

DOI: [10.20472/SS.2019.8.2.001](https://doi.org/10.20472/SS.2019.8.2.001)

SUBJECTIVE VALUES VERSUS OBJECTIVE SCIENCE

DOUGLAS A. ABBOTT

Abstract:

The purpose of this paper is to expose the bias in much of our social science research. The values and ethics of authors often influence their research procedures and results. Thus, the public gets a distorted (or unbalanced) view of important topics in marriage, sexuality, and family life. Universities have turned into institutions of liberal, secular-humanistic indoctrination and show little tolerance for conservative views on almost any topic. College classrooms have turned into battle grounds of competing ideologies where professors and students will not give the other and opportunity to speak freely and without negative repercussions.

Keywords:

bias, subjective and objective perspectives, points of view, ideological differences.

JEL Classification: I20, C18, C99

Authors:

DOUGLAS A. ABBOTT, Emeritus Professor of Child, Youth & Family Studies, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, United States, Email: douglasabbott473@gmail.com

Citation:

DOUGLAS A. ABBOTT (2019). Subjective Values versus Objective Science . International Journal of Social Sciences, Vol. VIII(2), pp. 1-13., 10.20472/SS.2019.8.2.001

Subjective Values versus Objective Science

By Douglas A. Abbott, PhD

The purpose of this paper is to reveal the liberal bias found in most academic papers and books. Second, the author will explain his interpretation of “Political Correctness” and how the dogma corrupts the quest for unbiased research and writing. Third, an example of academic bias will be provided. It is hoped the reader will be more careful and cautious when reading academic papers and evaluate the author’s bias, especially a liberal bias that dominates much of academia (Smith, 2012).

Many research studies have shown that the vast majority of professors (70-90% depending on department) in the social sciences (e.g., psychology, sociology, criminal justice, journalism, social work, theology, history, English, economics, and education) are humanist, liberals, atheists, democrats, multiculturalists. (Mooney, 2013). They place no value or belief in organized religion, though they may admit to having some type of personal spiritual orientation (Church, 2009).

These are the men and women who rule higher education with an iron fist and brook little tolerance for any thought or speech, point of view, or theory of intervention that flies in the face of their political correct values, dogmas or policies. True academic freedom is a concept that no longer exists at large, research one universities. If you teach anything controversial or have students read any article that may offended, distress or upset a student for any reason—even if the teacher is fairly presenting two sides of an issue—the student will complain to the department chair or dean and the faculty will be disciplined for insensitivity or bigotry.

How do I know this: It has happened to me several times at the University of Nebraska over a 30 year career of teaching and research. I once did a survey of 300 college students asking if sexual preference (who you choose to have sex with) can change over time. I implied that change was possible and supported that opinion with several published research papers from professional, peer-reviewed journals (Byrne, 2007).

One young lady stood up in class and said she was insulted and offended because she had always been a lesbian and one cannot change genetics, she said. She reported my remarks to the campus IRB (a group that approves and supervises all academic research) and I was called in for a two hour inquisition and reprimanded. So much for “academic freedom of speech.”

It should be noted that genes (our DNA) do not directly cause any complex psychosocial behavior (ref.....my paper). This is a fact, not my mere opinion. Genes only do two things: (a) make proteins and (b) regulate other genes. Genes always interact with the environment and it is this entanglement that contributes to behavior. However, genes alone do not cause behavior the environment and moral agency (or freedom of choice) also plays a role in behavior (ref again).

Environment can play a powerful role in behavior especially through the mechanism of the epigenome which responds to environmental forces and then turns off or turns on some genes. So don't be fooled when someone says that “genes cause this or that behavior.” It's a lie. Genetic determinism is a falsehood. Genes may directly influence eye or hair color or some rare physical diseases like cystic fibrosis, Trisomy 21, Fragile X Syndrome or sickle cell anemia but genes, in general, do not cause complex psychosocial behaviors: love or hate, honesty or

deceit, liberalism or conservatism, compassion or cruelty, atheism or belief in God (Baker, 2004).

Now the new “sacred cow” of the academic and medical profession is “transgenderism (TG).” This is a person who believes he or she was born into the wrong body; for example a male who believes he is really a female. The academics, the doctors, the psychologists, the news pundits all support and praise the newly revealed sexual status. The US government has decided that all of us should accommodate the TG preferences under Title 9, the Sexual Nondiscrimination Act. TG biological men should be allowed access to women’s bathrooms, showers, and toilets.

This makes a big assumption: it suggests that TGs (and gays) are otherwise normal, healthy, mentally and physically; the same as heterosexuals. This supposition is really an hypothesis. A scientific theory is an approximate guess of what might be true universally, but must be supported by experimental data using many samples and done over many years. Until then it is only a theory and any theory cannot be accepted by just one case (or person) who seems to be healthy mentally and well-adjusted (Creswell, 2013).

William James the father of American modern psychology has said, and I paraphrase, “If you want to prove that not all crows are black (the assumption or theory), then find just one white crow.” The entire scientific method is based on this truism: if one exception, one anomaly can be found that cannot be predicted by the theory, then the theory, in general it not universally true, and must be discarded or revised so it has the ability to predict the exception. If it can’t, it is not a true theory.

Scientifically speaking, all that we believe in are only theories of how we think the world works. At any time an exception can be revealed to dispute any theory of social sciences or the physical sciences. The closest thing we have to a “proven” theory is quantum mechanics, a branch of physics (Carey, 2003). Over 70 years and in thousands of experiments the laws of quantum mechanics have never once failed to predict the correct outcome of an experiment--- but even one day it too may be revised (Barr, 2003).

This dogma that almost all variations of human sexual behavior normal and healthy variations of human sexual behavior are not based on science (or scientific testing and evaluation), but primarily on the personal values and beliefs of the liberal, multicultural, agnostic intelligentsia that dominates our universities, news media, Hollywood, and government (Lewontin, Rose, & Kamin, 1984).

The true scientific method is rarely used in the study of human sexual behavior. Why? Because the intelligentsia believe there is nothing amiss with any type of sexual behavior. Science should be used to study problems not normalized though atypical sexual behavior. The scientific method requires the following: many large, random samples of those with abnormal sexual behavior, a comparison group of heterosexuals, valid and reliable measures of mental and physical health, independent statistical analysis by unbiased statisticians, and an openness by the authors to report findings that counter their personal beliefs (Hubbard & Wald 1999). This has not been done sufficiently especially with the TG population.

However, if one did apply the scientific method to the study of transgendered individuals, for example, I believe the results would be similar to the few studies that have evaluated the mental, social, and physical health of gays and lesbians. Gays are more likely than

heterosexuals to have both mental and physical health problems: anxiety, depression, suicidal thoughts, and sexually transmitted diseases, low self-esteem, short-lived sexual partnerships, and unstable friendship networks, and have more problems with addictions to alcohol, drugs, and pornography (Wilson & Rahman, 2005). Some counter this by saying, "It's the stigma and ill-treatment of atypical sexual behavior in this country that increases their risk to mental and physical health problems." Conversely, studies in Scandinavian countries where there is little or no prejudice against one's sexual behavior, the same finding occur: gays and lesbians are less healthy than heterosexuals far above the rates found in the average heterosexual population (Frisch & Hviid, 2006; Hershberger 1997). It is not, in my opinion, the social stigma that causes gays and the TG to be on average less healthy and functional than heterosexuals *but I propose it is the abnormal sexual behavior itself*. Yet no one in the scientific community will even acknowledge this possibility (or hypothesis) or test it scientifically.

What should be done? The scientific method should be applied as in all other cases of hypothesis testing. To comply to the laws of science, for example: several hundred transgender persons, half male, half female, should be interviewed and evaluated with medical and psychological testing over a five to ten year time frame. Only then would we have hard data to support or reject the null hypothesis that there are no differences in physical and psychological functioning between the transgender and straight men and women. The scientific community, unfortunately, will not do this research nor allowed it to be done. This would be offensive, and show bigotry and intolerance because the experiment assumes their might be something unhealthy and dysfunctional about one's atypical sexual behavior (Moshman, 2005).

Thus, the general public and the news media are left with the mere opinions and values of the academic intelligentsia such as those in the American Psychological Association, the American Medical Association, or the National Educational Association. Their politically correct pronouncements are to be taken as fact, not as hypotheses to be evaluated with the scientific method (Slife, 2008).

So what is the regular person to conclude about atypical sexual behavior given what this author believes is biased information presented in the news, on TV and movies and by mental health organizations? First, realize that the establishment itself is biased in favor of sexual license (Byne, 1995). Second, go online to sites like "NARTH" and read what the science really reveals about these two conditions (Nicolosi, 2009). Third, ask the preachers of promiscuity to show you the hard data that aberrant sexual behavior is harmless. Forth, include your faith beliefs in understanding sexual behavior (Church, 2009; Collins, 2006). Fifth, have faith in your own gut reaction to abnormal sexual behavior and don't be weak and overwhelmed if you are accused of intolerance, bigotry, homophobia, ignorance and stupidity. Your reply could be, "I have my beliefs that I consider rational and reasonable, and you have your beliefs. There is little extant data to prove either side of the argument. Let's agree to disagree." Never try and force your opinion on someone else. It never works and only creates anger and conflict. The opposition become more entrenched that there position is correct.

Political Correctness

When writing about scientist's values and their impact upon research, the term "Political Correctness" (PC) is often used: Yet it is never clearly defined. This author will attempt such.

PC is the philosophy that certain ideas, values, behaviors, and speech which could possibly offend, judge, or victimize a minority group (especially one related to race, gender or sexual behavior) should not be written, printed, or depicted in art in any form in a public forum. There are exceptions for the PC crowd of course. For example. In 1987, artist Andres Serrano made a photograph of Christ on the Cross submerged in a glass of Serrano's own urine. It was exhibited at the Stux Gallery in New York at public expense. The artist received nearly \$20,000 by the National Endowments for the Arts.

US Senators Al D'Amato and Jesse Helms were outraged and objected but were crushed in a juggernaut of condemnation and ridicule. PC views are not permitted to be challenged by rational argument, rigorous empirical research, or religious belief. If a specific position has been decreed on a specific issue by a PC group, supporters will brook no dissent. It is so bad on many universities that an anti-PC position guest (and invited speaker) cannot even be heard on campus. Students will protest with signs, loudspeaker, and even force. Academic freedom has almost disappeared from college campuses. If one's talk has any possibility of offending anyone for any reasons, then the person is considered objectionable and will be interrupted with derogatory signs, hate speech, and even violence.

Dissent from PC views will be condemned as bigoted, prejudiced, intolerant, biased, dogmatic, inflexible, narrow-minded, and parochial. The dissenter will be silenced by coercion, ridicule, name-calling, intimidation, demotion or dismissal from work, or threats of law suits. PC attempts to promote fair-mindedness, acceptance of diversity and tolerance of all views; but in fact, PC is a highly inflexible, intolerant, and narrow-minded creed. It shuts the door on debate and inflicts severe restrictions on scientific investigation and on clinical psychological intervention that violates PC Doctrine. For example, Psychologists are not allowed to help a person with *unwanted* same-sex attraction.

A Sample of Ten PC Decrees

1. Men are irrelevant to the proper development and well-being of children.
2. Lesbian women are better “spousal” companions and better parents than heterosexual couples.
3. No one is really to blame for their immoral, destructive, or harmful thoughts and behaviors. The real blame lies with society’s discrimination, intolerance, bigotry, racism, sexism, heterosexism, impoverishment, and lack of opportunities for education and advancement. Everyone is a victim of his hormones and chemical-electric circuitry in the brain.
4. Traditional families (e.g., mother, father, and children) are archaic and obsolete in our modern, progressive society. Any group of individuals, committed to the health, welfare and security of its members is a “family.” The word family should be replaced with: a semi-autonomous, temporarily bonded, egalitarian, mutual care association or assemblage.

5. Sexual behavior, any sexual behavior between consenting adults or between adults and post-pubescent children is natural, positive, and enriching to all involved. There is no bad sex and should not be judged as such.
6. Bisexuality, homosexuality, transgenderism with all their variations in definitions and behavioral practices are normal, positive and healthy variations of human behavior.
7. There is no God, or higher level supernatural being; omnipotent and omnipresent; who loves and cares of all his earthly children. Thus, there are no ultimate standards of moral conduct. Behavior depends on the person, place, and self-definition.
8. There is no creative insight, inspiration or enlightenment, unrestrained awareness, or serendipitous illumination that humans receive from God to improve the human condition. There is no hope or help from God!
9. The ultimate goal of life is “pleasure” a bodily, sensual, exhilaration of the flesh. Other things are important like being fair minded and honest, but they are a distant second to pure pleasure.
10. There is no ultimate judge of human behavior, though there may be some sensible agreement in what is to be permitted in the public sphere. But for private, consensual behavior there are no restrictions no regrets and no remorse.

These are just a few PC doctrines. Many more could be cited. It is amazing to this author that so much of this ideology is believed and put into practice affecting education, government social policies, laws (even at the Supreme Court level), mental health practice, medicine, the news media, and the entertainment industry. We are being overwhelmed by false propaganda that affects individuals and families on a daily basis.

It will be difficult for many reader to even consider my point of view, let alone accept it. That is why publishing an article with this thesis is so difficult. Yet there are those who see the bias and are willing to speak up: But they are few and far between (Gross, 2017; Kristof, 2016; Mooney, 2013; Shields, & Dunn, 2016; Smith, 2012).

References

- Baker, C. (2004). *Behavioral genetics: An introduction to how genes and environments interact through development to shape differences in mood, personality, and intelligence*. New York, NY: American Association for the Advancement of Science and the Hastings Center. Retrieved from <http://www.aaas.org/spp/bgenes/publications.shtml>
- Barr, S. M. (2003). *Modern physics and ancient faith*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Byne, W. (2007). Biology and sexual minority status. In I. Meyer & M. Northridge (Eds.), *The health of sexual minorities: Public health perspectives on lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender populations* (pp. 65–90). New York, NY: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-31334-4_4
- Byne, W. (1995). Science and belief: Psychobiological research on sexual orientation. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 28, 3033-317. https://doi.org/10.1300/J082v28n03_08
- Carey, G. (2003). *Human genetics for the social sciences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Church, D. (2009). *The genie in our genes: Epigenetic medicine and the new biology of intention*. Fulton, CA: Elite Books.
- Collins, F. S. (2006). *The language of god, a scientist presents evidence for belief*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Research Design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches, 4th Edition*. Thousand Oakes, CA: Sage
- Frisch, M, & Hviid, A. (2006). Childhood family correlates of heterosexual and homosexual marriages: A national cohort study of two million Danes. *Archives of Sexual Behavior* 35,533-547. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-006-9062-2>

- Gross, N. (2017). Professor are overwhelmingly liberal. Do universities need to change hiring practices? *Los Angeles Times, Feb. 16.*
- Hershberger, S. L. (1997). A twin registry study of male and female sexual orientation. *Journal of Sex Research, 34*, 212–218. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499709551886>
- Hubbard, R., & Wald, E. (1999). *Exploding the gene myth*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Kristof, N. (2016). A confession of liberal intolerance. *Sunday Review, May 7.*
- Lewontin, R. C., Rose, S., Kamin, L. (1984). *Not in our genes*. NY: Pantheon.
- Long, J. (2010). *Evidence of the afterlife*. New York: HarperOne
- Mooney, C. (2013). Yes, liberal rule the Ivory Tower—but why? *Mother Jones, April 20.*
- Moshman, D. (2005). *Adolescent psychological development: Rationality, morality, and identity*. Mahawah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Nicolosi, J. (2009). Shame and attachment loss: *The practical work of reparative therapy*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Shields, J. A., & Dunn, J. M. (2016). *Passing on the right conservative professors in the progressive university*. NY: Oxford University Press, <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199863051.001.0001>
- Slife, B. D. (2008). A primer of the values implicit in counseling research methods, *Counseling and Values, 53*, 8-21. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-007X.2009.tb00110.x>
- Smith, E. E. (2012). Survey shocker: Liberal Profs admit they'd discriminate against conservative in hiring, advancement. *The Washington Times, August 1.*
- Wilson, G., & Rahman, Q. (2005). *Born gay: The psychobiology of sex orientation*. London, England: Peter Owen.