews and conducting the remainder of our investigation" (p. 243). All that was required of the 215 to be considered for interviewing by GRACE was one's name and either an email address or phone number, which would be available from anywhere in the world.

The invalidation of the GRACE Report occurred because all of those who completed the survey merely volunteered and self-identified without any need to prove that they had ever been involved with Bob Jones University or Bob Jones Academy (BJU/BJA) or had personally known any alleged sexual abuse/assault victims from BJU/BJA. **The most serious error and most egregious mistake made by GRACE is its acceptance of self-identified individuals in its survey without any con-**

firmation of their true identities. In other words, the extensive, available worldwide, online survey was voluntarily completed by self-identified individuals as valid respondents, none of whom were required to prove they had at any time been at BJU/BJA or knew any alleged sexual abuse/assault victims from BJU/BJA.

I need to digress in order to demonstrate that the GRACE Report should have been rejected by BJU as it is invalidated by their survey methodology, which runs contrary to statistical requirements. All of the questionnaire completers self-identified **without proof** that they belonged in the stratified sample of BJU/BJA-related persons. The GRACE Report is guilty of one of the common sampling errors called "Selection Error." [5] The error occurs because GRACE relied upon a "Voluntary Sample," which "is made up of people who self-select into the survey. Often these folks have a strong interest in the main topic of the survey." This voluntary sample is guilty of "Voluntary response bias," which "occurs when sample members are self-selected volunteers." [6] *Bias* is defined as "prejudice in favor of or against one thing, person, or group compared with another, usually in a way considered to be unfair."[7] I demonstrate in my original article that the LGBTQQI activist community had a strong bias (prejudice) against BJU/BJA, and many were encouraged and motivated to participate in the survey, regardless of any affiliation with BJU/BJA. I will later deal with this subject.

GRACE states that "the survey was confidential but not anonymous" (p. 27). The survey was confidential, but, because GRACE did not verify the BJU/BJA relationship claimed by the self- identified individuals,

the survey takers were all anonymous, even to GRACE, with one exception to be explained shortly! Essential and critical to the conclusions and recommendations of the GRACE Report is the need for a pure, proven cohort[8] of BJU/BJA individuals, which GRACE nowhere in their report confirmed that they did! **If any and every individual can volunteer and self-identify as part of the group, GRACE committed an egregious error of research**. Because of the self-identified individuals lacking later verification with one exception, which I will discuss shortly, the GRACE Report would not normally be academically, statistically, or scientifically acceptable in peer-reviewed journals because of the lack of verification of the questionnaire completers. **I label the GRACE Report on BJU as an attempted statistical study that functionally failed, and for that reason alone all 301 pages should have been rejected by BJU, particularly the ill-conceived recommendations on Dr. Jones III.**

18 out of 342

There is only one exception to the lack of verification of the self-identified individuals by GRACE. Out of the 342 survey takers "approximately 50 participants [who] self-identified as victims of abuse" (p. 15) were interviewed. However, only 18 signed release forms for GRACE to access their records at BJU/BJA, which would prove they were bonified current or former BJU/BJA students. Thus, only 18 individuals were affirmed and confirmed to be valid BJU/BJA current or former students; all the rest who completed the survey would have been considered illegitimate by critical polling standards and thus rejected! **Therefore, out of the 342 who completed the online survey and the approximately 50 who were**

interviewed, there are only 18 that GRACE can say for sure were BJU/BJA current or former students who allege that they are sexual abuse/assault victims. All the rest of the "approximately 50" who self- identified as BJU/BJA alleged sexual abuse/assault victims and all others who completed the online questionnaire should have been rejected as well.

It is amazing and puzzling as to why more than half of the "approximately 50 participants" who "self-identified as victims" would not sign waivers to permit GRACE to have access to their records to prove their relationship with BJU/BJA. Because the other-than-18 individuals would not sign release forms, they too should have been rejected as participants! **Because there were only 18 legitimate (proven) BJU/BJA alleged sexual abuse/assault individuals in the stratified sample, all the others should have been rejected along with every comment made by them**.

Since the writing of my original article, the Greenville Police Department (GPD) investigated complaints from 13 BJU individuals. After their investigation, which included examining the 13 students' "educational and student records," the GPD "concluded that there is **insufficient evidence to establish probable cause or prove beyond a reasonable doubt that either the faculty or administration of BJU in place at that time violated the mandatory reporting law in the cases we reviewed"** (bold added).[9] While I would not know for certain, the likelihood is that, of the 18 who permitted GRACE to have access to their educational records, 13 of them complained to the GPD, resulting in only 5 who may be accusers of BJU. However, the 5 may consist of

some who made positive remarks (GRACE Report, pp. 59, 122) and some who criticized BJU for reasons that I debunked in my original article. All in all the GRACE Report survey sounds more like fiction than fact.

LGBTQQI Activist Community Victimized BJU/BJA

If the only thing anyone knew about the GRACE Survey was its failure to confirm the validity of those surveyed, that alone would be enough to eliminate its credibility. However, the LGBTQQI activist enemies of BJU/BJA compound, complicate, and doubly corrupt the incredulous GRACE Survey. To clarify, "activist" refers to the person and "activism" refers to the activity. Activism is defined as "a doctrine or practice that emphasizes direct vigorous action especially in support of or opposition to one side of a controversial issue."[10] I demonstrate in my original article that the LGBTQQI activist community is highly organized and likely encouraged members of its community and fellow travelers to complete GRACE's online questionnaire since there was no requirement to prove they had a right to do so. In other words, the LGBTQQI activist community was provided an opportunity by GRACE to complete the "Confidential Questionnaire," which allowed for potential exploitation by community members who may have felt justified in their "righteous reason" **to surreptitiously victimize BJU/BJA**. In my original article I quoted BJU's biblical position on the issue of life styles and desires of those who are LGBTQQI persons. This position would be extremely offensive to them and could easily serve as a rationale to rouse the LGBTQQI activist organizations worldwide to help victimize BJU/BJA covertly as their means of getting even. It is not far-fetched to suspect

that members of the LGBTQQI community would lie to support their cause. In fact, even some who are regarded as the most educated people, such as research scientists, lie at times. The *Scientific American* did an expose on "An Epidemic of False Claims"[11] and many other articles have been written about false claims (lies) made by scientists, some of whose falsified results landed them in prison. We can attest to the veracity of Jeremiah 17:9 that the "heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked."

The GRACE Report survey permitted "Personal experience/s and/or observation/s," "Experience/s and/or observation/s of friends or family members," "Unknown sources/Hearsay," and "Other (Explain)" (p. 242) in addition to those who claimed to be BJU/BJA connected individuals to complete the online survey without any need to confirm or verify any of what they claimed. Since no verification was required, the online survey could have been completed by anyone and everyone in the world who wanted to do it without proof that they had ever been connected with BJU/BJA or knew anyone who was. I searched but found nothing in the GRACE Report where they verified such an affiliation. GRACE apparently unilaterally accepted all the witness testimonies as true statements without investigating to discover those that were questionable .

I will now provide additional evidence to support my contention that, because of the open door to self-identified individuals, absent later verification on the part of the cohort group, activist LGBTQQI individuals were enabled to sneak into the study to condemn BJU/BJA . I mention in my original article that Jeffrey Hoff-

man, who leads "a group of LGBTQQI" individuals, was interviewed by the GRACE team and completed the questionnaire. Hoffman accuses BJU of "homophobic hatred" and reveals a network of like-minded individuals nationally, such as BJUnity, "an affirming alternative for lgbt+ alumni and students of Bob Jones University," "OneWheaton, Voiceless, CedarvilleOut, Biola Queer Underground, FUSGayAlumni, OneGeorgeFox, Baylor University's Sexual Identity Forum, and many, many other college and alumni groups."[12] One website alone lists over 100 public, private, and Christian higher education institutions and the active LGBT organizations on their campuses.[13] It is clear that the LGBTQQI activist community was greatly galvanized to support GRACE's efforts and would be strongly motivated, through worldwide social networking, to volunteer for the GRACE survey and also to desire to be interviewed, since there was no need to prove they had ever been at BJU/BJA or know anyone there.

Having worked with activist groups on the right and the left, I say the obvious. Individuals in activist groups on the right and on the left actually lie in their zeal to accomplish their goals. Some of the ones who were LGBTQQI individuals or fellow travelers, who merely completed the questionnaire and were not personally interviewed by GRACE, could have lied as a means of attacking BJU/BJA for what they regard as "homophobic hatred." They could have lied about being students at BJU/BJA and/or lied in answer to the questionnaire questions. Knowing the extent and intent of the LGBTQQI activist community and their hatred of conservative institutions such as BJU/BJA that take a biblical view of their sexual activity,

I conclude that this anti-BJU/BJA, LGBTQQI activist community lied in their zeal to bring down

BJU/BJA and its chancellor, Dr. Jones III. Because of GRACE's careless methodology, neither GRACE nor BJU/BJA would know for sure whether or not the questionnaire-only completers and those who did not sign a release form actually attended BJU/BJA or were ever sexual abuse/assault victims in that their assertions were never affirmed or confirmed for sure.

I repeat from my original article in which I provide ample proof that, after searching the internet and visiting numerous LGBTQQI oriented sites, **I conclude: GRACE has had the overwhelming support of the worldwide LGBTQQI activist community; this internationally connected LGBTQQI group supported the reinstatement of GRACE, which had been terminated by BJU; and many of those non-BJU/BJA LGBTQQI individuals were among those who responded, completed the questionnaire, and desired to be interviewed, even though they were not qualified to do so.**

In spite of the scientific and academic evidence to the contrary, the GRACE Report was sensationalized and sensualized by the press internationally without a statistically valid base from which to do so. I also conclude that the international LGBTQQI activist community was in a lynch-mob frenzy to bring down BJU/BJA and its chancellor, Dr. Jones III, and it was done with the naïve and unsuspecting help of GRACE with its worldwide open-door policy of who could complete the "Confidential Questionnaire" absent verification and absent proof that what was alleged was true. GRACE unwittingly issued

their Report based upon a statistically invalid survey and BJU unsuspectingly received and believed it. BJU/BJA and its chancellor, Dr. Jones III, were naively led like lambs to the slaughter by the GRACE organization, which was apparently clueless regarding statistical polling standards.

BJU and BJA have suffered from the carelessly cruel crucifixion of the school by the invalid GRACE Report Survey. **Though it was likely done in ignorance, GRACE needs to seek forgiveness for the statistically and scientifically insupportable and unjustified international calamity caused to the reputation of BJU/BJA and its chancellor, Dr. Jones III. Also, GRACE has done a great disservice to some of the very individuals it purports to defend and needs to seek forgiveness from all sexual abuse/assault victims for the unwise and unwittingly senseless accusations made on their behalf, based on an incredibly corrupt survey.**

Article 3

BJU Not Guilty as Charged by GRACE

For the benefit of our readers who may have further questions about the GRACE Final Report on Bob Jones University, we have included the following City of Greenville Police MEDIA RELEASE, July 20, 2015, on the topic "GRACE Review" by Media Relations Officer Johnathan Bragg, http://www.greenvillesc.gov/ArchiveCenter/ViewFile/Item/443.

> "Over the past seven months and in cooperation with the Thirteenth Circuit Solicitor's Office, the Greenville Police Department has conducted an investigation into allegations that teachers, counselors, and/or school administrators of Bob Jones University failed to report to police knowledge of alleged crimes of a sexual nature committed against juvenile students as required under S.C. Code Ann. 64-7-310. The Department's investigation was concerned only with the matter of violations of law, and not with breaches of moral

or ethical responsibilities that may apply in the matter.

"During the course of the investigation, the GPD attempted to contact all parties known to it through the GRACE Report. The Department was contacted by twenty individuals regarding possible instances in which BJU staff may have failed to comply with the statutory duty to report. Many of the reports involved incidents that were alleged to have occurred years earlier, and often in locations outside of Greenville County. After conducting multiple witness interviews, the GPD requested and obtained educational and student records for thirteen of the responding individuals directly from Bob Jones University.

"After interviewing all available witnesses, reviewing historical documentation, and consulting with the Solicitor, it was jointly concluded that there is insufficient evidence to establish probable cause or prove beyond a reasonable doubt that either the faculty or administration of BJU in place at that time violated the mandatory reporting law in the cases we reviewed. However, the GPD is currently conducting one investigation of sexual assault between two former students of BJU, as the incident occurred on campus and within GPD jurisdiction in 1988. This incident did not involve SC Code 64-7-310, but was reported to BJU Public Safety; however, the victim declined to prosecute at that time.

"As is the situation with any investigation of this nature, the Department will actively investigate any

new relevant information in these cases, investigate any new complaints if contacted by other victims described in the GRACE Report, and make appropriate referrals to police departments in other jurisdictions where alleged crimes may have occurred."

End Notes

Article 1: A Critivcal Review of the "GRACE Final Report" on Bob Jones University

1 *GRACE Final Report: For the Investigatory Review of Sexual Abuse Disclosures and Institutional Responses at Bob Jones University*, http://www.sccadvasa.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/Final-Report.pdf. Hereafter page references to this report will be in parentheses within the text. Also, all references to GRACE apply to the organization or team.

2 http://netgrace.org.

3 www.pamweb.org.

4 "#1 Community College in the Nation ~ The Aspen Institute," www.sbcc.edu/about/

5 "ABWE Replaces GRACE," 2/20/13, http://www.abwe.org/news/abwe-replaces-g.r.a.c.e.-and-hires-new-investigative-firm#.VRMxU45jmSo,

6 *Ibid*.

7 Martin and Deidre Bobgan. *Stop Counseling! Start Ministering!* Santa Barbara, CA: EastGate Publishers, 2011. *Person to Person Ministry*. Santa Barbara, CA: EastGate Publishers, 2009. *Christ-Centered Ministry Versus Problem-Centered Counseling*. Santa Barbara, CA: EastGate Publishers, 2004. *Against "Biblical Counseling": For the Bible*. Santa Barbara, CA: EastGate Publishers, 1994. *PsychoHeresy Awareness Letter*, numerous articles listed in website Articles Index under "Critiques of the Biblical Counseling Movement," http://www.pamweb.org/articles.html#Critiques%20of%20Biblical%20Counseling%20Movement.

8 "Critique of Walter & Trudy Fremont's Book *Becoming an Effective Christian Counselor*," *PsychoHeresy Awareness Letter*," Vol. 19, No. 1, http://www.pamweb.org/fremont_crit.html.

9 "Letter from the President," *Bob Jones University Student Handbook*, 2014-2015, p. 2.

10 *Ibid*.

11 GRACE, "Partnerships," http://netgrace.org/about us/partnerships/

12 When the word *we* is used it refers to both Martin and Deidre Bobgan.

13 Martin and Deidre Bobgan, "The American Association of Christian Counselors: A Sham and a Shame," *PsychoHeresy Awareness Letter*," Part One, Vol. 19, No. 3, http://www.pamweb.org/aacc_sham.html; Part Two, Vol. 19, No. 4, http://

www.pamweb.org/aacc_sham_2.html; Part Three, Vol. 19, No. 5, http://www.pamweb.org/aacc_sham_3.html.

14 http://www.dianelangberg.com/practice/staffbios.html#langberg.

15 Martin and Deidre Bobgan, "New Tribes Mission & the Grace Report," *PsychoHeresy Awareness Letter*," Vol. 20, No. 2, http://www.pamweb.org/new%20tribes_grace.html.

16 Phone call to *New England Journal of Medicine*, 1/16/15.

17 *New England Journal of Medicine* , "Conflict-of-Interest Policies," http://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJM200103293441312.

18 http://netgrace.org/about-us/board-of-directors/.

19 http://liberty.edu.

20 http://definitions.uslegal.com/t/trial-by-a-jury-of-ones-peers/.

21 "Hearsay," https://dictionaysearch yahoo.com.

22 http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/open-ended.

23 *Psychotherapy Networker*, March/April 2007, p. 24.

24 Jay Haley. *Strategies of Psychotherapy.* New York: Grune & Stratton, Inc., 1963, p. 71.

25 *Ibid*., p. 82.

26 E. J. Murray, "A Content-Analysis Method for Studying Psychotherapy," *Psychological Monographs* 70 (13, Whole no. 420), 1956; C. B. Truax, "Reinforcement and Nonreinforcement in Rogerian Psychotherapy," *Journal of Abnormal Psychology* 71, 1966, pp. 1-9.

27 "Leading question," http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Leading_question.

28 "What is a 'hostile witness'?" http:www.straightdope.com.

29 "ABWE Replaces GRACE," *op. cit*.

30 *Ibid*.

31 U.S. Department of Health & Human Services, Administration for Children, Youth and Families. Child Maltreatment 2012, http://www.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/cb/cm2012.pdf.

32 https://dictionarysearch.yahoo.com.

33 Elizabeth Loftus & Katherine Ketcham. *The Myth of Repressed Memory: False Memories and Allegations of Sexual Abuse.* New York: St Martin's Press, 1994. Michael D. Yapko. *Suggestions of Abuse: True and False Memories of Childhood Sexual Trauma*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1994.

34 "BJU investigation announcement to be make Thursday," http://greenvilleonline.com, 12/11/14.

35 http://bjunity.org/confronting-hatred/jeffrey-hoffman-activist/.

36 *Ibid*, p. 2.

37 *Ibid*, p. 3.

38 Randy Page, Director, Public Relations, email re: Bob Jones University biblical position statement, 4/4/2015,.

39 John MacArthur, "Homosexuality and the Campaign for Immorality," Grace to You, http://www.gty.org.

40 Jeffrey Hoffman, "Why I Became An Activist," http://bjunity.org/confronting-hatred/jeffrey-hoffman-activist/.

41 http://bjunity.org/confronting-hatred/panel-discussion-announcement/.

42 http://boz.religionnews.com/2015/04/02/god-victim-child-abuse-survivor-taught-good-friday/.

43 Tim Waller,"Former BJU student claims sex abuse was hidden," http://www.wyff4.com/news/local-news/greenville-news/former-bju-student-claims-sex-abuse-was-hidden/24358248, 2/3/14.

44 "Welcome to GRACE," http://netgrace.org.

45 Randy Page, *op. cit*., p. 1.

46 Phone call to Julie Valentine Center, 1/8/15.

47 Bob Jones University *Student Handbook*, 2014-2015, http://www.bju.edu/life-faith/student-handbook.pdf

48 http://dictionary.searchyahoo.com.

49 *Student Handbook*, *op. cit*., pp 50-51.

50 *Ibid*., p. 57.

51 Phone call to BJU, 1/19/15.

52 Conversely men should not be trusted as to what "cute" and "sexy" mean to a woman.

53 Disclosure: Because of my unfamiliarity with BJU, I have been in email contact with Randy Page, Director, Public Relations, asking questions and confirming my impressions of BJU, but I do not know him personally.

54 http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/In_loco_parentis., 1/15/15.

55 http://www.bobjonesacademy.net.

56 "ABWE Replaces GRACE," *op. cit*.

57 BJU Public Relations Director, email, 3/6/2015.

58 Cause célèbre: http://dictionarysearch.yahoo.com.

59 Diminished capacity: http://legal-dictionary.thefreedictionary.com/Diminished+Capacity/

60 Victor and Mildred Goertzel. *Cradles of Eminence*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1962.

61 "Summary of the Jeanne Clery Act," "Clery Center for Security on Campus," http://clerycenter.org/summary-jeanne-clery-act.

62 "Clery Act Reports," Liberty University, 2010, Case #200630326784, http://studentaid.ed.gov/about/data-center/school/clery-act#liberty.

63 *Ibid*.

64 Email from Randy Page, Director, Public Relations, Bob Jones University, 1/26/2015.

65 *Ibid*.

66 Conversely, can a man always know or understand a woman's feelings? See Louann Brizendine, MD. *The Female Brain*. New York: Morgan Road Books, 2006.

67 Carl Sherman, "Man's Last Stand: What Does It Take to Get a Guy into Therapy?" *Psychology Today*, Vol. 37, No. 4, p. 71.

68 Steven Stosny, "Case Studies," *Psychotherapy Networker*, Vol. 33, No. 2, p. 65.

69 Ethan Waters. *Crazy Like Us: The Globalization of the American Psyche*. New York: Free Press, 2010.

How the LGBTQQI Activist Community Victimized BJU/BJA

1 Martin Bobgan, "A Critical Review of the 'GRACE Final Report' on Bob Jones University," www.pamweb.org.

2 *GRACE Final Report: For the Investigatory Review of Sexual Abuse Disclosures and Institutional Responses at Bob Jones University*, http://www.sccadvasa.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/Final-Report.pdf. Hereafter page references to this report will be in parentheses within the text. Also, all references to GRACE apply to the organization or team.

3 http://netgrace.org.

4 "Stratified Sampling," https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Stratified_sampling, 9/17/2015.

5 *Qualtrics*, "5 Common Sampling Errors," www.qualtrics.com.

6 Stat Trek, "Voluntary Sample," www.stattreck.com

7 Yahoo Dictionary, search.yahoo.com.

8 "A cohort is a group of people who share a common characteristic or experience within a defined period," https//en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cohort_study, 9/9/2015.

9 City of Greenville Police Media Release, July 20, 2015, www.greenvillescgov/ArchiveCenter/ViewFile/Item/443.

10 Merriam Webster, "activism," www.mirriam-webster.com.

11 John P. A, Ioannidis, "An Epidemic of False Claims, Scientific American, June 2011, www.scientificamerican.com.

12 BJUnity website: http://bjunity.

13 http://tigernet.princeton.edu/~ffr-gala/links.html.