

In response to the "Jehovah's Witness Elders Accused of Playing Rape Recording to Victim" article, by Covert Fade

### **Skittles**

I know all the people involved in this experience. The elders handled the issue plain wrong. The girl was underage and it shouldn't have mattered whether or not she "consented" because underage girl can't ever legally consent.

However, he was not appointed and he was not considered exemplary in any way. Maybe he gave a bible reading at one point but I, and my peers never looked at him as "good association." Even the article says that the family was warned of the boy before any sex happened. The family is grasping at straws by calling him an instructor in the lawsuit.

And to answer your question, he is not active

### **Covert Fade**

In reply to Skittles.

Hi Skittles. Thanks for contacting us about this. If you can email further details to our contact account we can discuss this further. I'm sure you will understand that we will need to verify what you've said and will need to discuss this in more detail if we are to contradict what has been reported in the news.

Can I ask you though, do you think the girl is entitled to compensation? You say the family is grasping at straws. That would seem to imply that even though she was played a recording of her rape by the elders, who tried to use it to disprove her accusation of child sexual assault, she is not entitled to any compensation for that?

### **Skittles**

In reply to Covert Fade.

Sure, I'd be happy to as long as my info is kept confidential and not shared with anyone outside of jwsurvey.org.

I do not believe she is due compensation. The perpetrator was not facilitated by the congregation. The elders acted in a boneheaded way. But it would be ridiculous to expect the elders, congregation, or the organization to be responsible for every boneheaded act. IMO, it does make a difference whether or not this girl was brutally raped against her will or raped under statutory laws. The boy was an adult by law, but barely.

Again, the elders were extremely wrong to try and adjudicated consent since she was underage but I know that I would never want ANYONE wrongly accusing me of a brutal rape.

Also, the boy is a creep. He always gave me the creeps. He had a history and the family was warned. So yes, adroitly calling him an "instructor" is a very slimy way of trying to give him more clout in the congregation than deserved. Just look at your article, you ran with the very tricky word play of the lawsuit and article and went off on him either being an elder or MS. Why wouldn't any ew-JW use the proper terms in their lawsuit? Because saying that he was an instructor (which he was not) and that he had control over younger ones (which he did not) sounds better than saying he was a creepy teenager that no one liked.

I wonder if you read the article because even the article says that the elders warned the family of the guys recent sexual improprieties. That alone should have raised the red flag that he was likely not an appointed man. Dave, who commented, was an elder. He knew the details.

And this is tangential... this is the problem with people today. Just because we "woke up" doesn't mean we are immune to confirmation bias and cognitive dissonance. I have found 2 cases on JWnet where there are people that I knew personally and they are absolutely lying in their posts about their personal history. If we just want to commiserate that's fine but call it what it is. I believe this website wants to try and be accurate and ethical but let's not confuse cynicism for skepticism. This is why so many people hold false truths about EVERYTHING. We need to always exercise critical thinking

### **Skittles**

I would like to point out one more time that the writer of this story took huge liberties with the details of the sltrib write up. I have emailed jwsurvey and offered them further details if they promise to keep my info private. I have not heard back but even the father of the girl that commented on this story has said that there are some problems with the facts.

### **Covert Fade**

In reply to Skittles.

Hi Skittles.

I've not yet received your email but we have been having some problems with our email due to a server migration so could you please resend?

I am happy to keep your details private, but keep in mind we will have to be able to verify the facts you send if we are to act on them.

Many Thanks

### **Skittles**

In reply to Skittles.

I have said my comments and I stick by them. The article is now heavily edited from the original and doesn't even note that. Also, saying, "Yet even if this man turns out not to have been an appointed man, the fact remains that many confirmed accounts of appointed men engaging in child abuse are on record" doesn't give you a pass for completely missing the facts in your first write up.

I believe that it is sloppy reporting. I don't believe this website is exactly journalism but I do believe that the editors do have some standards for what they report

And to Winston's points, they claim to be appointed by god but we know they are just men. So of course they're going to make mistakes just like the fact that most of them are actually good guys that are just trying to do what they think is right.

### **Covert Fade**

In reply to Skittles.

Skittles:

1: You appear to have posted before I was finished with all my updates.

2: The phrase I actually used was “sufficient warning.” I think that accurately describes the situation outlined in the linked article (which I linked and encouraged people to read).

When warned that someone has engaged in “sexual misconduct” in JW world, that can mean anything from a kiss to consensual adult sex. It does not automatically imply a rape risk.

3: Due to the uncertainty implied by the phrase, “instructor” I have updated the article to reflect the uncertainty.

4: You haven’t actually provided any evidence to contradict the newspaper report itself in terms of this person’s position or the conduct of the elders, or any other events.

You can claim anything you like about the situation, but without evidence we can verify, you’re just a voice on the internet. Send us some actual verifiable evidence we can check. To do otherwise would be a violation of basic journalistic practice, and I’m sure you would not want us to do that.

### **Skittles**

In reply to Covert Fade.

I CANNOT prove that he wasn’t a servant or an elder. Do you not understand that? What am I supposed to do, send you his publisher cards?

You are basically using the argument from ignorance when you insist that your claim must be disproven instead of first proving your claim.

And one thing that I don’t know and that you don’t know is whether or not he raped anyone else.

This is where that tricky language play really screwed up the way you read the article. You assumed he was much older than the victim because you assumed he was a servant or an elder, even though that would probably be a funny conundrum the elders would be in if they were warning the congregation of an elder or MS that RECENTLY had committed immorality in another congregation.

If the article had said, “when he was barely 18 years of age, the congregation elders had warned the family that he was a ‘bad kid’ and had recently been involved sexually with another girl in Oregon...” Then you probably wouldn’t have jumped to so many other conclusions.

And again, what is sufficient warning supposed to mean? You haven’t proven that he was a rapist before this happened and the Sltrib article surely doesn’t say that, so what could the elders do other than warn that he was bad association?

And my final comment on you saying that I haven’t contradicted the newspaper report. It NEVER says that he is an MS or an elder. I have made my case why that word use is shady in the article. It doesn’t make sense in the timeline that he was appointed.

In response to the "JW Survey Results" article, by John Redwood

### **Skittles**

So because this website is so concerned about not publishing details that they can't verify from "faceless names on the internet" how do they actually verify that the respondents are who they say they are? Would it be that hard for someone to say that they were an actively serving elder? Seems like a very non scientific poll being carried out by a very biased website. That is a recipe for disaster

### **Winston Smith**

In reply to Skittles.

@Skittles

So you are making the baseless accusation that these people in the survey are lying? Toward what ends? Do you disbelieve other surveys or studies because the respondents might be lying? There are small percentage of people who will lie no matter what. But in general people tend to be honest, especially when there is nothing to gain by fraud. There have been studies conducted by universities on why and when people tend to lie, but then those studies might be made up by liars to, so I guess we might as well disbelieve everything we read.

WS

### **TwistedSister69**

In reply to Skittles.

@Skittles

Would you prefer loads of non-scientific PROPAGANDA and FAIRY TALES being carried out by a very biased CULT????!!!

Maybe you should lay off the Skittles for a while.

HA HA HA

### **Skittles**

In reply to Winston Smith.

Excuse me? Did I claim anyone was lying? Or did I simply raise my skepticism regarding the stats used in this article?

And one very big thing that you're wrong about is the fact that studies on humans is so difficult to carry just for the fact that humans lie so much. One study tried to replicate 100 studies and less than half replicated the initial results. Here is an NPR article about humans lying about what they eat <http://www.npr.org/sections/thesalt/2015/01/14/377238265/we-lie-about-what-we-eat-and-its-messing-up-science>

So, am I going to just take jwsurey's word for it? Hell no. I am not replacing my credulity to my first religion to a credulity for anything that is a counterpoint to it.

Some here don't have that same standard and thats fine, its just not how I choose to go on

### **Skittles**

The sites admin blocked me from accessing this website. I had to connect via my phone data in order to get pass their firewall.

Seems like this website doesn't like dissenters? Hmmm, maybe the pot is calling the kettle black? It seems like it would take a lot of insecurity to not allow comments from someone simply questioning the methods they use to make outlandish claims.

I have been learning about evolution lately and I was fascinated by vestigial organs. I think that the staff at jwsurvey has one. They don't allow dissent, they don't allow detractors. Either you are with them or against them. No skeptical thinking allowed!

Oh, and the sites motto should be, "You can't prove that my claim isn't true"

### **Skittles**

In reply to twisted sister69.

Your comment speaks volumes on your intellectual ability. I'd like to see how I'm guilty of your demagoguery. But simply asking for evidence to claims is not being a douchebag, it's being a critical thinker. But again, based off of your comment, I suspect those are not values you cherish.

And again, I am not expecting perfection from this site or the writers but they are expecting the perfection from the org. Call me crazy but I don't think that the org is a crime syndicate. I am an atheist who looks at people for what they really are, highly evolved animals. So when I feel like when some battles an extreme with more extreme I'm going to call them out.

I'm curious what cedars thinks? Is criticism of you and your fellow contributors off limits? Have I been breaking your posting rules? If anything twisted sister69 has broken the rules with his/hers offensive comments

### **Winston Smith**

In reply to Skittles.

@Skittles

I don't speak for the site and I am not sure what you would be blocked for, based on comments I was able to see. Skeptical thinking and dissenting are certainly allowed and even encouraged, also based on what I see.

However, many of the claims you make lack basis in facts. Your arguments are much like Russell's (Bertrand, not CT Russell) Tea Pot Theory – if he were to assert, without offering proof, that a teapot orbits the Sun somewhere in space between the Earth and Mars, he could not expect anyone to believe him solely because his assertion could not be proven wrong.

You made the assertion that people were lying on the JW Survey, but offered no facts to back up your accusation. I could likewise accuse you of having a tail (although I have never seen you). Is it possible? Sure, why not. But if I offer no evidence that Skittles has a tail, why should anyone believe me.

It seems to me that you do not want to believe that there are elders answering the survey and saying they disagree with the GB, so therefore you fabricate the accusation that people are lying about being active elders so you do not have to accept what you don't want to.

WS

## **Skittles**

In reply to Winston Smith.

I'd like to remind you that you and covert fade and others on this site are the ones replicating the teapot theory. You have said to me, what proof do I have to prove their results wrong. I am not claiming anything, but the claim is that xx amount of elders have responded to this survey and I want to know how they know that no one was duplicitous on the survey.

Have I made a single claim? Did I claim anyone was lying? Did I claim that zero respondents were elders? No, I simply inquired as to how they control for phony answers. Because if you did research on scientific polls you would understand that many Controls would have to be inserted to help the results to not be biased. But let's just start with the fact that anyone taking the survey is more than likely a witness that is questioning their faith or at the very least not 100% loyal to their religion. That's an obvious conclusion, and thus you would have to have control for that. At least for Those that take these results and apply them to the entire population of JW's

I don't even know if that is jwsurveys intentions. But again, I haven't made a single claim. But anyone who thinks that the results have to be 100% accurate because, "why would people lie about it" well... I have a bridge to sell you

## **Skittles**

In reply to Twmack.

I would like one person to explain to me why me not blindly being led by ceders makes me a jw hack?

I think that if anyone that has left the dogma of JW's shouldn't accept the dogma of an ex-jw website. Of course you can be a jwsurvey evangelical and reject any proof that is counter to their reporting or never question any claims they make but doesn't that make you sound like it's the same story as when you were a witness? Just a different leader and a new dogma

## **Skittles**

In reply to John Redwood.

Can you guys actually make a well reasoned response to my questions? Or are you sticking with, "you can't prove me wrong" BS?

Almost all of my comments have been deleted even though I don't break any of your guidelines. I strictly don't worship this website as an absolute truth.

I'm curious if anyone here sees the irony of the censorship and the confirmation bias type reporting that is exhibited by this site.

The pot is calling the kettle black

## **Skittles**

In reply to John Redwood.

Also, Could you simply answer Alfred's question?

Did I get blocked from this website simply for questioning your methodology?

