

# Resolution – Prohibit Sexual Grooming of Minors

**WHEREAS**, Definition of Grooming: Behaviors or Activities that

- Desensitize children to sexual topics.
- Expose children to, and normalize sexual behavior for children (including peer to peer sexual behavior).
- Break down a child’s natural boundaries so that they are more vulnerable to sexual abuse.

**WHEREAS**, Comprehensive Sexuality Education (CSE) leads to grooming:

- CSE programs utilize the same techniques often used by offenders to groom children for sexual abuse.
- Grooming prepares children to engage in sexual activity with the person doing the grooming or someone else.
- Grooming can be intentional or inadvertent.
- Teachers and other adults may not recognize how CSE grooms children.
- Desensitizing children to sex by removing a child’s natural aversion.

**WHEREAS**, The academic journal *Deviant Behavior* published an article “Toward a Universal Definition of Child Sexual Grooming”<sup>1</sup> which states: “While sexual grooming is considered integral to the child sexual abuse process, there has yet to be a universally accepted definition of the construct that condenses and summarizes this complex process.”

**WHEREAS**, Oxford Dictionary of English defines grooming<sup>2</sup> as “the practice of preparing or training someone for a particular purpose or activity.”

**WHEREAS**, *Journal of Sexual Aggression* published an article “Sexual Grooming of Children: Review of literature and theoretical considerations,”<sup>3</sup> stating that “Psychological grooming is used to achieve this increased sexualization, often under the guise of sexually educating the child.”

**WHEREAS**, CSE reduces children’s inhibitions. A 2011 decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit<sup>4</sup> said that grooming includes efforts that result in “reduction of the child’s inhibitions in order to prepare the child for sexual activity.”

**WHEREAS**, RAINN (Rape, Abuse & Incest National Network) published a Fact Sheet<sup>5</sup> that lists “grooming” activities that are common in many CSE programs:

- Emotionally separate a victim from those protecting them and often seek out positions in which they have contact with minors.
- Gain trust of a potential victim through gifts, attention, sharing “secrets” and other means to make them feel that they have a caring relationship and to train them to keep the relationship secret.
- Show the victim pornography or discuss sexual topics with them, to introduce the idea of sexual contact.

**WHEREAS**, Early sexual behavior is harmful to children. The Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance published by Center for Disease Control and Prevention found the prevalence of risky sexual behaviors, suicidal behaviors, tobacco use, and alcohol use were higher among students who had sexual contact than students who had no sexual contact.

**WHEREAS**, Grooming behaviors are red flags for breaking down a child’s boundaries if perpetrated by a stranger at a playground. A teacher can unknowingly engage in grooming, making children more susceptible to sexual abuse by other children and adults. We are not accusing teachers of grooming but they are inadvertently grooming when teaching from many federally funded CSE programs, and we need to recognize that CSE results in children being groomed.

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, that the state of Texas \_\_\_\_\_ party should adopt a plank on Prohibit Sexual Grooming of Minors:

**Plank xxx. Prohibit Sexual Grooming of Minors:** Adults must not desensitize children to sexual topics, expose children to, or normalize sexual behavior for children. Texas should modify the Miller Test in the Harmful Materials to Minors statute to close loopholes exploited by publishers and digital resources. Texas Legislature and State Board of Education must remove the conflict between law and administrative code to provide clarity that a local school district may choose to NOT teach Human Sexuality Instruction and that a local school district may choose to be an OPT IN district. We demand that the Texas Legislature pass legislation that requires Texas schools and libraries to filter inappropriate and/or harmful content, such as pornography, for minors. School District employees, contractors, or volunteers must not demonstrate or distribute contraceptives to minors (including condom dispensers in the restrooms); refer or provide counseling for risky sexual behavior, abortion, or any reproductive subjects; host extra-curricular clubs or activities for minors of a sexual nature; or provide digital or physical publications related to sexual subjects. Abortion providers and affiliates must be prohibited from having a physical and digital presence in schools. Texas should prohibit the advertising, promotion, distribution, and sale of obscene devices to minors or displayed within minor’s reach. We call on the Department of Justice, state Attorney General, local district and county attorneys, and law enforcement to enforce obscenity laws to protect minors regardless of source whether domestic or foreign. If necessary, we call on Congress and Texas Legislature to expand jurisdiction to allow enforcement.

A copy of this resolution should be sent to the \_\_\_\_\_ County/Senate District # \_\_\_\_\_ Convention Resolutions Committee from Precinct # \_\_\_\_\_ with the recommendation that it be passed and sent to the State Convention Platform Committee of the \_\_\_\_\_ Party of Texas.

## **Sources:**

- 1 Georgia M. Winters, Leah E. Kaylor & Elizabeth L. Jeglic (2022) Toward a Universal Definition of Child Sexual Grooming, *Deviant Behavior*, 43:8, 926-938, DOI: 10.1080/01639625.2021.1941427
- 2 Oxford Dictionary of English
- 3 Craven, Samantha & Brown, Sarah & Gilchrist, Elizabeth. (2006). *Sexual Grooming of Children: Review of literature and theoretical considerations. Journal of Sexual Aggression*. 12. 287-299.
- 4 United States v. Chambers, 642 F.3d 588 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2011)
- 5 RAINN (Rape, Abuse & Incest National Network) Fact Sheet