

SCOUTS-L

**YOUTH
PROTECTION**

From PANNELLJ@DELPHI.COM Ukn Jul 12 19:29:41 1994

To: Multiple recipients of list SCOUTS-L <SCOUTS-L%TCUBVM.BITNET@PUCC.PRINCETON.EDU>

Status: RO

X-Status:

**>I have often wondered about how the shower rule fit in with some of
>the other concepts in YPP. If we can't allow scouts to have patrol
>meetings on their own without 2 adults present because of fears of
>hazing and such, why do we require the showers (where there is the
>largest chance of such things happening) not have any adults present?
>I don't think that the adults should be showering with the kids, but
>there isn't any way now to address problems in the showers. Can
>anyone out there shed light on the reasoning behind the decision?**

There's no way to put this delicately, but I will be succinct...

As I have had it told me... It is perceived that this is a situation where sexual abuse between an adult and child is most likely to occur. Hence to avoid even the appearance of impropriety, adults are banned from the shower house.

Should adults be allowed in and a case of abuse occurred, even once, the lawyers would have a field day and eat the BSA for lunch. Allowing adults to be present in such a situation might be viewed as prima facie evidence of negligence on behalf of the BSA.

John

From mfbowman Tue Jul 12 20:34:17 1994
Date: Tue, 12 Jul 1994 20:19:50 -0400 (EDT)
From: "Michael F. Bowman" <mfbowman@cap.gwu.edu>
Subject: Re: Showering
To: SCOUTS-L Youth Groups Discussion List <SCOUTS-L%TCUBVM.BITNET@PUCC.PRINCETON.EDU>
cc: Multiple recipients of list SCOUTS-L <SCOUTS-L%TCUBVM.BITNET@PUCC.PRINCETON.EDU>

Kathy's advice is probably the best - get another adult and intervene, if it looks like trouble. If a Scout is seriously injured because there is no adult supervision in the showers, some lawyers would have a merry time making a case that the absence of adult supervision was per se negligence. While we do have to heed youth protection policies, we also must exhibit responsible judgment. If you are alone, Loudly announce you will enter, asking all showers to be turned off, all Scouts to wrap in a towel or put on shorts immediately. You can poke your head in and give such direction as is necessary to knock off horseplay, language, etc. If one or more need to be separated, tell them to finish dressing and wait in the doorway - in your view and in view of the other Scouts -. Your intervention does not have to be running into a room full of naked scouts, nor does it have to result in you being alone with one or two. In fact you can make sure that it doesn't. I think that by keeping the policy with judgment on how to respond may work for most horseplay instances.

The real problem starts, if you suspect that a Scout is in the process of being victimized; e.g. beaten up, severe hazing, etc. Again the sound the alarm, snap to approach probably will stop the activity. You can figure out the details when everyone's out of the showerhouse and dressed. If it doesn't stop, then what? That's the toughest - I think we have to lean towards making sure that harm is not continued, if we really believe it to be happening. On the other hand you may want to be careful not be suckered into a prank either.

**Michael F. Bowman, a/k/a Professor Beaver
mfbowman@CAP.GWU.EDU**

Date: Wed, 12 Oct 1994 01:16:51 -0400 (EDT)
From: "Michael F. Bowman" <mfbowman@cap.gwu.edu>
Subject: Re: "baptism" of fresh summer-campers

"Baptism" of fresh summer-campers was once a universal fate that most Scouts endured, but did not really much enjoy. There was always the argument that afterward it did something to make a member feel more a part of the group; e.g., I survived and its now great fun, etc.

Unfortunately, altogether too much of this hazing became psychological abuse with no real beneficial purpose other than gratifying some apparently sadistic impulses. In one camp, we had older Scouts dragging younger ones off into the woods to get branded. The younger Scout would see a huge bed of coals with a white hot poker or iron in it and then be blind-folded. Then the "humorists" would simultaneously press ice on the poor fellows chest and the hot iron on the ice to get a sizzling sound causing the victim to urinate profusely in his shorts. What would have happened, if one of the victims had a weak heart and died? By law the offender would have been charged with kidnapping and homicide. What Scouting purpose was being furthered? None that I can think of.

Another group had a prune eating contest for first year campers with predictable end results. Still another kept its first year campers busy chasing after smoke-turners and the like to the extent that they missed many advancement and merit badge opportunities. Those kids were cheated!

One group required its first year campers to wear their uniforms backwards for a day or so. The list of horrors and ingenious degradations could go on and on. If you stop to think how you would feel now, I don't think many of us would willingly volunteer to endure some of these abuses.

In my own Troop I was forced to wear a camouflaged loin cloth after having my trousers removed, whereupon I learned what poison ivy, poison summac, and nettles were. Subsequently, I ended up on probation for giving each of the perpetrators a good old fashioned punch in the nose. When I think back on it, I still have a low opinion of the guys who did it and the leader who allowed it. It was bad enough to be unsure of oneself at that age without the conflicting signals this gave and to have had to succeed in spite of the hazing.

I can think of no good reason why hazing or physical/psychological abuse is necessary, tolerable or beneficial. As a youth I saw a lot Scouts quit because of it and a lot of damage to feelings and relationships into the bargain.

If we are trying to teach Scouts to live up to the Scout Law and Scouting's ideals, this sort of thing really sends strong conflicting signals. We are much better off creating a healthy, robust environment that encourages self-esteem, mutual respect, and tolerance and we can do so much easier without hazing.

This rite of passage is now no longer as prevalent here in the U.S. and many other countries. However, it does persist in many places because of tradition and custom. Sometimes it does good to challenge customs and traditions and ask what purpose they serve.

Better yet, we should be asking what are some alternatives. Fixing a breakfast for the older Scouts might lend itself to teach helpfulness, and cheerfulness in service. Constructive tasks with opportunities to learn a Scouting value ought to be easy for ingenious Scouts and Scouters to improvise as a substitute.

**Yours in Scouting, Michael F. Bowman, a/k/a Professor Beaver
Deputy District Commissioner Exploring, GW Dist., NCAC, BSA
Speaking only for myself, but with Scouting Spirit . . .**

_____ mfbowman@CAP.GWU.EDU _____

Date: 12 Messages
From: <joakes@unm.edu>
Subject: Re: "baptism" of fresh summer-campers
To: "Michael F. Bowman" <mfbowman@CAP.GWU.EDU>

Michael,

I have stayed quiet during this thread for about as long as I can...now for my 2 cents. When I was young, My parents sent me off to Military School (I was such a compliant child..Grin) at Linton hall there not far from you over by Manassass, in Bristow. I was not very big boy .. and the other boys took advantage of that. I can't remember the things that I went through (Vietnam took care of that) just feelings. One I do remember is running the guantlet, older kids each had a paddle. MANY years

later I returned and confronted that retired Marine Drill Instructor, as a Marine Sargent. He still didn't get it. Years later I came back from Vietnam and had people spit on me.. I snapped.. I started beating on people before they got to me(I became bigger, size). What I am trying to say is I for a L O N G time carried the effects of that abuse with me. It tainted my whole life. I have changed much in the last eight years.

Because of that I WILL NOT LET ANYBODY DO THIS TO MY SONS OR THE BOYS IN

MY TROOP. I am known by the parents of my kids for this. However, On the

other hand there should be a rite of passage from Joe newbie to Joe scout. I think the breakfast idea coupled with the stick ceremony at first Campfire is an excellent idea.

Date: Sat, 15 Oct 1994 08:30:22 -0400 (EDT)
From: Susan Ganther <susan@isisa.oit.unc.edu>
To: mfbowman@CAP.GWU.EDU
Subject: Re: "baptism" of fresh summer-campers (fwd)
Message-Id: <Pine.A32.3.90.941015082211.36182B-100000@isisb.oit.unc.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII
Status: RO
X-Status:

[Michael, I am forwarding a copy of an e-mail I sent out to another poster regarding snipe hunts (which our troop still does). The stuff in the brackets is fresh and added particularly for your enjoyment :-)]

Randy, snipe hunting is not hazing, it teaches the new Scouts not to believe someone just because they are in a position of authority or because they are presenting themselves as experts. I have seen a tendency in some Scouts to not want to admit that they do not know the answer to a question, and during a skill training presentation by a patrol if they are asked a question they do not know the answer to they will make something up that they hope sounds authoritative. If our Scouts do not have their gullibility pointed out to them as a potential for becoming misinformed ignoramuses, then how do we know they will not just swallow anything the older Scouts spoonfeed to them just as they have been trained to do in school. We spend way to much time on input mode when we are young, sitting in a classroom, sitting in front of the tube, and potentially while making the rounds of skill training stations. It is better to train them to look upon the information being presented to them as being of conversational interest and something they might want to study more about. Teach them to check on each others presentations to try to catch the other guy out at having presented something that was incorrect and point it out to the patrol leaders to bring up at the PLC's when evaluating the patrols presentations. What better way to teach them that not everything an older Scout says should be considered gospel than by sending them looking for snipes or left-handed smoke shifters. I asked the DE in our area since there had been so many people claiming that this is hazing, if we had to stamp it out if we see it going on, and his answer was, "it depends". It depends on why the Scouts are doing it, how they are doing it, and how the new Scouts feel about it. In other words, just don't let it go too far.

We really do not want to give it up, we get a lot of good out of it, beside the gullibility resistance training, when asked by a new Scout if what the other Scouts is saying is true, I usually tell them "it is in your Scout Handbook and you can see for yourself, you did bring your handbook didn't you?". If there are any complaints about the troop trying to pull the wool over their eyes, we remind them that it couldn't have happened if they had remembered their handbook (the don't leave home without it speech). None of our Scouts think this is hazing because of the lessons they learn from it. They understand that it has a point other than just picking on the new guy.

Of all the adults who have come up to me when they see me in uniform or overhear in conversation that I am a Scout leader, many have told tales of their initiation, they have all been happy memories, not one complaint.

[Well, Michale, your complaint is noted, however we are talking about a different situation entirely with snipe hunts and other wild goose chases since no potential for physical cruelty is involved.]

I guess someone would have to really go overboard with this to make it hazing, and that is all we really have to watch out for, going too far, taunting someone or making them feel bad are not compatible with the Scout Law, that does not mean we are incapable of having Snipe hunts without taunting and bad feelings. Besides they are delicious :-)

YIS, Susan

Date: Fri, 14 Oct 1994 21:34:50 -0400 (EDT)
From: "Michael F. Bowman" <mfbowman@cap.gwu.edu>
Subject: Re: "baptism" of fresh summer-campers
To: joakes@unm.edu

John,

You unfortunately are not alone in the suffering people thought of one time as a rite of passage. Thank the good Lord that we are making a difference for our kids. I too am know for my opposition to such things. At a camporee at Fort Belvoir, I had the MPs arrest a Scout Leader for abusing a boy - beating. The leader had been an Eagle Scout, broke down and wept confessing that he had been abused by older boys in his Troop and just couldn't control his temper. He has at my instigation been through therapy and is better. But damn it, it shouldn't have been allowed then or ever.

**Yours in Scouting, Michael F. Bowman, a/k/a Professor Beaver
Deputy District Commissioner Exploring, GW Dist., NCAC, BSA
Speaking only for myself, but with Scouting Spirit . . .
_____ mfbowman@CAP.GWU.EDU _____**

Date: Sun, 16 Oct 1994 01:14:35 -0400 (EDT)
From: "Michael F. Bowman" <mfbowman@cap.gwu.edu>
Subject: Re: "baptism" of fresh summer-campers (fwd)
To: Susan Ganther <susan@isisa.oit.unc.edu>

Susan,

I enjoyed your posting and am glad to see you found a value in the traditional snipe hunt. I've seen so many abuses that I've gotten to the point of discouraging it, especially at camp. Not enough leaders try, as you did, to make it a good experience with a value. Too often, what I saw as Camp Program director was kids being sent to look for snipes without flashlights in a field of nettles, followed by a rash of "I want to go home phone calls". They were usually city kids scared s...less of the dark and sounds to boot. The way you have handled it sounds fair enough to me and I can imagine a bit of fun and learning as well. Thanks for sharing!

Yours in Scouting, Michael F. Bowman, a/k/a Professor Beaver
Deputy District Commissioner Exploring, GW Dist., NCAC, BSA
Speaking only for myself, but with Scouting Spirit . . .
_____ mfbowman@CAP.GWU.EDU _____

Date: Fri, 14 Oct 1994 18:33:02 +100 (BST)
From: Ian Ford <ianford@dircon.co.uk>
Subject: Re: "baptism" of fresh summer-campers
To: "Michael F. Bowman" <mfbowman@CAP.GWU.EDU>

Mike -
I agree with you 110% ! Right on !

Ian

Date: Sun, 16 Oct 1994 01:40:20 -0400 (EDT)
From: "Michael F. Bowman" <mfbowman@cap.gwu.edu>
Subject: Re: "baptism" of fresh summer-campers
To: Ian Ford <ianford@dircon.co.uk>

Ian,

Thanks for the support. At least in our District, I've been able to get hazing a/k/a abuse eliminated in almost every unit.

Yours in Scouting, Michael F. Bowman, a/k/a Professor Beaver
Deputy District Commissioner Exploring, GW Dist., NCAC, BSA
Speaking only for myself, but with Scouting Spirit . . .
_____ mfbowman@CAP.GWU.EDU _____

Date: Wed, 19 Oct 1994 23:32:07 -0400 (EDT)
From: "Michael F. Bowman" <mfbowman@cap.gwu.edu>
Subject: Re: "baptism" of fresh summer-campers (fwd)
To: Susan Ganther <susan@isisa.oit.unc.edu>

Susan,

Good luck on your fall outing with new Scouts. Knowing that they have excellent leadership, I can't help thinking they'll have a great time.

Yours in Scouting, Michael F. Bowman, a/k/a Professor Beaver
Deputy District Commissioner Exploring, GW Dist., NCAC, BSA
Speaking only for myself, but with Scouting Spirit . . .
_____ mfbowman@CAP.GWU.EDU _____

Date: Mon, 17 Oct 1994 12:19:58 -0400 (EDT)
From: Susan Ganther <susan@isisa.oit.unc.edu>
To: "Michael F. Bowman" <mfbowman@cap.gwu.edu>
Subject: Re: "baptism" of fresh summer-campers (fwd)

Michael, I forgot how inventive boys can be. It really takes imagination to turn almost any innocuous tradition into something cruel, but I will not underestimate them now that you have warned me. Usually we end up with snipe hunts and the like after they have been reminded that the troop brand or something equally terrifying is no longer to be given to first time campers, so they have already been warned at this point. We have a new batch of newbies for our next outing, so maybe we will ask the SPL to remind the Scouts to be kind. We have a very small troop in a reforming stage, and I try to remind them to make the first outing something the new boys will want more of so that we can grow the troop to a size that will be better for all of us. It has worked on everyone except the adult visitors so far. Sometimes I wish we could have Scouting with just Scouts and the parents would not act like a bunch of yahoos (or if they did we wouldn't care because they wouldn't be there).

Date: Sun, 16 Jul 1995 01:28:09 -0400 (EDT)
From: "Michael F. Bowman" <mfbowman@CapAccess.org>
To: SCOUTS-L Youth Groups Discussion List <SCOUTS-L@TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU>
Subject: Re: Females at Camp

Linda Heinz,

Well I finally did it. Fell asleep at the keyboard and sent an empty posting. So if you saw a blank message yesterday - sorry.

Others have commented aplenty on the Troop's policy regarding restrictions on females going on campouts and to camp. Instead of repeating the same line, I'd like to offer a few other thoughts:

*** YPP Coordinator**

As part of the rechartering process you are now going to have to have an adult designated as a YPP Coordinator, whose job it will be to see that adult registrations are reviewed and to see that key leaders get to YPP training. Sound like something that may be helpful in your unit.

*** YPP Trainers Are A Resource**

Sounds like your Committee Chair probably hasn't gone to YPP Training or went very early on and has limited memory or desire to look further. You may want to consider using a YPP Trainer as a unit resource - ask one to be a guest at a Committee Meeting to present the latest developments on YPP. Similarly, you could call on your Unit or District Commissioner to be a guest and help by giving an update. The chair may not appreciate it and it would be better if he were part of the inviting group. The best thing to do might be to have your friends on the committee bring it up for a vote and push it through - then invite 'em. The chair is not supposed to be a dictator position, use the vote and your resources.

*** Council Policies**

Because some state Child Protection laws vary greatly, your Council may have formulated a specific policy on the number of adults required when two sexes are represented in a contingent. It may be a good idea to check with your Council to see whether it has a policy in this area.

*** For venture crews and Explorer activities with coed participation, YPP**

is real clear - you must have at least two adults over 21 and one must be female, if the activity is coed.

Speaking only for myself in the Scouting Spirit, Michael F. Bowman
DDC-Training, GW Dist. Nat Capital Area Council
mfbowman@CAPACCESS.ORG

Date: Sat, 12 Aug 1995 11:20:41 -0400 (EDT)
From: "Michael F. Bowman" <mfbowman@CapAccess.org>
Subject: Re: JLTC/scout punishment

Larry,

Sometimes you have to remind folks that first time courses like this are investments with big pay-offs later. But I suspect that you won't find your Council to be adverse to such a course, especially when they know that a Wood Badger is a to be director and will use his resources to get needed material at little or no expense other than the cost of food that will part of the registration fee. :-)

As to the military close order drill and punishment exercises - that probably should be considered as unnecessary hazing and not allowed. There is no real reason to engage in such behavior. It sounds like the adults were asleep at the switch here and failed to step in with some counseling for the boy leaders on how to handle the course. It is much more effective to use the carrot than to beat a stubborn mule.

Speaking only for myself in the Scouting Spirit, Michael F. Bowman
DDC-Training, GW Dist. Nat Capital Area Council
mfbowman@CAPACCESS.ORG

Date: Mon, 18 Sep 1995 09:49:40 EST
From: Bruce Ward <Bruce.Ward@SMTPGWY.AGRIC.NSW.GOV.AU>
Subject: Re[2]: Hazing whatever number

This issue seems to pop up regularly, although I never herd the term 'hazing' before I subscribed to SCOUTS-L. Like many, I have been through various 'initiation' rites over my life, and while I don't bear too many scars, I can see the destructive side of the process.

BUT I can also see the positive side... and this is perhaps why boys in particular are attracted by some gangs that have pretty bizarre initiation rites. I think the powerful part is the feeling of

belonging that comes from a strong shared experience.

So to get the positive side, design 'team bonding' activities that are well controlled, do not include humiliation, and have some stability through time. Maybe this is why we feel such a bond with our Woodbadge Patrols?

Bruce Ward
Australia
(wardb@agric.nsw.gov.au)

Date: Wed, 20 Sep 1995 23:44:16 -0400 (EDT)
From: "Michael F. Bowman" <mfbowman@CapAccess.org>
To: "Michael F. Bowman" <mfbowman@CapAccess.org>
Subject: Hazing, Abuse, Unscoutlike Conduct, etc.
NOT SENT

Over the last week we've seen about 40 postings on the subjects of hazing and a case of alleged spousal abuse. The discussion has been lively and the opinions many and varied. From time to time the discussion has stirred some deep feelings and this is as it should be. After all we as Scouters are always concerned about anything that affects the Scouts and we constantly strive to place the welfare and interests of Scouts first and foremost in our thoughts as we strive to give them the best possible program and a place where they can experience healthy growth.

It is always difficult when we find a leader that has apparently not lived the Scout law and oath as we all understand them differently. We all have different experiences that we bring to our interpretations. And this colors how we perceive things. And when we try to apply the Scout Oath and Law with these different understandings and experiences, we find that they are never a precise measuring stick.

This leaves us with a question or two when we start to talk about hazing and instances where a Scout leader appears to have strayed.

The first stop are the hard rules/policies of the organization. In BSA hazing is simply not permitted. Hazing has been variously defined but comes down to acts that are intended to humiliate, intimidate, or belittle the subject of the act. BSA states in its Guide to Safe Scouting "Any form of hazing, initiations, ridicule, or inappropriate teasing are prohibited

and should not be allowed. Likewise the Youth Protection guidelines prohibit abuse, including physical abuse.

>From this it is fairly clear that old Troop practices of having initiations should not be continued or condoned by leaders. When a leader continues in this way with such a policy in place that leader is assuming a greater liability and risk of litigation. The initiation rite of substituting an ice block for the branding iron at the last minute is one that I am familiar with, in my youth I participated in such a rite of passage. Then we didn't think much of it other than it was one of those things We didn't think about what would have happened if a Scout had gone into cardiac arrest, etc. Now most would conclude that such an activity goes way beyond the permissible. It seems clear that such an initiation rite is no longer appropriate given the rules. Did we lose something? There was a bonding that took place to be certain and a feeling of belonging that was intensified.

> Some out there in Cyberland choose to attack any possible thing that
> they consider offensive. I guess I am one since these kind of postings
> offend me. Let us remember, We are here for the boys, To teach and
> instruct while having fun so that they might become good citizens.
> Lets put a smile on our face and have some FUN.
> YiS
> Greg Gough
> SM Troop 201
>

Speaking only for myself in the Scouting Spirit, Michael F. Bowman
DDC-Training, GW Dist. Nat Capital Area Council
mfbowman@CAPACCESS.ORG

Date: Fri, 22 Sep 1995 07:01:40 -0400
From: "Brian A. Oliva" <BOliva@AOL.COM>
Subject: Youth Protection Policy

I'll be checking through our council to get their official instructions, but I wanted to bounce this off the collective group experience. I have a prospective Den Leader that was up front and reported a child abuse incident on his application. He was charged by his ex-wife for grabbing his son on the

shoulder hard enough to leave a mark. There was no conviction. I don't know the exact timing, but he has since remarried and has another son in second grade, so it was at least 8 years ago. I will verify that and check with the people he put as references.

Is there any policy on how to proceed with an investigation? Is it done at the unit, or district, or national level? Exactly what has to be done? This is the first time anyone has ever answered yes to one of the screening questions on the application, and I want to be fair, and not screw this up. This question aside, he would have passed the interview process with flying colors. Based on the limited information I have now, if nothing else turns up, I would still recommend his approval.

Comments?

Thanks in advance,
YIS
Brian Oliva, Committee Chair
Pack 846, Milford Ohio
Big Bear District
Dan Beard Council, Cincinnati
boliva@aol.com

From mfbowman@CapAccess.org Sat Sep 23 23:33:57 1995
To: SCOUTS-L Youth Groups Discussion List <SCOUTS-L@TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU>
Subject: Re: Youth Protection Policy

Brian,

The disclosure made by a prospective-Scouter of being accused of, but not convicted of child abuse certainly is a difficult situation. So far you have his side of the story, which may or may not be an accurate recasting of the facts. Your chartering organization is responsible for the first level review of his character and based on this information needs to ask more questions and dig a little deeper before approving him.

You stated there had been "no conviction" which implies that he was charged and prosecuted. Is this true? If it is, the fact that there was no conviction doesn't mean anything more than that the jury didn't think

the prosecution presented a case that proved beyond reasonable doubt that a crime was committed. This could also mean that the preponderance of the evidence was that he had committed a battery on the child. If he wasn't charged or prosecuted, it might be easier to see this as situation that is all to typical of marital dissolutions where the fighting spouses try to damage each other in vicious attacks.

Unfortunately without a closer look into his past, the information you have is pretty lean for making a decision.

This is a situation where the Chartered Organization Representative or the Institutional Head needs to have a discussion with the Scout Executive to decide how best to proceed and what questions need to be resolved.

What evidence existed at the time to suggest abuse?

What triggered the alleged abuse?

Was there a problem that has been treated by counseling?

Was there an untreated problem - substance abuse, alcohol, etc.?

Has the individual had other reported but not prosecuted instances of the same behavior?

Has the individual demonstrated over the last eight years good character?

It may well be that after looking at some of these questions, the feeling will be that what did or did not happen eight years ago is not likely to be repeated and that there is no risk. This result is probably unlikely, however. If there is any question or doubt, the Scout Executive and the chartering organization are going to act to protect the interests of the Scouts and not accept the registration. This sounds pretty tough, but they have to be concerned with the welfare of the boys and that balances a lot heavier in most places than an adult's right to be registered.

Speaking only for myself in the Scouting Spirit, Michael F. Bowman

**DDC-Training, GW Dist. Nat Capital Area Council
mfbowman@CAPACCESS.ORG**

**From mfbowman@CapAccess.org Fri Sep 29 03:58:18 1995
To: SCOUTS-L Youth Groups Discussion List <SCOUTS-
L@TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU>
Subject: Re: Two Leaders, One MB Counselor**

Are we letting paranoia overtake rationality?

Jon, you obviously have strong feelings and appear to be hoping for a surge of support for what you see as rational. Unfortunately, what may have appeared irrational years ago is no longer so irrational. The sad fact of life is that we have become the most litigious society on the face of the planet and a burgeoning growth area for lawyers is child rights. All it takes is for a youngster to accuse and you are on the defensive. Now because BSA and almost every youth organization is coming around to the rule of two, you have another problem and that is a standard of care that is expected. If you are accused, even wrongly and are the only one at a meeting, what happens? The Court will hear that the standard of care is for two leaders to be present and in the absence of two, the meeting was supposed to be cancelled. The Court will infer that at best you were negligent and probably entertain suspicions about your reasons. The plaintiffs will introduce or try to introduce evidence about other known cases of Scout leader abuse in similar cases. To win and vindicate yourself, you will end up paying your lawyer \$10 to \$25k to prove your point and to what result. The case probably will be dismissed and the cloud of suspencion will never leave. This is the reality. This why it is critical even in Troop Meetings to have two leaders present - you are protecting yourself period. Not to mention that you can put on a better program with more adults participating. Instead of waxing poetic about paranoia, its time to recruit more leaders and sell more parents on participating. Sure in the meantime some meetings may have to be cancelled. Maybe this is necessary to get the parents' attention. But for sure, you can take this as a growth challenge and come out better for it. Instead of trying to stick out a point, use your resources to develop a richer program where you don't have to worry about it.

Speaking only for myself in the Scouting Spirit, Michael F. Bowman

**DDC-Training, GW Dist. Nat Capital Area Council
mfbowman@CAPACCESS.ORG**

**From mfbowman@CapAccess.org Thu Dec 21 01:19:49 1995
Subject: Re: More on Close Order Drill**

Pete,

We had a discussion some time back on Scouts-L about some misguided Troops that were attempting to use so called Close Order Drill as a form of punishment. In the case that comes to mind a former military type, who probably wouldn't have been welcome in the military long, punished Scouts for small infractions of his rules by making them wear full backpacks and march in a square, up and down a hill, etc., despite heat and humidity conditions that made the level of activity downright dangerous. This is a long way from learning good order for a parade or ceremony. Likewise there were some examples of this sort of thing being used sadistically as part of an initiation type environment. The feeling on the list at the time was fairly strong that this sort of thing amounted to abuse and was something that should not be a part of Scouting. I too recoiled almost instinctively at the request for information on Close Order Drill because of the past discussion and the peculiar abuse that was engendered. However, I have to agree that there is no harm in helping the boys develop pride through good presentation skills, learning to form up into lines, getting through some marching steps for a parade, or the like. For years the (then) Central Indiana Council had a nationally renowned Boy Scout Marching Band that was featured in many parades for both its marching and musical skills. In that case, the Scouts that participated mastered a good bit of drill routine and were so good at it that getting into the Scout Band was harder than getting into the All-City Band.

**Speaking Only for Myself in the Scouting Spirit, Michael F. Bowman
a/k/a Professor Beaver (WB), ASTA #2566, OA Vigil Honor '71, Eagle
Scout '67, Serving as Deputy District Commissioner for Training,
G.W.Dist., Nat. Capital Area Council, BSA - mfbowman@capaccess.org**

**Date: Sat, 6 Jan 1996 10:05:43 +0000 (GMT)
From: Ian N Ford <ianford@dircon.co.uk>
To: "Michael F. Bowman" <mfbowman@CAPACCESS.ORG>
Subject: Re: Youth Protection Act Part 2 of 2**

Mike

The UK [Children Act 1968] provides for background checks of individuals having " substantial access " to children and young people, mainly professionals such as teachers, social workers etc. but also volunteers in sensitive positions. Most youth organisations have access to the list of " undesirables " , individuals who have been convicted (I note the US law says arrested , which seems to go against the supposition of innocence until proven guilty) of a Schedule One offence, including indecency and I think wilful neglect etc. (I've not got a copy of the documentation at home.)

We do not include fingerprints - we are far more sensitive to that as a civil rights issue. In fact during the first MB lock-in the Ministry of Defence police were reluctant to teach Fingerprinting MB because our law on fingerprinting (especially juveniles) is so strict. From memory prints are only kept if an individual has been <convicted> of an offence carrying a maximum penalty of a custodial sentence of three (?) years. If the defendant is acquitted or convicted of a lesser charge the prints must be destroyed and computer images wiped. Fingerprints are not used for administrative purposes such as firearms or liquor licensing as they are in parts of USA.

Each agency has to have a nominated senior officer and one deputy who are authorised to initiate a search on the Police National Computer. The search is conducted by the police and a report sent to the Authorised Officer, i.e. no other agencies have access to PNC apart from police , security services and other law enforcement agencies.

The Authorised Officer has to specify the job or position that the individual is applying for in order to establish that " substantial access to children " is involved.

In many ways I would like the system to be more available. All the UK professional bodies felt that it should be limited to actual proven convictions or admitted offences that resulted in a caution , because of the possibility of malicious allegations, and that makes sound sense.

Regards,

Ian

Date: Sat, 17 Feb 1996 16:47:25 -0500 (EST)
From: "Michael F. Bowman" <mfbowman@CapAccess.org>
To: SCOUTS-L - Youth Groups Discussion List <SCOUTS-L@TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU>
Subject: Adult Leadership - Coed Activities

Mike Walton, et al

I've just looked over my copies of YPP, the Guide to Safe Scouting, literature on several High Adventure Bases, and Exploring literature and no where does BSA require that an Explorer unit have two male and two female leaders for a coed activity.

Let me quote from the Explorer Leader Handbook at page A-66:

"Two-deep leadership. Two registered adult leaders or one registered adult leader and a parent of a participant, both of whom must be 21 years of age or older, are required on all trips and outings. If the activity is coeducational, leaders of both sexes must be present."

If BSA had meant to double the leadership requirement, it would have done so explicitly, but it has not. And while there are advantages to having back-up leaders of both sexes it is not required by National.

There are three circumstances where an exception to this may occur and where four adults may be required:

1. When the local Council Risk Assessment Committee recommends a more stringent standard and it is approved by the Council Executive Board and Scout Executive.
2. When a chartering organization requires more leaders.
3. When a host location; e.g. another organization's camp or a specific Scout activity requires a higher ratio of leaders.

But remember these are the exceptions and not the rule. If we had to have four adults for every Coed Explorer activity, we would soon see the death of Exploring in some areas.

Speaking Only for Myself in the Scouting Spirit, Michael F. Bowman

a/k/a Professor Beaver (WB), ASTA #2566, OA Vigil Honor '71, Eagle Scout '67, Serving as Deputy District Commissioner for Training, G.W.Dist., Nat. Capital Area Council, BSA - mfbowman@capaccess.org

Date: Mon, 19 Feb 1996 17:07:45 -0500
From: Dave Hultberg <dave.hultberg@PAONLINE.COM>
Subject: MINIMUM # OF ADULTS

In a message to Professor Beaver (Mike Bowman) you wrote:

PB> I've just looked over my copies of YPP, the Guide to Safe Scouting,
PB> literature on several High Adventure Bases, and Exploring literature
PB> and no where does BSA require that an >Explorer unit have two male
and
PB> two female leaders for a coed activity.

> Sure it does. I've looking at page 4, from the 1995 version
> of the Safe Guide to Scouting:

Based on what I was taught at Wood Badge and Scoutmastership Fundamentals,
and my own "Scouter's sense" I've got to agree with Mike (Professor Beaver)
instead of Mike (Black Eagle) on this one. We had this exact same question
come up when our Venture Crew invited a Girl Scout Troop as their guests
on
an AT hike. We only had one female adult (Girl Scout Leader) and several
male (SM, ASM) adults to lead the trip. We checked this out thoroughly at
bothe the district and council level with both the volunteers and
professionals. We were assured that there was no requirement to have
two
female adults. I agree totally with Professor Beaver's interpretation (and
who better to interpret than a lawyer) of the rules quoted above.

+-----+
|David B. Hultberg, ASTA #1781 email: dave.hultberg@paonline.com|
|Advancement Chairman, Troop 196 Eagle Scout Class of 1967 |
|Keystone Area Council Bobwhite NE-VI-34 |
+-----+

Date: Mon, 19 Feb 1996 18:40:45 -0500

From: Patrick Skelly <ScoutLdr@aol.com>
Subject: Re: Adult Leadership - Coed Activities

Mike Walton suggests we apply "Scouter's Sense" to this dilemma.

Scouter's Sense: that has always meant my (or another person's) biased interpretation. I happen to like Mike Bowman's interpretation.

***My* strict interpretation of the rule, "No fewer than four individuals (always with the minimum of two adults) ...", is that it is technically satisfied with one man, one woman, one boy, one girl. There is no 'sense' applied here, only a pure analysis of words and their dictionary meanings.**

But please *DON'T* believe me. Stop the trivial pursuit. Let someone who really cares ask *the BSA* in Irving TX for a written clarification.

Nothing else will settle our difference of views. There is *no* other proper solution.

Now, back into the bunker ...

Pat Skelly <ScoutLdr@AOL.com>
host, AOL Scouting Online forum
Cape Cod MA

(I only quoted 14 words from other people. Please try to do as well, or better, with this post. Thank you.)

Date: Mon, 19 Feb 1996 12:35:11 -0600
From: golden cliff <c60clg1@corn.cso.niu.edu>
Subject: Re: Adult Leadership - Coed Activities
To: Multiple recipients of list SCOUTS-L <SCOUTS-L@TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU>

I've been an Explorer Post Advisor for 8 years. Although we are not a coed post, I've been to all the required training.

When the book says Male and Female adult leaders are required, that does not necessarily mean plural to each gender. One male and one female would fulfill that sentence.

I have never heard at any time a requirement for four adult leaders on a coed trip. The adult leadership must reflect the genders of the youth, but not necessarily in duplicate.

YIS, Cliff Golden cgolden@niu.edu First Lutheran Church, DeKalb
Scoutmaster Troop 33 (Advisor Post 333) Three Fires Council, Illinois

Date: Sun, 18 Feb 1996 21:47:23 -0600
From: "Settummanque, the blackeagle (MAJ) Mike Walton"
<blackeagle@HCC-UKY.CAMPUS.MCI.NET>
Subject: Re: Adult Leadership - Coed Activities
To: Multiple recipients of list SCOUTS-L <SCOUTS-L@TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU>

Professor Beaver (Mike Bowman) wrote:

>I've just looked over my copies of YPP, the Guide to Safe >Scouting,
literature on several High Adventure Bases, and >Exploring literature and
no
where does BSA require that an >Explorer unit have two male and two
>female leaders for a coed activity.

Sure it does. I've looking at page 4, from the 1995 version
of the Safe Guide to Scouting:

"No fewer than four individuals (always with the minimum of
two adults) go on any backcountry expedition or campout."
This appears in bold on the second column at the top of the
page, under "Safety Rule of Four".

Under "Leadership Requirements for Trips and Outings", same page, under
"two-deep" leadership", the last sentence reads "Coed *overnight* activities
require male and female adult leaders."

Using a little "Scouters' Sense", and knowing that if you take
two male leaders normally on an overnight trip WITHOUT female
members, if
you take one female youth member, you MUST have dual
female adult supervision. Therefore, four adults. And since the
ONLY part of our program that has both male and female youth members
is our
Exploring program, it has to apply to them.

>If BSA had meant to double the leadership requirement, it would >have
done
so explicitly, but it has not. And while there >advantages to having
back-up leaders of both sexes it is not >required by National.

Everything I've attended over the past four years (with the exception of the Philmont Conferences) with regard to Exploring have stated this policy, although I've only seen the references I've given here. I'll call and find out for sure on Tuesday (Monday's a federal holiday in the USA, for those unaware) because again, we have one book saying one thing, and some local Councils saying the same things, and other Councils saying other differing things.

>There are three circumstances where an exception to this may >occur and where four adults may be required:

>

>1. When the local Council Risk Assessment Committee recommends a >more

stringent standard and it is approved by the Council >Executive Board and Scout Executive.

>

>2. When a chartering organization requires more leaders.

>

>3. When a host location; e.g. another organization's camp or a >specific Scout activity requires a higher ratio of leaders.

>

>But remember these are the exceptions and not the rule. If we >had to have

four adults for every Coed Explorer activity, we >would soon see the death of Exploring in some areas.

I don't see it that way, Mike. If I know that my Post is going to go on an overnight camping event (a superactivity), I will insure that I have myself, my Associate Advisor and at least two other adults (not necessarily registered Exploring leaders...it can be parents of the Explorers involved, or an older brother or sister of one of the members...as long as they are 21 or older) attending BEFORE the event is conducted.

Exploring takes some planning on the part of the youth involved as well as the chartered partner. I don't think that OVERNIGHT events will come to an end just because they can't find two more adults to come along. If that was the case, then we have more of a problem with our Posts and Ships being run by one or two adults than we think we do!

The string started with Utah asking about the "bare minimum" adults needed to charter (recharter, in his case) an Explorer Post. We really shouldn't be emphasizing the "bare minimum", although we answered the question; we should instead be emphasizing that ALL POSITIONS be filled by adults so that it will allow the unit to participate in any activity or event without trying to "gather two males and two females". This involves some communication between the parents of the Explorers and the Advisor that "I'm not here to take your teens on trips...WE'RE here to help your son or daughter to explore a career or hobby area. As parents, you have a role in this process as well...and believe me, we will be asking you to play your role."

I'll give a call and find out for sure if we're talking "two adults", "two adults and one more if we're taking females", or "four adults". While I'm at it, I want to get an answer on the proper device for our Commissioner staffs (Cub and Scout) to wear now that we're not recognizing them as "commissioners".

Thanks for the additional information, Mike!

Settummanque!

Date: Mon, 19 Feb 1996 18:03:12 -0600
From: "Settummanque, the blackeagle (MAJ) Mike Walton"
<blackeagle@HCC-UKY.CAMPUS.MCI.NET>
Subject: Re: Adult Leadership - Coed Activities

Pat Skelly wrote:

>Mike Walton suggests we apply "Scouter's Sense" to this dilemma.

>Scouter's Sense: that has always meant my (or another person's) >biased interpretation. I happen to like Mike Bowman's >interpretation.

I do also, Pat...but I would rather find out what the real story is (and I will in the morning).

>But please *DON'T* believe me. Stop the trivial pursuit. Let >someone who really cares ask *the BSA* in Irving TX for a written >clarification.

I agree. I would think that I'm correct here, and what I've read kinda agrees with me, but there are seven other Scouters (including Professor Beaver) that says otherwise. To me, that indicates that *perhaps *I'm* wrong* about this.

THAT'S "Scouters' Sense"...it doesn't have to be biased, it just has to make sense to the 'average Scouter'. And the 'average Scouter' here says "Settummanque's wrong in this case".

Settummanque!

Date: Tue, 20 Feb 1996 18:54:47 -0600

From: "Settummanque, the blackeagle (MAJ) Mike Walton" <blackeagle@HCC-UKY.CAMPUS.MCI.NET>

Subject: Re: Adult Ldrs - Coed Activity

To: Multiple recipients of list SCOUTS-L <SCOUTS-L@TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU>

Well, you KNOW when seven other brains are thinking on the same wavelength, that "seven's better than two". We two (myself and another Exploring leader that agreed with my interpretation) are *technically INCORRECT*. I have to place that "technically" part there, because according to two Council Scout Executives, we are accurate in what we stated, but not according to what was STATED AS POLICY.

The Assistant Council Executive of the Council where I'm located assisted me in getting this information, and I thank Gary here (it was a little risky, because the "information" isn't supposed to be "placed on the Internet"). The other guy just confirmed what Gary found out, and added his own caveats to the discussion.

Gary first stated that "if you're interested in protecting the lone female adult from mis-statements or possible molestation claims from others -- the other male leaders or from youth members -- it seems to be a great idea to have two males and two females along for the trip. However, the Safe_Guide_to_Scouting, the way that we read it here, says that only TWO adults, one of which is registered, and preferably both of them registered, is MANDATORY when taking a unit even out to Philmont." With a "I can see your point, though...", he then had the secretary to call Don Winston at the Exploring Division. Don's out travelling, but he got to speak with Bill Rodgers, the Associate National Director of Exploring and to Larry (I didn't catch the last name) with Risk

Management.

While the Exploring Youth Protection Plan materials in the current Exploring Leader Handbook addresses having more than two adults present for any outdoor activity, both National staffers agreed with Gary (and with Professor Beaver (Mike Bowman) and some other Scouters here) that

ONLY TWO is what the BSA is going to look at for the BARE MINIMUM. Each Council, Larry stated, has a copy of the present Youth Protection Policies which apply to Exploring units as well as to Scout Troops and Cub Packs.

The key, said Bill, is that the unit must have two-deep leadership while undertaking any kind of outdoor overnight activity. While having the additional adults is a great thing, and should be strived for at the interest of the youth participating, as long as you have the registered Scouters present, it doesn't matter.

He also stressed the importance that all dealing with the unit (including parents) participate in the BSA's YPP program.

When I asked about the Exploring YPP Guidelines, Bill stated that they couldn't get a large number of Councils to "buy off on it" and the policy, as stated in the 1995 Safe Guide is the most current. Larry concurred that if your Council is still distributing the older versions, to insure that they are replaced with the current version. Each unit should have a copy.

Bill also asked if I was coming to Philmont this summer. I replied that I'm not sure, but I told him that I'll do my part in promoting the conference. "I'm sure you will, Mike", he said.

Then, shortly after I finished trying to capture Kimi to take her to the Vet, Scott (the CE from southern Ohio) returned my call and stated the same things as both Gary and Bill. He also added that "If I was taking both males and female Explorers to Philmont, I would bring along at least two female leaders, and one of them would be registered. I tell my key Scouters here that they should never be in a situation whereby they are alone with any Scout or Explorer..they should always have another adult present, or at least another youth member. The rationale made sense, Mike, but it's not the way the book reads, or what the 1995 policy says;

and THAT'S what we have to go by. While it was being fielded, a lot of us expressed some reluctance to implementing it. It means that we would have to find female adult leadership for some posts that we know are merely on paper as "holding places" for our older boys."

So, with head bowed to Professor Beaver, and to those other Scouters that stated the same things (or close to it...while disagreeing with me), I'm wronnnnnnnnnnnnnn(can't put that "g" in there...but it's there...*grinning*).

Thanks for a great discussion, however.

Date: Sun, 18 Feb 1996 22:53:29 -0500
From: "Robert W. McGwier" <n4hy@CCR-P.IDA.ORG>
Subject: Re: Adult Leadership - Coed Activities

I completely agree and subscribe to Michael Bowman's reading and interpretation of the YPP and Safety Guide, which I have also spent the last couple of days reading and re-reading. This personally affected me as I am advisor to one of the largest Explorer posts in George Washington Council (we hit forty members) and being Outdoor/High Adventure, mostly what we do is overnight and co-ed. Having taken co-ed overnights with one female along clearly had me worried with the current question.

Thanks to all for bringing this serious issue to our attention but I believe the Mike W. has not read it correctly.

Bob

--

Dr. Robert W. McGwier | n4hy@ccr-p.ida.org: ham radio,
scouts,
Center for Communications Research | astronomy, golf (o yea, & math!)
Princeton, N.J. 08520 | Cmte member Troop 5700, ACM Pack 53,
(609)-279-6240(v) (609)-924-3061(f) | Council Commissioner Sanhican #2
WWW,
(609-443-8963 (h) | I used to be a Buffalo . . . NE III-120
Explorer Post 995 advisor | proud parent in Brownie Troop 196

Date: Mon, 19 Feb 1996 15:05:56 -0700

From: Ted Burton <tedbrtn@CYBERHIGHWAY.NET>
Subject: Re: Adult Leadership - Coed Activities

There has been much discussion of the two-adult rule as applied to coed outings. I have an occupational hazard as an attorney of reading language rather precisely, which admittedly can be more precisely than the original writer wrote it, and thus misleading. Still:

>

>"No fewer than four individuals (always with the minimum of
>two adults) go on any backcountry expedition or campout."

That rule speaks of 'four individuals (always with the minimum ... two adults'. That language standing alone permits the outing to be two adults, and two young people. If we then take our four individuals, and make one of the adults female, and one of the young people female, the rule is not broken. We still have four individuals, and two adults.

>Under "Leadership Requirements for Trips and Outings", same page, under
>"two-deep" leadership", the last sentence reads "Coed *overnight*
activities
>require male and female adult leaders."

I submit that with one adult male, and one adult female, we have as a matter of English 'male and female adult leaders.'

>Using a little "Scouters' Sense", and knowing that if you take
>two male leaders normally on an overnight trip WITHOUT female
members, if
>you take one female youth member, you MUST have dual
>female adult supervision.

No, there is a logical error in in assuming nothing changes in the requirements respecting the original two males. You must have an adult female present. You can have two-deep leadership, while letting one of the two male leaders stay home, or you may have three-deep leadership by merely adding the female.

Now, using a little "Scouter's Sense" we might well decide that, if we can do so as a matter of volunteers, and do so without overwhelming the youth by making the youth feel like an add-on to an adult outing, taking four adults or even more can be a good idea. Among other things, if a Scouter's

wife is not using "Shadow Scouter's Sense," an adult male Scouter might be well advised to have his opposite adult female Scouter and himself chaperoned by one or more other adults. I have met a Mrs. Assistant Scoutmaster or two who were very jealous of the Troop, and adding a female adult leader would have been the frosting on that cake. That is Burton's Adult Protection Policy. ;-)

Ted

who is netAddressed as: tedbrtn@cyberhighway.net

"Indeed, it would not be an exaggeration to describe the history of the computer industry for the past decade as a massive effort to keep up with Apple."

-Byte, December 1994

From ianford@dircon.co.uk Sat Jan 6 05:06:52 1996
Date: Sat, 6 Jan 1996 10:05:43 +0000 (GMT)
From: Ian N Ford <ianford@dircon.co.uk>
To: "Michael F. Bowman" <mfbowman@CAPACCESS.ORG>
Subject: Re: Youth Protection Act Part 2 of 2

Mike

The UK [Children Act 1968] provides for background checks of individuals having " substantial access " to children and young people, mainly professionals such as teachers, social workers etc. but also volunteers in sensitive positions. Most youth organisations have access to the list of " undesirables " , individuals who have been convicted (I note the US law says arrested , which seems to go against the supposition of innocence until proven guilty) of a Schedule One offence, including indecency and I think wilful neglect etc. (I've not got a copy of the documentation at home.)

We do not include fingerprints - we are far more sensitive to that as a civil rights issue. In fact during the first MB lock-in the Ministry of Defence police were reluctant to teach Fingerprinting MB because our law on fingerprinting (especially juveniles) is so strict. From memory prints are only kept if an individual has been <convicted> of an offence carrying a maximum penalty of a custodial sentence of three (?) years. If the defendant is acquitted or convicted of a lesser charge the prints must

be destroyed and computer images wiped. Fingerprints are not used for administrative purposes such as firearms or liquor licensing as they are in parts of USA.

Each agency has to have a nominated senior officer and one deputy who are authorised to initiate a search on the Police National Computer. The search is conducted by the police and a report sent to the Authorised Officer, i.e. no other agencies have access to PNC apart from police , security services and other law enforcement agencies.

The Authorised Officer has to specify the job or position that the individual is applying for in order to establish that " substantial access to children " is involved.

In many ways I would like the system to be more available. All the UK professional bodies felt that it should be limited to actual proven convictions or admitted offences that resulted in a caution , because of the possibility of malicious allegations, and that makes sound sense.

Regards,

Ian

Date: Fri, 29 Mar 1996 00:58:46 -0600
From: Olan Watkins <o.watkins@GENIE.COM>
Subject: Excess Scout Energy

I have attached below a copy of a message from a Scout that was posted in a youth area of a Scouting bulletin board to give you an idea of what some of our Scouts do after we adults are asleep. I don't think I have ever had an thing quite like this go on at camp, but I have had my fair share of other things.

When I first got into Scouting as an adult with a Troop, the Scoutmaster had been an old Army Top Sergeant, and he made all of us Assistant Scoutmaster rotate the duty of what he called fire watch. Any way, at least one adult ASM had to be up and awake all night long when we were out on a campout or

at something like a Camporee. I always thought that the all night long gaurd duty was wasted effort, and when I took over the Troop a few years later I dropped the practice, but he may have had the right idea. <G>

YIS, Olan

=====

28-Mar-96 14:38:25

Sb: CAMP- BOY SCOUTS ONLY!!

To: all

Hi,

Each month we go on camp and each time we play a trick on the new member of the troop. Every new member must endure this trick (It even happened to ME!). So below we have written the new Camp Trick for 1996. We all thought hard over this new prank and finally came up with the worst thing that could ever happen to a Boy Scout, below is our new prank. This trick must be done at night when the leaders have all gone back to their tents. First you grab the boy and gag him so he doesn` t scream and attract the leader, strip him to his underwear, then all carry him to a nearby tree, where you tie his ankles to the bottom and then his hands must be tied to the tree above his head. Next you must blindfold the boy and make sure he cannot shout. Then you leave him there for about 10 minutes before you come back to him to carry out part B!. In part B you must find the scout with the smelliest socks (It`s a good idea to do this after a very long hike!). Then use must put the socks under the scouts nose causing him to breath in the stink! (Remember most of this has happened to me). Then after about 10 minutes of the socks, try spraying ICE-COLD water and then leaving him freeze for 5 minutes or so before you cover him in mud and do really what ever you like to him, we tickled him

and made him kiss our feet before we let him go.
WARNING: Although this was all a lot of fun that night, we did have to pay for it when our leader found out. We all had to kiss his feet and be his SLAVE for the entire day, it was hell! Could you imagine it one young scout with the entire troop at his mercy! He made us wash the dishes while he tickled us, I heard some scouts had to sniff his dirty underwear and we all had to sleep in one 6 man tent - there were 16 of us!
SO JUST THINK BEFORE YOU DO SOMETHING LIKE THIS but it is a lot of fun!!!
IF YOU HAVE ANY TRICKS OFF YOUR OWN COULD YOU PLEASE TELL ME AS WE NOW HAVE TO CHANGE THIS ONE SINCE WE GOT CAUGHT

From mfbowman@CapAccess.org Sat Mar 30 01:58:47 1996
Date: Sat, 30 Mar 1996 01:58:45 -0500 (EST)
From: "Michael F. Bowman" <mfbowman@CapAccess.org>
To: SCOUTS-L - Youth Groups Discussion List <SCOUTS-L@TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU>
cc: Multiple recipients of list SCOUTS-L <SCOUTS-L@TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU>
Subject: Re: Excess Scout Energy
In-Reply-To: <199603290122.AA159692571@relay1.geis.com>
Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.91-FP.960330011739.20276D-100000@cap1.capaccess.org>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII
Status: RO
X-Status:

One of my favorite pictures is a Norman Rockwell painting of a Scoutmaster standing behind a campfire tripod with slumbering scouts in open front tents in the background. It was on the front of the first Scoutmaster's Handbook I used. The picture speaks to the situation you have raised. The Scoutmaster on a campout has to be alert to and watchful of what his Scouts are up to and that often means some late hours with not too much sleep. Your message suggests a reason for the late night vigilance.

The Scout who wrote the to bulletin board, although engaging in hazing which we cannot condone, is behaving ways that some of us did in our own youth. The difference is that with age and experience we have learned that this sort of behavior is destructive and may well result in some of the younger boys leaving the program. BSA has taken a pretty strong position in its Youth Protection Policies against hazing because of the harm it causes.

In the past there have been a number of us on Scouts-L who have written about youth experiences with hazing and a steadfast desire to make sure it doesn't happen in units that we are involved with as Scouters. In many cases it is because we know what it feels like to have been the victim.

There are some that would argue that this is just one of those rites of passage and that boys will be boys. I can't accept this as a justification. There are plenty of ways in which the Scouting program can offer a positive set of experiences that also serve as rites of passage without the harm or risk of injury. And whether we all agree or not, the behavior described is against the rules BSA has set up.

In this case it sounds like the Scoutmaster tried to reverse the roles as punishment, but succeeded only in perpetuating the "game" of pranks. Having the victim act as perpetrator in activities similar to the hazing validated the behavior he was trying to eradicate. And along the way he may have himself violated YPP rules by allowing this conduct.

The lesson in this is that the leader needs to be vigilant and aware that Scouts will sometimes try these sorts of pranks. When it occurs the misconduct needs to be addressed. In some cases counseling will do, in others the Scout(s) may have to be suspended. In no case should the Scoutmaster reciprocate in the conduct either directly or by allowing a Scout to do so.

We should also be aware that word of this sort of thing gets around. Little Johnny goes home and mom wants to know why he's encrusted with mud, so he explains the fun time he had. :- (Now mom is upset and reactive. In my neighborhood we had such a situation and unfortunately the mom was also the PTA President. Her reaction was to try to get the PTA to dump a charter.

The example that Olan provided is one that should serve to alert us all

to be aware that sometimes Scouts with excess energy can and do engage in unacceptable behavior as in the case of the lad posting to the BBS. I would be interested in hearing how unit leaders act to reduce the chance of similar conduct in their own units.

Speaking Only for Myself in the Scouting Spirit, Michael F. Bowman
a/k/a Professor Beaver (WB), ASTA #2566, OA Vigil Honor '71, Eagle Scout '67, Serving as Deputy District Commissioner for Training,
G.W.Dist., Nat. Capital Area Council, BSA - mfbowman@capaccess.org

Date: Thu, 23 May 1996 01:44:50 -0400 (EDT)
From: "Michael F. Bowman" <mfbowman@CapAccess.org>
Subject: Re: behavior problem dad

Gary,

When an adult directs physical assaults on other children, that adult is engaging in child abuse and this needs to be referred to your Scout Executive pronto. We in Scouting do not and cannot condone an adult directing a child to hit or punch another Scout. This is a Youth Protection Policy issue that should be addressed now. Let your Cubmaster, Committee Chair and Chartered Organization Representative know the circumstances and what you are going to do, if you wish, but this needs to be reported. Your Scout Executive can evaluate with the Council's legal counsel and local authorities the proper course of action. If you do nothing and this continues, you can be named in a lawsuit for being negligent in your duties by allowing this to continue, if a parent decides to sue. In the meantime, I would simply tell this adult that you will not allow them to participate with your den. The sad thing is that the son of this adult will ultimately be the victim because his parent cannot behave in a responsible manner.

Speaking Only for Myself in the Scouting Spirit, Michael F. Bowman
a/k/a Professor Beaver (WB), ASTA #2566, OA Vigil Honor '71, Eagle Scout '67, Serving as Deputy District Commissioner for Training,
G.W.Dist., Nat. Capital Area Council, BSA - mfbowman@capaccess.org

Date: Thu, 23 May 1996 23:21:09 -0400 (EDT)
From: "Michael F. Bowman" <mfbowman@CapAccess.org>
To: The Hendra Family <hendra@MACSCOUTER.COM>
cc: "Hendra, Gary" <YA0009UH@macpo.ssd.loral.com>

Subject: Notice On Patch Company (fwd)

Gary,

You may want to pull references to the patch company listed in the forwarded message from your web page.

**Speaking Only for Myself in the Scouting Spirit, Michael F. Bowman
a/k/a Professor Beaver (WB), ASTA #2566, OA Vigil Honor '71, Eagle
Scout '67, Serving as Deputy District Commissioner for Training,
G.W.Dist., Nat. Capital Area Council, BSA - mfbowman@capaccess.org**

----- Forwarded message -----

Date: Wed, 22 May 1996 20:28:55 -0500

From: Todd N. Tingblad <tingbltn@UWEC.EDU>

To: Multiple recipients of list SCOUTS-L <SCOUTS-L@TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU>

Subject: Notice On Patch Company

Indianhead Council has send notice to it's Districts to stop using the I.T.L. Patch Co., Inc. of Minneapolis, MN. It's owner has admitted to being a pedophile. This notice was issued by Indianhead Council about 14 days ago.

This was quite a surprise to all of us in the districts since nothing as been in the media. Maybe it was, but we all missed it.

Any questions about Indianhead Council's position on this matter should be directed to the Council office at 612-224-1891.

YiS,

Todd Tingblad -- tingbltn@uwec.edu

Date: Tue, 2 Jul 1996 01:56:32 -0400 (EDT)

From: "Michael F. Bowman" <mfbowman@CapAccess.org>

To: SCOUTS-L - Youth Groups Discussion List <SCOUTS-L@TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU>

cc: Multiple recipients of list SCOUTS-L <SCOUTS-L@TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU>

Subject: Re: Y.P. and Camping

Pat,

I am not aware of any National YPP prohibition on a married couple being with a unit on an outing for the purposes of having two adult leaders, as well as for two-deep leadership. However, some Council Risk Assessment Committees have developed local Council policies that require more stringent requirements under local YPP rules. Baltimore Area Council may have opted to require an additional leader, if the leadership on an outing would otherwise be a married couple. This question is best answered on a local Council basis.

Speaking Only for Myself in the Scouting Spirit, Michael F. Bowman a/k/a Professor Beaver (WB), ASTA #2566, OA Vigil Honor '71, Eagle Scout '67, Serving as Deputy District Commissioner for Training, G.W.Dist., Nat. Capital Area Council, BSA - mfbowman@capaccess.org

**From mfbowman@CapAccess.org Thu Jul 4 17:20:36 1996
Date: Thu, 4 Jul 1996 17:20:35 -0400 (EDT)
From: "Michael F. Bowman" <mfbowman@CapAccess.org>
To: SCOUTS-L - Youth Groups Discussion List <SCOUTS-L@TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU>
cc: Multiple recipients of list SCOUTS-L <SCOUTS-L@TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU>
Subject: Re: two deep leadership**

Marc,

Our YPP Guru tells me that the rule to be followed with campouts, camporees and the like is that a single adult driver is okay, provided that at least two other Scouts are in the car, unless it is the adult and his/her child only. The adult should never be in a car with a single youth member, unless its his/her child. The "front seat" rule sounds like a local council policy or advice, but as far as I know is not a National rule.

Speaking Only for Myself in the Scouting Spirit, Michael F. Bowman a/k/a Professor Beaver (WB), ASTA #2566, OA Vigil Honor '71, Eagle Scout '67, Serving as Deputy District Commissioner for Training, G.W.Dist., Nat. Capital Area Council, BSA - mfbowman@capaccess.org

**Date: Sun, 7 Jul 1996 13:41:29 -0400 (EDT)
From: "Michael F. Bowman" <mfbowman@CapAccess.org>
To: SCOUTS-L - Youth Groups Discussion List <SCOUTS-L@TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU>**

**cc: Multiple recipients of list SCOUTS-L <SCOUTS-L@TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU>
Subject: Re: Sleeping Arrangements for Explorers**

Bruce Dollens,

While not exactly as clear as it might be, the Explorer Leader Handbook at pages A-64 to A-67 sets out the Youth Protection Policies for Explorers and makes it clear that "One-on-one contact between adults and Explorers is not permitted, except for authorized ride-along programs." The policies also state that youth members, in this case 14-21, cannot share a tent with an adult leader (over 21). Now this can lead to some fairly silly circumstances. For example you might have two college roommates in the Post - one is 20 (junior) and the other 21 (senior). These guys live together for 9 months of the year at college but officially cannot share a tent in Exploring. Frankly, I like what I hear about NOAC from Bruce's posting, it makes more sense to have a clear cut off at 18.

Speaking Only for Myself in the Scouting Spirit, Michael F. Bowman a/k/a Professor Beaver (WB), ASTA #2566, OA Vigil Honor '71, Eagle Scout '67, Serving as Deputy District Commissioner for Training, G.W.Dist., Nat. Capital Area Council, BSA - mfbowman@capaccess.org

**Date: Sun, 7 Jul 1996 14:48:09 -0400 (EDT)
From: "Michael F. Bowman" <mfbowman@CapAccess.org>
To: SCOUTS-L - Youth Groups Discussion List <SCOUTS-L@TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU>
cc: Multiple recipients of list SCOUTS-L <SCOUTS-L@TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU>
Subject: Re: Found on Disney Newsgroup**

George

You quoted a posting you found on the Disney Newsgroup

**> >Scouts, Parents, friends of Scouting - Did you ever try to warn
> >scouting officials of possible sex abuse by adults in scouting, only to
> >be ignored and persecuted for your allegations and were later proven
> >right.
>>
> >Boy Scout sex abuse whistleblower is interested in speaking with you.
> >Please respond confidentially to**

This sort of message is troublesome for a variety of reasons. It has

been released to many lists. We don't know the intentions of the author or the author's motivations. Sadly some will do much to try to damage Scouting in the pursuit of a personal agenda or a group agenda without consideration for the Scouts. This may be a situation where a lawyer, investigative journalist or someone with an axe to grind is trying to gather unconfirmed allegations to further a personal purpose. At which point the promise of confidentiality will most likely be forgotten, because no legal privilege from testimony exists for such messages a lawyer can use any e-mailed responses in evidence without much regard for the privacy of anyone responding.

We have an fairly good plan for protecting youth in Scouting using barriers to reduce the chance of a problem. Likewise we have a fairly good reporting chain to address problems. Finally, in every State there are reporting laws that protect people who come forward to Child Protective Agencies to report abuse. There are ample safeguards, and there are reporting avenues that do assure confidentiality and privacy interests. I am aware of many instances where BSA has reacted quickly to charges of abuse and not aware of any instances where someone who reported the abuse was harassed. I am one of those who have reported a situation of physical abuse to a Scout and I guess the recent honor I received of becoming a Silver Beaver would kind of suggest that there is no organizational feeling against those that report abuse.

I really get agitated - yes, go ahead ask me how I feel about this - when I see someone trying to generate discontent to benefit themselves personally instead of trying to work constructively within the Scouting movement to make things better for all of our Scouts.

**Speaking Only for Myself in the Scouting Spirit, Michael F. Bowman
a/k/a Professor Beaver (WB), ASTA #2566, OA Vigil Honor '71, Eagle
Scout '67, Serving as Deputy District Commissioner for Training,
G.W.Dist., Nat. Capital Area Council, BSA - mfbowman@capaccess.org**