

*Ipce*

# NEWSLETTER

Number E 5, February 1999

## CONTENT

- 02 Colophon  
02 Corrections to Newsletter E4: [Table 10](#) of the Attachment 2  
03 Introduction
- 04 **ACTUAL:**  
UNESCO Conference in Paris  
[Pre-conference](#) paper; [two](#) critical [letters](#); [Declaration](#) & [Action Plan](#)
- 14 **BACKGROUND & ANALYSES:**
- 14 Interpreting the [Satanic Legend](#)  
23 [Robbing kids of their childhood](#) and teaching parents to panic  
Let children be children and adults be adults  
26 [Families for Freedom](#) Child Safety Bulletins
- 29 **OPINION & DISCUSSION**
- 29 A [letter](#) to the readers  
30 [Seven ideas](#) for coping with a vicious and dangerous world  
31 A Difficult [Childhood](#)?  
35 [Tolerance](#), please
- 38 **THE DOCTOR & THE REVEREND**
- 38 Dr Frits Bernard [writes](#)  
39 Frits Bernard's [Preface](#)  
40 [Sexuelle Freiheit](#) ist nicht überall gleich, Dr Frits Bernard  
40 [Pastorate and pedophilia](#), Rev. Hans Visser.
- 44 [Documentation Service](#) List February 1999

This Newsletter is edited in several word processing packages. The contents were created in MS Word 97. Consequently, the numbering of the pages may be different in other formats.

### COLOPHON

*Ipce* is a forum for people who are engaged in the academic discussion of and the understanding and emancipation of, paedophilia. Paedophilia, in this context, is intended to be viewed from an unbiased, non-judgemental perspective and in relation to Human Rights.

*Ipce* meets once every one or two years in a different country, publishes a newsletter, co-ordinates the (electronic) exchange of texts and keeps an archive of specific written publications.

### Corrections to Newsletter E4

#### Number of the Meeting

In the content, the *Ipce* Meeting is said to be the 11th, the report says it's the 12th. It was the *twelfth* meeting

#### Table 10 in Attachment 2

In *An Examination of Assumed Properties...*, I saw a mistake in table 10, while I was translating it in Dutch. In the box near "Landis 1956, f, Time to recover" the text of a former box is abusively repeated. Here is the table again in corrected version.

**Table 10**  
*Self-Reported Effects of CSA Experiences on College Students*

<i>Study</i>	<i>Sex</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Type of effect</i>	<i>Response</i>
Condy et al., 1987	m	51	Adult sex life	good = 37%; none = 28%; mixed = 9%; bad = 16%
Fisher, 1991	m	24	Stress then or now	no stress then or now = 21%; mean stress now = 2.12 on 1-10
Fritz et al., 1981	m	20	Current sex life	problems = 10%
Fishman, 1991	m	30 <sup>a</sup>	Overall life	positive = 17%; neutral = 57%; negative = 27%
			Current sex life	positive = 24%; neutral = 63%; negative = 13%
Landis, 1956	m	215 <sup>a</sup>	Time to recover	no shock = 68%; little/no = 10%; days to years = 22%; never = 0%
			Damage to emot. Developm.	none = 81%; temporary = 19%; permanent = 0%
			Affect on sex attitudes	none = 80%; temporary = 17%; permanent = 0.4%
West & Woodhouse, 1993	m	67	Lasting effects	"only one or two" out of 67 of a sexual nature
Fisher, 1991	f	54	Stress then or now	no stress then or now = 7%; mean stress now = 3.00 on 1-10 scale
Fritz et al., 1981	f	42	Current sex life	problems = 24%
Hrabow, 1987	f	107	Troubled over it now	minimal or trouble-free = 75%; moderately = 20%; very = 5%
Landis 1956	f	531 <sup>a</sup>	Time to recover	No shock = 25%; little/no = 17%; days to years = 51%; never = 4%
			Damage to emot. Developm.	none = 66%; temporary = 30%; permanent = 3%
			Affect on sex attitudes	none = 70%; temporary = 26%; permanent = 2.2%
Nash & West, 1985	f	50	How long affectes	not at all/ weeks = 52%; months = 16%; year /+ = 10%; still = 22%

*a* Indicates number of experiences. Otherwise, *N* indicates number of subjects.

## Ipce Newsletter E5, February 1999 INTRODUCTION

It seems that the devil himself has gone online, if we believe the 'experts' of the UNESCO Conference about 'Pedophilia on the Internet' which took place in Paris, January 17 & 18, 1999. In the pre-conference paper, 'pedophilia' appears as a great danger for children who are merely sitting at a computer screen. 'Pedophiles' put pictures of naked children on the web and, of course, we know, 'because it's self-evident', that seeing a nude picture of another young person is *very dangerous for a child*. Only a part of the pre-conference paper is published in this Newsletter because it repeats the same tired old story in every section.

Two of our readers have sent critical letters to the UNESCO Conference. These two letters are given in full. Following that we publish the Conference's Declaration and Action Plan, which is: *more & severer laws, more regulation, Internet police, more 'Law'n Order' to combat the great danger of all those Pedophiles on the Internet*.

Maybe the next article can give some insight in the process that is going on by naming 'pedophilia' a devilish phenomenon. It's the process of creating a scapegoat and to project the inner shadow side of society's collective unconscious. This article can go some way in explaining the fanaticism we see in, amongst others, UNESCO and its 'experts'.

The parental panic that comes alive in this process is not good for our children, explains the next article. It is a plea to return to children the freedom they need to grow to be stable, life enhancing, adults. Overprotection does not protect, it harms.

Similar views are expressed by a UK organization called Families for Freedom who have produced a number of papers on various aspects of the way children are treated in our modern caring society. Here we reproduce their paper on 'Stranger Danger'.

In the chapter *OPINION & DISCUSSION* there are two letters with strategic ideas followed by two discussion threads, picked up from *BoyChat*. The first of these is about the widespread idea that 'pedophiles' must have had a problematic childhood; that's self-evident, isn't it? But then, of course, if society is uncertain of its facts it always calls them 'self-evident' doesn't it? The second gives us a look at an internal discussion after someone had said it should be better, these days, to avoid all sex with children. Well, if we ask for tolerance for ourselves, we must first be tolerant with each other.

Dr Frits has his own section in the Newsletter and thanks to him, the Germans have their section also.

The concluding 'sermon' is the lecture of the Reverend Hans Visser, Minister of the St. Paul's Church in Rotterdam, The Netherlands, given at the symposium in December 1998. The day after he spoke these words, the Dutch newspapers and other media failed to mention any of the scientific research presented that day (see att.2 of Newsletter E4 and Doc. Nr 99-...), but all mentioned the condemnation of Visser's ideas by the Board of Cooperating Dutch Churches.

Let's go on to develop a more unbiased and non-judgemental view and have an eye on the facts. Maybe the documents of the Documentation Service can be helpful.

The next issue of the Newsletter is planned to appear in May 1999. We are planning that that copy of the Newsletter will be put on a web site and that from then on all those receiving the Ipce Newsletter electronically will do so via a link from that web site. Meanwhile we now have an Ipce E-mail List especially to prepare the site. Meanwhile your secretary is studying to learn the know-how to become an Ipce Webmaster.

Still yours sincerely,

## ACTUAL:

### UNESCO CONFERENCE IN PARIS

By Frans & Ricky, with the help of several others

#### Introduction

On January 18th and 19th, 1999, UNESCO organized a conference in Paris,. This was purportedly a "Meeting of 'Experts'" to formulate plans to combat the "danger to children of *pedophilia* on the Internet". From the mass of papers (See Doc. List nr 99-...) we give only a part wit our comments in brackets and in *italics*.

#### Homepage

Let's have a look at < [http://unesco.org/webworld/child\\_screen/index.html](http://unesco.org/webworld/child_screen/index.html) >

This page consists of well drawn pictures of kids at some school or something, apparently looking at pictures on a computer screen, suggesting they're surfing the net. Two kids are looking at some soccer picture, one kid is looking at the Mona Lisa and the kid at the front sees the back of a naked boy. The kid behind this terminal is looking very angry and wags his finger up as if saying "this shouldn't happen." The screens have been dramatized by adding background colors and such on the soccer and Mona Lisa screens while the naked boy is shown on a completely white background.

In a box: The Convention on the Rights of the Child.

"... Protect the child from all forms of sexual exploitation and sexual abuse" Article 34

"...The child has the right to freedom of Expression" Article 13

*The papers are written in Csaispeak (Child Sexual Abuse Industry language). We provide a translation ...*

#### The pre-conference paper:

**Sexual Abuse of Children, Child Pornography and Paedophilia on the Internet: an international challenge - Expert Meeting, UNESCO, Paris, 18-19 January**

#### A window for children

It is through the window that a child makes first contact with the external world -- discovering the culture of others, forming a vision of the world, building the basis of beliefs. And then having just encountered this world, a new skylight opens.

It is the television, where zapping brings the child to every part of the world and opens new magic vistas. Sometimes it also brings the violence of fiction or of reality. Hardly does the child begin to appreciate these wonders, and still another window shakes the old habits and seeks to grab attention:

Internet.

This new space for free expression keeps the child busy, alone or with others. One need only click to consult, to navigate, to communicate with someone at the other end of the world. Through this space for free expression and pleasure, the child discovers a virtual but interactive world where images flow constantly sometimes instructive, sometimes shocking.

*(Of course, this only applies to that small minority of the world's children whose parents and society have the resources to give them the means to access the Internet. But as these are the ones whose parents pay our salaries and these children are the ones who will be the principle opinion formers in the next generation it is important to us that they be properly conditioned **now**. The other children who will **never** get this new resource we won't bother about - they've got no clout)*

The child has to learn to make the best use of these resources

The clickable main title brings us to:

< [http://www.unesco.org/webworld/child\\_screen/conf\\_index.html](http://www.unesco.org/webworld/child_screen/conf_index.html) >

Here we find what we're looking for, the introduction to the conference.

We will give only a few quotes from this paper because it's too long for the Newsletter AND because it is more or less a repetitive message. We can summarize the whole paper in two sentences.

*According to us Seeing images of sex or nudes is not good for children. It is paedophiles, who put such images on the Internet. Paedophilia is a very wrong thing, a disease, a crime and a danger because paedophiles are eager to have sex with children. More and more measures are needed to prevent it therefore.*

*(In other words: Just the same old story.)*

Here are some quotes from the Introduction .

### The problem

In responding to the views expressed by many Member States, UNESCO is deeply concerned with the problems of sexual abuse of children, child pornography and paedophilia on the Internet - because these children are at the very crossroads where education, culture, tolerance and peace should be making headway, and not the traffic of moral corruption, violence and hatred. These are the children who should be in the schools that UNESCO and its Member States seek to assist and for which the Organization seeks to provide the latest resources and techniques in education, science and culture. The minds of children are the seeding grounds for the peace of the next generation. And if these very children are corrupted in morals and their ethical sense is distorted at this very tender age, what is to become of the adults tomorrow.

[...]

### Scope of the problem

The sexual abuse of children, child pornography and paedophilia on the Internet today are problems of international proportion. Through satellite, cable and the Internet, they touch all levels of society, they reach all regions, they put at risk children who should be in school and studying to contribute to their society.

The global community has recognised (*ie it sounds good if we say it*) that children who are victimised by implicit or explicit sexual acts and recorded on camera photographically or digitally for commercial sale and distribution also face a future of psychological trauma and potential sickness. It should also be realised (*ie it sounds good*) that repeating this audiovisual presentation over and over again to audiences of several thousands also repeats the sense of victimisation of these children.

It is estimated (*ie. It sounds good*) that many of the girls and boys trafficked for sex slavery and tourism in Asia and Africa end up victims of AIDS (over a million in South Asia alone). A proportionally high number are tempted to commit suicide.

The problem is internationally widespread. The solution must also be international, enjoining the resources and forces of all concerned. There are no excuses for sexually abusing children at any time, in any place and under any circumstances. Every child has the right to protection from cruelty, neglect and exploitation (*except of course, exploitation by us*). Every child is a human being and must be respected and treated as such.

### The numbers

Most of the data regarding the extent and nature of the problem have focussed on North America and Northern European regions, which have also played a key role in the production, distribution and consumption of child pornography not only in these regions but all over the world. In developing countries, the reality of child pornography is often dwarfed by the magnitude of other problems such as poverty, infant mortality, illiteracy, hunger, and disease and often there is little reliable data on the subject. (*It would cost us a lot of money to do anything really effective about all*

*these problems so instead we will concentrate on the popular subject of child abuse and hope that the public don't see we are doing so little about anything else).* Street children, poor children, juveniles from broken homes, and disabled minors are especially vulnerable to sexual exploitation and to being seduced or coerced into the production of *(what we call)* pornographic material. Thus, a combination of factors -- economic, social, cultural, attitudinal *(and of course our political ineptitude)* -- push children to fend for themselves, *(This means that they are outside the school system and therefore outside our exploitation so we will say that it is...)* often taking them into situations of exploitation. Wherever they live, problems within or among the family environment often either precede or become the causes for child abuse, neglect or exploitation. One cannot be remiss in appreciating these social factors when proposing solutions. It has not been easy *(probably because the figure is too low to attract the sort of attention we desire)* to determine how many child pornographic or paedophilic sites there are, nor to estimate how many consult these sites deliberately every day. Simple key word searches could raise from 100,000 to over a million *(we always like to work in nice round figures which the dupes (sorry - the public) can grasp)* sites dealing with everything from sexy pinups to videos of paedophilia. But this does not take into account multiple use of keywords nor multiple referrals to the same sites. Nor do any of these counters distinguish deliberate visitors from casual or accidental visitors, or those doing research. But numbers aside, the problem of paedophilia and child pornography on the Internet does exist. Perhaps quantification is itself a problem to be analysed, tackled and referred to a competent institution *(as long, of course as the institution is one of 'ours')*.

### Redefining the jargon

It is always helpful to clarify terms *(so that everybody gets the ideas which we want them to get)*. The meaning of the sexual abuse of children is usually self evident, until one starts to quibble between research definitions and those used in legal work and jurisprudence. Sexual abuse of children refers to the persuading or forcing of children (as determined by the legal age of majority) to engage in implicit or explicit sexual acts, alone or with another person of any age, of the same sex or the opposite sex. Most dictionaries define paedophilia as a sexual aberration or perversion in which the preferred sexual objects are prepubescent children, usually under the age of 13 *(actually it doesn't but we hope that by stating it here the reader will believe it and therefore not go to a dictionary to seek the truth - perish the thought!)*. Paedophilia is thus a synonym for the sexual abuse of children. Because this is usually understood as a psychiatric description, law enforcement agents often employ a broader definition of paedophilia to include adults who have a sexual attraction for persons legally considered children *(This makes it a lot easier for these law enforcement agencies. It's not very ethical but it's only against paedophiles (so far) so that's ok)*. The question of what constitutes child pornography can be complex. The standards applied are often subjective and contingent upon moral, cultural, sexual, social and religious beliefs that differ from country to country and sometimes among different societies in the same country. *(However, this will not deter us from foisting our morals on the rest of you)* Nor do these mores readily translate into law in the strictly juridical sense. Legal definitions of both child and child pornography differ globally and may differ among legal jurisdictions within the same country. However, the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, now adopted by 191 Member States, provides an international definition of the Child as being anyone under 18. The Council of Europe defines child pornography in broad terms as any audiovisual material which uses children in a sexual context. The International Criminal Police Organisation (INTERPOL) defines child pornography as the visual depiction of the sexual exploitation of a child, *(but expects police forces to prosecute on an even broader definition)* focussing on the child's sexual behaviour or genitals. For this meeting, it is difficult to separate any one of the three aspects of the meeting title for an exclusive discussion. The three aspects must be considered together: child pornography and paedophilia on the Internet are two mediated aspects of the one evil, the sexual abuse of children.

### The paedophile

*(WE tell you)* Child exploiters, paedophiles and pornographers represent a cross-section of the larger community including highly esteemed members of the population. Furthermore *(WE also tell you)*, they frequently seek occupations that bring them into habitual contact with children, such as schools, social centres, orphanages. Such sex exploiters *(WE tell you)* frequently target neighbourhood children or those with whom they have contact through their occupation. It is important to note that *(WE tell you)* child pornography serves significant purposes for both paedophiles and child molesters. Child Pornography and paedophilia on the Internet are usually sought to aid an adult's sexual arousal and gratification; or to reassure him or her that their behaviour is shared by thousands

of others and therefore not abnormal; to seduce children thus lowering their inhibitions and grooming them to model their sexual behaviour along this orientation; to blackmail the child into keeping silent about the abuse; (*of course, all this (except the blackmail bit) is true but we reckon we've got you all sufficiently brainwashed so that you won't believe it so it's safe for us to say it and it makes us look clever to have discovered this*) to share audiovisual images of paedophilia with other paedophiles; and commercially to make profits. Paedophiles and child molesters often possess large collections of child pornography that are meticulously catalogued and carefully guarded. The incidence of women paedophiles, however, is (*according to feminist belief*) rare.

Digitized paedophilia ?

How has such a (*what we call*) social sickness as paedophilia or sexual abuse of children been so quickly internationalised?

[Etcetera... Etcetera... Etcetera...]

**A quote from a press release:**

"This worldwide initiative follows UNESCO Director-General Federico Mayors declaration of 20 July 1998 on the need for urgent action against the "unthinkable perversity" of paedophiles and the sexual and commercial exploitation of children and adolescents that he considers to be "crimes against humanity". On that occasion, Mr. Mayor expressed support for an international observatory on abuses committed against children."

**Critical letter nr 1**

Open Letter to the UNESCO Expert Meeting, Paris, 18-19 January 1999.  
16 January 1999

Ladies and Gentlemen, participants of the conference:

I support the struggle to win greater public consensus to support the rights of children and adolescents. I applaud the UN's fight to improve the overall quality of the lives of the young.

So it was with genuine interest, I read, on the World Wide Web, the text introducing the public to the UNESCO Expert Meeting entitled: "Sexual Abuse of Children, Child Pornography and Paedophilia on the Internet: an International Challenge."

I was disappointed, however, to read that, instead of presenting scientific analyses and clarification, in harmony with its UN mandate to educate governments and the public, the pre-conference paper for the UNESCO Expert-Meeting disseminates unscientific concepts.

Quote:

"It is always helpful to clarify terms. The meaning of the sexual abuse of children is usually self evident, until one starts to quibble between research definitions and those used in legal work and jurisprudence."

Then the UNESCO pre-conference paper on the web presents the public with superficial definitions of the term "paedophilia" without reference to the reliable and peer-reviewed scientific literature.

Quote:

"Most dictionaries define paedophilia as a sexual aberration or perversion in which the preferred sexual objects are prepubescent children, usually under the age of 13. Paedophilia is thus a synonym for the sexual abuse of children. Because this is usually understood as a psychiatric description, law enforcement agents often employ a broader definition of paedophilia to include adults who have a sexual attraction for persons legally considered children."

But paedophilia is not a "synonym for the sexual abuse of children," even if law enforcement agents, legislatures, and the mass media in some parts of the world confuse these issues.

Paedophilia is the erotic and/or sexual orientation (or preference) of adults toward children under 13 years of age (American Psychiatric Association Diagnostic and Statistical Manual [DSM] IV). Scientists and psychiatric diagnosticians widely agree on this simple definition for now.

The term "child sexual abuse" cannot be responsibly included in any UNESCO definition of paedophilia. The word "paedophilia" would then become a negatively valued expression, and couldn't be used any more by psychiatrists, anthropologists, and sexual scientists to describe and understand the phenomenon -- as intended by sexual science, which introduced this term ("Paedophilia Erotica", Krafft-Ebing) more than 100 years ago. In its pre-conference paper, the UNESCO accepts the corruption of the scientific "jargon" without justification and without the informed agreement of the world's scientific community.

In the UNESCO pre-conference paper, the authors restate:

"...the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, now adopted by 191 Member States, provides an international definition of the Child as being anyone under 18." (Article 1).

But the UNESCO pre-conference paper then misleads the reader about what the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child says. Article 34 of this Convention, which is about child sexual abuse, limits itself to unlawful sexual activity and the exploitative use of children.

Article 34 of the Convention reads:

"States Parties undertake to protect the child from all forms of sexual exploitation and sexual abuse. For these purposes, States Parties shall in particular take all appropriate national, bilateral and multilateral measures to prevent:

- (a) The inducement or coercion of a child to engage in any \*unlawful\* sexual activity;
- (b) The exploitative use of children in prostitution or other \*unlawful\* sexual practices;
- (c) The \*exploitative use of children\* in pornographic performances and materials."

The age of consent is lower than 18 in most of the countries of the world. Therefore, the definition of "child", "children", and "paedophilia" cannot be accurately linked to the adolescent age of 18 in this context.

Furthermore, UNESCO paper fails to define the term "child sexual abuse". This failure, and the unscientific re-definition of the terms "pedophilia", "child", and "children", lead the Conference into extreme positions in a world context and to unbalanced and culturally insensitive action. Without formal authorization from the governments that signed the UN-Convention on the Rights of the Child, the conference seems to justify the extension of repressive governmental activities in those countries and cultures which do not accept or follow the lead of the Anglo-Saxon/American and neo-Puritan understanding of how these matters must be dealt with by government. For a conference, sponsored by a world-wide organization like UNESCO, this is unacceptable in any of its papers.

I want to state clearly that I do not advocate behaviors or activities that bring harm to the young. I condemn the exploitative use of children, and would support rational and balanced efforts by the United Nations to eliminate it.

I respectfully ask the conference to consider my concerns.

With my best wishes for a positive outcome for children and adolescents from this conference,

Somebody from Germany

### **The second critical letter**

Amsterdam, January 18th, 1999

Dear ladies and gentlemen,

With interest have I read your web-pages regarding the pedophilia conference being held this week in Paris. Some parts of these web-pages struck me, and I'd like to comment on them and raise some questions via this E-mail message. If you feel my comments bear something important, or this message might give the conference some other viewpoints which could be of interest, you are invited



to print this E-mail message and share it with the people attending the conference. Of course, I'm willing to answer any questions directed to me via my E-mail address [...]

First, the meeting is said to be an \*expert meeting\*. I'm really wondering who those experts are. Will all sides of this controversial subject be represented? Will people who have suffered terrible child sexual abuse be represented? Will people be represented who experienced great benefits from their relationship as a child with an adult? Will psychologists and sexologists be there, representing different sides? Will child-lovers themselves attend? I just fear your meeting will again be one of those unilateral meetings. Your list of web-links seems to support this feeling.

The DSM-IV reads: paedophilia is the erotic and/or sexual orientation or preference of adults towards children under 13 years of age. There's no reference [there] to its being an aberration or perversion. Being a paedophile doesn't mean one actually abuses children, so a paedophile cannot be equated with the sexual abuser of children. But this is exactly what you did in your paper: explicitly defining the word paedophile as a synonym for "sexual abuser". Later in the paper you referred to the child molester and paedophile as being different sorts of people, as you differ between acts of paedophilia and the sexual abuse of children. This confused me, as I fail to see the difference when keeping in mind your own definition of the paedophile being a sexual abuser. For the sake of clarity, I will follow your definition of the paedophile and use the word child-lover for the person who feels erotically/sexually attracted primarily towards children. I do hope you understand and acknowledge the difference between the two.

From the DSM-IV definition, I didn't read paedophilia is a social sickness, nor will any social researcher agree that it is. But in your paper you literally wrote paedophilia is a social sickness. If we would be warped back 40 years, would you also have written homosexuality is a social sickness? And how about transsexuality?

How should I interpret what is known about the ancient Greek and Romans, as well as the customs of many tribes, when reading that sexual relationships between children and adults run diametrically counter to universal social and human values? If you had written "current Western social and human (and maybe Christian) values," I would have agreed with you, but here you seem to be ignorant of our history and of other cultures.

You twice suggested paedophiles are keeping children away from school for their own sake. Is this really true? Where did you learn this? My experience is that child-lovers really care for these children, encourage those children to go to school, to study -- they want only the best for them. In many cases, this friendship lasts many years, often even a lifetime.

I wonder how large the actual market for commercial childporn is at this moment. Do you have any serious estimates? Do you have any estimates about how many children have been involved in childporn movies in, let's say, 1997? Is it 5, 10, 500, 10,000? Has any research been done on how much child pornographic material has being made lately and how old (and previously legal) material keeps popping up, as if it were a terrorist handbook? Later in this message, I will provide some statistics.

Has any research been done for the conference about the extent the repeated presentation of the material actually repeats the sense of victimisation of the children? If so, has it been corrected with the social factor: how would the retrospective experience be in a somewhat more permissive society?

You refer to statistics in your introductory paper, but I couldn't find any statistics. I wonder, for instance, whether you've read the research printed in Psychological Bulletin 124 (1998) which revisited and corrected many important, well-known and often-quoted statistics.

The number of web sites containing childporn struck me: 100,000 to 1,000,000 sites!? I wonder how you got to these figures -- even the quite inexperienced Internet user can check the validity of your figure and realize it just has to be wrong. Having a web site always means you can be tracked down, and while childporn is illegal in almost all countries worldwide, having childporn on your site is one certain way to be caught and sent to jail. So, it's not too surprising that a simple keyword search on any search-engine won't reveal many sites containing child pornography. On the other hand, all search engines do return thousands of hits. When researching these sites, it soon becomes clear

these sites are those which fight against childporn on-line or the more 'clever' adult porn sites which use phrases like "child-porn" as meta-tags to generate more hits (i.e., more people accessing their site).

Many sites exist on the Internet which do focus on paedophilia, but not in the way you define paedophilia, but the way I defined "child-lover". These are web-sites which exercise their right to free speech, bring information to the public, give room for discussion between child-lovers and often other people, et cetera. Most, if not all, monitor their discussion rooms intensively just to make sure their platform doesn't get abused as a location for people to make appointments with children, to orchestrate illegal acts or to exchange childporn images. I haven't seen any of these sites advocating sex with children -- most child-lovers will advise everyone to keep away from having sex with children. If these sites advocate anything, it's the discussion of this subject and sincere research. They know this is almost like fighting a losing battle, as the fight against child sexual abuse and child-porn is big business, whereas striving to find more of the truth regarding child-loving, child sexuality and such, isn't. Of course, you'll acknowledge these sites have a right to exist.

Didn't Noam Chomsky once say "If we don't believe in freedom of expression for people we despise, we don't believe in it at all." Don't think I need to add anything to this statement.

While childporn is extremely rare on the web, it apparently isn't in another corner of the Internet: on the Usenet, also known as newsgnet. The Dutch police have done thorough research recently on this issue (my sources: Internet and several Dutch newspapers). The research focused on 48 so-called newsgroups. We can expect the police to have carefully selected these newsgroups as those where child pornography might be expected. The research period started on August 11th, 1998 and ended on September 23rd, 1998. Over this period, 120,000 messages were downloaded by the police of which 82% contained an image. 2.1% of these messages were judged to contain illegal child pornography. The total number of messages posted during this period can be estimated at 24,144,376 messages (using statistics at news.radio-msu.net). So 0.01% of the messages consisted of child pornography, as defined by Dutch law. Now it appears most of the material consists of reposts of already posted images. My guess is 95% of these images are reposts, and my sources came up with similar estimates. The conclusion is the growth of new childporn material is extremely small: 0.00053% of all messages are estimated to contain a new child porn image. These figures are easy to recalculate, if necessary. I can send you exactly how I calculated it. Do these figures really justify the attention this issue gets?

The assumption that child pornography leads to more child sexual abuse, as you seem to be saying, isn't one sexologists have found agreement upon. Another viewpoint is that child pornography keeps people away from children because the use of child pornography lowers their lust-feelings. I even know from some pedophiles who do use pornography as some kind of medicine before meeting any children. To my surprise this opinion got backed-up just this Friday by Judge Duncan Shaw (British Columbia Supreme Court judge in Canada) who ruled that possessing of child pornography should not be a crime. His [careful judicial] reasoning is available on-line.

Your paper stated the Internet leads to more internationalisation, which causes childporn to spread easier worldwide. Is this true? Indeed it's available worldwide. But, say, 20 years ago, many magazines -- which would be qualified as child porn magazine nowadays -- were legally available and got shipped worldwide as well, just by the ordinary postal services. The same happened with videotapes. By the way, many [old] pictures from both these magazines and movies are popping up on [the Internet] nowadays.

Commercial child pornography is very difficult to market these days, as one doesn't know if he's dealing with an undercover cop. So childporn networks are destined to stay relatively small, just because marketing the material too openly is just far too dangerous. Besides that, the need for commercial material is close to nil, due to the availability of old material which can be obtained for free and which answers to an existing need. But the increased patrolling of the Internet could have a terrible side-effect: the increase of child-porn production, just because the demand will increase due to the disappearance of free material. More children will get hurt due to the efforts of exactly those who try to fight child porn and to save children from being hurt. This should be a horrific thought for everyone! On the other hand, a laissez-faire approach isn't the right one as well: in my opinion the police should look for those people producing child pornography (focusing more on commercial/professional stuff) instead of the spreading of old material.

The safety of the child on-line isn't all that bad. Yes, I do advise children to never tell anyone their age, address, phone-number or last name on-line or at least discuss the issue with their parents or me. The chance that a child comes across childporn on-line is extremely small. On the web, it's almost impossible to find this material and on the Usenet, one has to be looking deliberately for it. But as with everything on the Internet: if you're really looking for something extremely weird, the odds are you'll find it in the end. The child looking for pictures showing a hamster being torn apart, he'll find it. But if this kid isn't interested in the abdominals of a hamster, he won't ever come across such an image.

By the way, the suggestive drawing on your site regarding those children surfing the web struck me. Two kids are looking at some soccer-site, one is looking at the Mona Lisa and a third is angrily looking at me, as if telling me the image on his screen is a forbidden one. What's on his screen? A picture of a naked child. What's wrong with the image of a naked child? Is nudity becoming a problem now? Is this an effort to obfuscate and exaggerate the child-porn issue? Nudity, eroticism, sexuality and sexual abuse, to me these are four different issues. I feel it would be very wrong to teach the public a nude child should be associated with child sexual abuse, as you seem to be suggesting.

Does the need exist to shield information from the child on-line? I feel a child has no need to access sexually explicit sites and should not enter them, just like a child has nothing to do with porn magazines, but I can imagine other people might have different views here -- who am I to impose my opinions and views upon them? But informational sites are quite something else. Bennett Haselton (Peacefire, you have a link setup to his site) can tell you more about this and about the censoring of sites by several blocking programs. Regarding child-love, I think children might be interested in this issue, especially the theoretical part: what does child-love really mean? An example: most child-lovers know they feel attracted to kids from the time they were about 12, 13 years old. Almost all of them didn't have any access to information regarding their odd feelings, except extremely negative ones. As a result, they will try to respond to the expectations his society sets: being a good heterosexual, pushing away their own emotions and feelings, wearing a mask and becoming a super-macho. It doesn't need any explanation that this could very easily lead to extreme frustration, and these persons could turn into very dangerous persons: one day they might explode, sexually abuse a boy or girl and afterwards realize what they have done and kill the kid, or, at least, scare the hell out of the kid. How different could this be if the person was able to learn about his feelings earlier, to have discovered he wasn't alone and to have managed to cope with his feelings without ever hurting a child, although living in a hostile society. Also, children who have a relationship with an adult might find important information, confirmation, warnings, and so on, on sites like these. This way decreases the chance something bad will happen. I'm really afraid the current hysterical hunt for child-lovers will turn out into something dramatic: many children will suffer, while this was exactly what the [Paedophile] hunters tried to prevent.

Maybe it helps to put all this into perspective by mentioning some other statistics: one in five people in the world lives in extreme poverty, has no chance to ever come across a computer, let alone surf the Internet. Every hour, 1400 children die from malnutrition and preventable childhood diseases. Sixty-five percent of all child deaths worldwide are caused by a) Acute Respiratory tract Infections (3.6 million children a year) b) Diarrheal diseases (3 million children a year) c) Immunisation preventable diseases: measles, tuberculosis, tetanus, diphtheria, polio, and pertussis (2.1 million children a year, of these, almost 1 million are attributed to measles). Who's causing this? Can anyone be accused of being the bogey man here? No. Is action being taken? Yes, there is; but apparently it's not enough, by far.

Now back to the issue of the almost non-existent child porn production and the almost non-existing danger of the on-line predator. Isn't the balance a bit weird? How many children's lives could have been saved just by the money spent for this conference alone?

During the past three years over 300,000 soldier-children were fighting in wars around the world. During the 1985-1995 decade, the number of child victims of war has been estimated at 2 million killed, 405 million disabled, 12 million left homeless, over a million orphaned or separated from their parents, and 10 million seriously psychologically traumatized. How can all this be compared with the issue of paedophilia and child-pornography? I don't want to play down the serious issue of child

sexual abuse. But I do feel we need to keep things in balance and perspective, and if something has been lost in the last two decades, it's just that: perspective.

I wish you all an educationally productive conference,

Kind regards,

[...] (On-line activist, academically educated in the science of psychology and sexology)

**Declaration after the Conference**

< [http://www.unesco.org/webworld/child\\_screen/conf\\_index.html](http://www.unesco.org/webworld/child_screen/conf_index.html) >

**Declaration and Action Plan - 19.01.99**

On 18 - 19 January 1999, some 300 specialists in child care and child protection, Internet specialists and service providers, media practitioners, law enforcement agencies and government representatives met at UNESCO Headquarters in Paris to consider ways of combating paedophilia and child pornography on the Internet. Taking account of work that has already been done, the experts' meeting prepared an action plan and issued the following declaration.

**Declaration 19.01.99**

The Internet provides a new world for curious children. It offers entertainment, opportunities for education, information and communication. The Internet is a tool that opens a window of opportunities, but it is available only to a tiny minority of the world's children. Today only five percent of children have access to the Internet and most of these live in the developed regions of the world. This information gap between have and have not countries must be closed.

As Internet use grows, so do the risks of children being exposed to inappropriate material, in particular, criminal activity by paedophiles and child pornographers. While the benefits of the Internet far outweigh its potential drawbacks, these dangers cannot be ignored. If left unanswered they pose a threat to children and will become the object of resistance to future Internet use.

We believe that future use of the Internet will be determined by the next generation who have been born into a digital society and are beginning to think, work, play and learn in fundamentally different ways from their parents. In this current period of transition, however, the use and development of digital technologies must take account of current social, cultural and democratic values.

Above all, we need to know more about what is available, its accessibility, the content, how many and which people consume it. To date, not enough is known about the scale or extent of paedophile activities on the net, their consequences and impact on young people.

Child protection on the Internet is not a matter of censorship. Creating a safe environment for children online must preserve and enhance fundamental liberties, such as freedom of expression, freedom of information and the right to privacy, while ensuring their right to protection from harmful and illegal material.

The fight against paedophilia and child pornography on the Internet requires a coalition of forces involving children, industry, policy makers, educators and parents to ensure that users are aware of the potential dangers and have available to them the necessary means to combat these threats.

Action against illegal content needs industry co-operation in restricting circulation and a fully functioning system of self-regulation aiming at a high level of protection, which must go hand in hand with effective law enforcement. Harmful content needs to be treated differently from that which is clearly illegal.

In this spirit, we have identified concrete measures which are needed in order to encourage an environment favourable to the development of a child-friendly Internet. The following Action Plan requires a strategic approach which is both global and inclusive, and carries with it the commitment of all the actors, in particular governments, to ensure a framework of coordination, financial resources and political support. We request the Director-General to bring this text and Action Plan to the attention of the Member States of UNESCO, the National Commissions and the General Conference.

Paris, 19 January 1999

**Action Plan (19.01.99)**

*Introduction*

While the Action Plan is addressed primarily to UNESCO, it contains elements which must be taken up by all actors in the fight against paedophilia on the Internet. Governments, international agencies, NGOs, industry, educators, parents, law enforcement agencies and media all have a role to play but special effort should be made to ensure that the voice of children is also heard in the elaboration of strategies to make the Internet safe. UNESCO's role in this joint effort should be primarily that of a catalyst.

#### *Research, Awareness and Prevention*

Within its field of competence, UNESCO has a specific role and responsibility for action. In particular, a clearing house should be established for the exchange of information and to promote cooperation among groups concerned with child rights.

UNESCO educational, cultural and communication programmes should take up the issues raised at this meeting and in particular should:

- Sponsor and develop initiative for the use of technical means to combat harmful materials, particularly through the use of filters and self rating systems;
- Promote existing screening tools which make children and adults aware of how to protect themselves; and
- Sponsor information campaigns which raise public awareness of the harm suffered by children who have been sexually abused and identify such abuse as an abuse of power.

#### *In addition UNESCO should:*

- Design and support research programme systematically in partnership with research institutions, to obtain a clearer, comprehensive and more up-to-date understanding of the problem of paedophilia on the Internet ;
- Disseminate information among researchers, and promote exchange of information with child care and child protection organizations, ISPs, web masters, police and judicial institutions, media practitioners, citizens and civic groups and other client groups;
- Commission the preparation of a comprehensive glossary of terms concerning the Internet and its operations so that users and specialists can arrive at a common understanding of this valuable informational and networking facility;
- Support and encourage national "hotlines" and international "electronic watchtowers" which provide the immediate possibility for children to get help;
- Develop media and Internet education, information and awareness strategies to sensitize children, parents, teachers, educational institutions, social workers, media and politicians;
- Link mothers/parents associations and create a world network of strategic citizens and personalities, institutions and industry against paedophilia on Internet;
- Develop a common long-term strategy where a child-friendly cultural climate is created and the idea of a virtual civil society is promoted.

#### *Law and Regulation*

UNESCO's role regarding law and regulations should be developed according to the following framework :

1. Targeted regulation to be used by those who are against child pornography including support for anti-child pornography laws covering possession .
2. Self-regulation to be taken as an industry response and ethical guidelines to encourage the industry's broader participation.
3. Co-regulation, which implies that regulation with the backing of governments, NGOs, industry and civil society should also be possible.

UNESCO in co-operation with others should set up a Task Force or Experts Committee bringing together experiences from all sectors concerned by sexual abuse and pornography to protect children on the Internet. It should act on the following questions

#### *Prevention:*

- Promote awareness for the protection of children online among all actors concerned, including law-making bodies and law enforcement agencies

#### *Collecting information:*

- Collect legal information of all kinds related to child pornography online. Industry definitions and terminology on children rights, child pornography and sexual abuses on children.

*Disseminating information:*

- Widely disseminate and publicise throughout the Internet the information collected on legal issues related to child pornography online, making use of international observatories or clearing houses.

*Analysis:*

- Conduct studies on legal issues related to child pornography online.

*Self-regulation:*

- Study the efficiency of self-regulation
- Promote industry and private sector initiatives to develop codes of ethics on child pornography online working in parallel with judiciary experts worldwide
- Study the ISPs role related to how paedophile networks are used
- Promote dialogue among all actors concerned, governments and ISPs to balance soft-law efforts

*Law-making :*

- Promote legal harmonisation and international private law, as well as international co-operation between the legal profession and the police.
- Study the relevance and feasibility of an international legal framework to protect children online under the auspices of UNESCO, among other legal issues.

*International co-operation and law enforcement:*

- Promote appropriate standards for law enforcement and international cooperation, in coordination with ISPs.
- Establishment of some international principles or standards

Paris, 19 January 1999

## BACKGROUND & ANALYSES

### Interpreting the Satanic Legend

*\*Journal of Religion and Health\* Vol. 37, No 3, Fall 1998, pp. 249-263.*

**Abstract:**

*It is argued that the recent hysteria about Satanic cults can best be understood as a moral panic and an urban legend. Data from a wide variety of sources, including the author's own personal experience, are brought forward in support of this thesis. It is then suggested that if we are not to remain at the mercy of the anxieties and distortions that produced this moral panic, we must interpret the legend. The interpretation that is offered is that this most recent outbreak of panic about Satanism is specifically about a growing awareness of the ubiquity of intergenerational Eros.*

"I guess this is it. I guess this is where I get cut up like those cats. Nooo! Malachi is coming over by me and then he's saying some funny words and smoky stuff's going up in the air. He's all crouched over me. He's cutting that baby over me! It's all over me. He's rubbing it all over me! Oh, God, there's stuff all over me."

*Michelle Remembers(1)*

When psychiatrist Lawrence Pazder undertook the treatment of a client named Michelle Smith, he became persuaded that the appalling and bizarre stories that emerged in the course of therapy -- stories of being tortured at the hands of a Satanic cult -- were not fantasies, but literal truth. The book that they wrote together, *Michelle Remembers*, sounded the alarm. The modern war against Satanic cults was launched.

In the course of providing psychotherapeutic services in a mental health clinic I had occasion to work with a number of clients with stories very similar to those Michelle related, and I supervised others who worked with the same population. These clients generally carried a diagnosis of multiple personality disorder. They claimed that large numbers of otherwise normal appearing adults, many of them pillars of society, regularly gathered together in obscure places at night where, in the name of Satan, they committed unspeakable crimes against children.

According to their reports, sexual molestation and rape were only the beginning. Children were forced to eat feces and drink urine, were subjected to heinous tortures and to the mutilation of their genitals, were systematically brainwashed, were taught to act in violent and ruthless ways, and were sacrificed to Satan after which they might be ritualistically dismembered and fed to the participants in the ritual.

In the 1980s and the early 1990s I was by no means alone in wondering what to make of "cult abuse" stories. A workshop I attended, a "survivors" newsletter, and a sizable body of literature on the subject all insisted that the cult abuse stories had to be accepted as literal truth. I was told that not to "believe" my clients was to betray their trust in me. Yet I was unsure and sought some objective evidence to either substantiate or refute the stories. Some therapists, who may also have had doubts, suggested that it was not necessary to take a stand on the objective reality of the stories. If the stories were "true for the client," that was sufficient. But babies in large numbers either were or were not being cut to ribbons on Satanic altars throughout the country. And it made a difference -- a profound difference -- to a lot of people. I have come to the conclusion, with many experts in the field, that the Satanic child abuse conspiracy can best be understood as an urban legend. But I believe we need to go beyond this. When an urban legend destroys well functioning families, traumatizes children, slanders innocent people, poisons the trust which is the foundation of any community life, leads to the creation of draconian laws to protect people against imaginary threats, and condemns people to prison on the evidence of the fantasies of disturbed individuals, then we must ask ourselves what is taking place in society. We must, in short, interpret the myth. We must ask what the myth tells us about our collective fears, confusions, and delusions. In this essay I make an interpretation of the Satanic myth that will be disturbing to many individuals. That should not be surprising. When a set of highly implausible propositions, with profoundly negative consequences for society and its members, is passionately defended by otherwise intelligent persons of good will, then we must suspect that society is intent on suppressing a truth of profound and far-reaching ramifications. I believe that truth concerns the ubiquity of intergenerational Eros.

#### *Satanic Ritual Abuse as Moral Panic and Urban Legend*

In their book, *Moral Panics: the Social Construction of Deviance* Erich Goode and Nachman Ben-Yehuda capture the essence of the Satanic conspiracy stories very nicely. "Beginning roughly in 1980, a tale has been told on a national scale that qualifies as a contemporary legend, a collective delusion, a moral panic, and, when told among believers, a rumor panic as well. It seems that, in the United States and England, a conspiracy of Satanists is kidnaping (and breeding) children in order to use them in Satanic rituals, which includes sexually molesting, even torturing, mutilating, and murdering them. Most, or at least a significant proportion of cases of missing children, sexual molestation, and child pornography, the legend claims, have a Satanic connection."<sup>(4)</sup> Goode and Ben-Yehuda suggest that there are at least five criteria for judging an event to be a moral panic: concern, hostility, consensus, disproportionality, and volatility. With regard to the first criteria, the depth and intensity of the concern about the Satanic conspiracy is captured in a quote by Geraldo Rivera:

"Satanic cults! Every hour, every day, their ranks are growing. Estimates are there are one million Satanists in this country. The majority of them are linked in a highly organized, very secret network. From small towns to large cities, they've attracted police and FBI attention to their Satanist ritual child abuse, child pornography, and grisly Satanic order. The odds are this is happening in your town."<sup>(5)</sup>

The second criterion, hostility, takes the form of moral outrage against some enemy of society who is held responsible for threatening civilized values, for engaging in immoral behavior and/or for perpetrating crimes and atrocities against innocent citizens. The identified "folk devils," as they have been termed by some researchers, are so immersed in evil as to be almost incomprehensible by ordinary people.

Michelle had stopped crying, but still spoke with a tremor. "Those people aren't people," she said, raising her eyes to look directly at Dr. Pazder. "People who do things like that are monsters."

Michelle Remembers (6)

In defining the third criterion, consensus, Goode and Ben Yehuda point out the "sentiment must be fairly widespread, although the proportion of the population who feels this way need not be universal or, indeed, even make up a literal majority." (7) An example from *The Courage to Heal*, one of the most popular books ever written on the subject of child sexual abuse, will serve to give some indication of the credence that much of the professional community gave to stories of Satanic cult abuse.

Annette grew up in an upper-middle-class town in the Midwest. Her father held the same managerial job for over thirty years. Both her parents were community leaders, active in church affairs. Secretly they were involved with a group that performed ritualized abuse according to a Satanic calendar. Town leaders, business people, and church officials were all involved in this cult. From infancy, Annette was abused in rituals that included sexual abuse, torture, murder, pornography, and systematic brainwashing through drugs and electric shock: "I was what they called a "breeder." I was less than twelve years old. They overpowered me and got me pregnant and then they took my babies. They killed them right in front of me." [Presumably ref 8 here]

Ellen Bass and Laura Davis, the authors of the book, presented this as fact. And it was uncritically accepted as fact by innumerable counselors working with an untold number of clients, helping them to discover the "reality" of their abuse through hypnosis, recovered memories, and just plain suggestion and imagination. In a speech on cult abuse, psychologist Cory Hammond summed up the position of many of the militant believers:

"people who believe ritual abuse is not real are either naive - like people who didn't believe in the Holocaust -- or they are dirty." (9)

Good and Yehuda suggest that the fourth criterion, disproportionality, is met when "public concern is in excess of what is appropriate if concern were directly proportional to objective harm." (10) Obviously if thousands and perhaps millions of children throughout our communities were in danger of being raped, tortured, dismembered, and killed by an extremely powerful and efficient organization of psychopaths, no amount of concern could be deemed excessive by any reasonable person. We must, therefore, address the objective validity of the claims before concluding that we are, in fact, dealing with a moral panic. Whether it be Loch Ness monsters, wolves under the beds of young children, or rumors engendered by the latest moral panic, it is notoriously difficult to prove the non-existence of anything. Reasonable adults, however, discard their belief in entities and phenomena when two criteria are met: first, sane and conscientious people have investigated the matter and found no evidence for the existence of the entity, and second, the existence of the entity is highly implausible. When we have carefully examined the area under the bed, as well as the closet and all other possible hiding places in the room, and found neither wolf nor wolf droppings, and we have in addition thought about how unlikely it is that a really hungry wolf has been hovering there for the last 365 nights without ever having devoured the inhabitant of the bed, most children will probably concede that there is no wolf in the room, at least until you turn out the light and leave. The case against the great Satanic conspiracy is almost this clear. Debbie Nathan and Michael Snedeker point out in *Satan's Silence* that testimony growing out of Satanic cult abuse allegations "typically included accounts of being raped and sodomized with weapons and other sharp objects while camera shutters clicked and videotape machines rolled, of participating in the slaughter of animals and human infants, of being kidnaped in vans, boats, and airplanes, of hearing threats that their parents would be killed if the abuse were disclosed, and of suffering these tortures while the perpetrators engaged in devil worship rituals." (11) The defense lawyers would point out that "there was no evidence to support these claims: no adult witnesses, no pornography, no lacerations on the youngster's genitals, no blood, no dead babies -- and virtually no talk of abuse from the children until investigators and their parents pressured them relentlessly to disclose." (12) Indeed, over a decade of investigation by competent law enforcement professionals has failed to turn up corroborating evidence of Satanic rituals and cults as they are described in the literature. Nevertheless, prosecutors frequently obtained convictions and extremely severe prison terms for alleged cult related crimes. Clearly it is imperative that we carefully examine



the nature of the evidence that led to such convictions. Much of the evidence of cult abuse comes from "memories" retrieved from the minds of adults about events that purportedly occurred many years before.

Daytime, probably Saturday or Sunday afternoon. I ask or tell Paul Jr. & Ericka to come upstairs & then we go into Erica's room I close the door and tell them we are going to play a game. I tell them to undress. Erica's says "But dad." I say, "Just get undressed and don't argue." From my tone or the way I say it, neither objects and they undress themselves ... Erica is about 12 or 13, body fairly well developed, Paul is 13-14 ... I tell Erica to kneel and to caress Paul's genitals. When erect I tell her to put the penis into her mouth and to orally stimulate him... When Paul has his orgasm I have Erica hold his penis in her mouth and continue stimulation. I tell her to swallow the sperm but she runs to the bathroom and spits. I tell her to get back to the room and tell her the sperm is protein and won't hurt her...

Written confession of Paul Ingram (13)

Here we have a remarkable case of a recovered memory that we know to be false, because we know when and how it was implanted. Actually Paul Ingram's confession was the result of two implanted memories. The sequence of events that led to the "confession" above started when his daughter Erica was twentyone years old. A charismatic Christian speaker at a camp she attended announced to Erica, "You have been abused as a child, sexually abused." The charismatic leader then received another message from God. "It's by her father and it's been going on for years." (14) When Erica repeatedly told others that she had been sexually abused, the Sheriff's office eventually heard about it and launched an investigation. During this investigation a second daughter came up with stories of her own which supported Erica's accusations. When confronted with these accusations, Paul at first denied them; but it was explained that people frequently repress this kind of memory, and it was pointed out that his daughters would not lie about such matters. Paul found these points persuasive. With the aid of some crude, auto-hypnotic techniques, he was able to "recover" the related memories, which supported his daughter's accusations. However, when Paul Ofshe, one of the authors of *Making Monsters*, was called in for consultation, he had his suspicions. So Ofshe made up a story, a purely fictional and imaginary account, and related this to Paul as one of the accusations of the daughters. Paul then used his memory retrieval technique to produce the account reproduced above - one that corresponded exactly to the deliberately induced fictional account. The example of Paul is unusual only in that it enables us to observe directly a deliberately induced, false, recovered memory. Investigator induced memories of this kind provide believers with a large proportion of the evidence that is used to persuade people of the existence of Satanic cults. In addition to the recovered memories of adults, the other common source of damning testimony against alleged perpetrators of cult abuse come from children interviewed by police and professional counselors. When the now famous McMartin Preschool case was being investigated, the police sent a letter to two hundred families whose children had some previous connection with the preschool. Parents were informed that Ray Buckey, one of the defendants, was being investigated for child molesting, and parents were asked to "question your child to see if he or she has been a witness to any crime or if he or she had been a victim. Our investigation indicates that possible criminal acts include oral sex, fondling of genitals, buttock or chest area, and sodomy, possibly under the pretense of 'taking the child's temperature.'" (15) Not surprisingly, such an alarming letter led to many parents bringing their children to professional child care workers for more intensive questioning. Lee MacFarlane, a leader of considerable prestige and influence in the field of investigating child sexual abuse, and a creator of new techniques for conducting investigative interviews, was active in the investigation. A small sample gives the flavor of how such interviews were conducted.

MacFarlane proceeded to ask Tanya if she had ever seen a man's weenie. Her daddy's, Tanya answered. MacFarlane was not satisfied. "How about somebody else?.. I know who else... another man." Still, Tanya insisted she had seen only her father's. "Well, I know some secrets," said MacFarlane, "that I know you know them too. You know what? I know some secrets about your old school." When Tanya didn't respond, MacFarlane added that she had seen the little girl's friends from McMartin's, and they told her "all the bad secrets". [Ref: 16 here?]

Felicity Goodyear-Smith, a doctor in New Zealand who has studied the matter carefully, concludes that "it can be seen from many videotapes of interactions between therapists and children that overzealous interviewers often use leading questions, cueing of desired responses, praise for

desired answers, and manipulated fantasy play which implants ideas about sexual activity." (17) Before I had formulated any firm conclusions about the objective reality of the cult abuse stories, I either observed or participated in efforts to track down evidence that would corroborate the cult abuse stories related by our clients. Always, it seemed, we were just on the verge of finding either cult members or unequivocal evidence of their activities, yet somehow the evidence slipped through our fingers at the last moment. I came to call this the mirage effect. When I turned to the examination of the literature, beginning with the reading of a number of accounts by the "survivors" themselves, the mirage effect continued to manifest itself. That so many atrocities could have been perpetrated by so many people for so long, and to have all corroborating evidence dissolve into nothingness whenever anyone gets close enough for a good look, can lead a reasonable and unbiased investigator to only one conclusion: the Satanic child abuse conspiracy is a mirage. It is an urban legend engendered by a moral panic. Therapy offered to the "victims," many of whom came to therapy with only ordinary problems in living, has frequently been devastating. Elizabeth Loftus provides an example which unfortunately is not that atypical.

In the next year, Lynn tried to kill herself five different times. After one attempt, she was hospitalized for two days. She was taking several different prescription medications at once including Xanax for anxiety, Mellaril to control her flashbacks, Lithium for mood swings, Zantac and Carasate for ulcers, Restoril to help her sleep, and Darvocet for headaches. Her therapist kept changing the diagnoses. In less than a year Lynn was diagnosed with schizoid affective disorder, bipolar disorder, major depressive disorder, neurotic depressive disorder, chronic post traumatic stress disorder, clinical depression, dissociative disorder, dysthymic disorder, and borderline personality disorder." (18)

Lynn had come to therapy with some signs of depression and anxiety and an eating problem. It was also true that she had, as a child, been raped. These were real problems that needed attention and help. The help she received, however, led to her being swallowed up into the fantasy world of the therapist, with devastating consequences. Finally, with the aid of a new therapist, she came to realize that "the massive doses of drugs, the preoccupation with sexual abuse, the paranoia inspired by her therapist, and the mass hysteria of the group, worked together to create a traumatic but wholly fictional world. The memories had actually created the trauma." (19) Then she was able to begin to heal. Perhaps most tragic of all, perpetrators of these stories have caused great suffering for the very children they purport to protect. In *Making Monsters*, Ofshe and Waters relate the disturbing case of "Mark," who was described by a nurse at the start of his treatment as being "warm and appropriate and friendly with peers and staff," so much so that the intake psychiatrist was reluctant to admit him. Early in his treatment, after a visit from his father, Mark tried to barricade his door so his father couldn't leave, saying: "Please don't go, Dad! When will you come back? A week is a long time." After being persuaded during three years of institutionalized "treatment" that he had been sexually molested by his mother and that he had committed heinous crimes at her instruction, he was described at the end of the treatment as "incapable of 'social niceties,'" and as having trouble with 'lying and violating the rights of others ' ". (20) If stories of Satanic cult abuse were in the same category with legends of finding cockroaches frozen in ice cubes at expensive restaurants, or Doberman pinschers gagging on the fingers of intruders they almost caught, it would be material for amusing dinner party stories and interesting Ph.D. dissertations. But belief in this particular urban legend is not harmless. As Ofshe and Waters point out in *Making Monsters*, "If we discover that Satanic cults do not exist beneath our society, committing horrible crimes with impunity, then the recovered memory therapists are responsible for the destruction of the lives of thousands of patients and their families." (21) The fifth criterion of a moral panic, cited by Goode and Ben-Yeuda, is volatility. Moral panics "erupt fairly suddenly (although they may lie dormant or latent for long periods of time, and may reappear from time to time) and, nearly as suddenly, subside." (22) The Satanic panic has waned in England, and is showing signs of waning in the United States. However, the underlying social tensions, that provided the soil in which this legend could flourish, remain. Therefore the Satanic legend is very much in need of interpretation so that we can dispel its power and prevent it from re-emerging in some new guise at a later date.

*Interpretation:*

Historian N. Cohn gives us the key to interpreting the Satanic cult abuse stories. "To understand why the stereotype of Devil-worshipping sects emerged at all, why it exercised such fascination and why it survives so long, one must look not at the beliefs or behaviors of heretics but into the minds of

the orthodox themselves." (23) For us this means looking into the minds of the parents, the therapists, the law enforcement people and the investigators who set themselves the task of defending children against this wholly mythical threat. It means looking deeply into the collective assumptions, conflicts and tensions of our society as a whole. As Nathan and Snedeker point out, "at the beginning of each ritual-abuse case, the children had been eminently reliable, but what they communicated was that they had not been molested by Satanists. It was only after an investigation started, after intense and relentless insistence by adults, that youngsters produced criminal charges. By then, their utterances had nothing to do with their own feelings or experiences. Rather, what came from the mouths of babes were juvenile renderings of grownups' anxieties." (24) A similar process is clearly documented in the literature with regard to how adults in therapy "discover" their victimization. If we use the cult abuse stories as a legend to be interpreted, what do they tell us about the anxieties driving our culture?

Ollo describes the experience of one of her clients who suspected that she had been sexually abused but could not recall any specific incidents. At a social gathering she became extremely anxious in the presence of a three-year-old child. She didn't know why she was so upset although she was conscious of a desire to tell the little girl to keep her dress down. When encouraged in therapy to tell a story about what was going to happen to the child, the client ultimately related with tears and trembling her first memories of abuse.

In this case, described by Loftus, the therapist concludes that her client is trying to keep repressed memories from surfacing, and subtly guides her to begin producing those "memories." But there is a simpler, more obvious, and more direct interpretation that remains closer to the immediate data. Suppose, as is usually the case with repression, that it is a forbidden impulse, feeling or idea, rather than a memory, that the client was wishing to repress. Suppose what is so disturbing to the client is simply that the child is sexually attractive to her. How then, do we understand the behavior of the therapist? Why has she by-passed this obvious interpretation and encouraged the client to focus on repressed memories of a purely hypothetical nature -- memories that, as we have seen, are generally not recovered records of the past, but creations of the therapeutic or investigative process itself? The answer to this question is as simple as the interpretation of the client's anxious thoughts and feelings. The therapist also is profoundly uncomfortable with the reality of intergenerational sexual feelings. She does not wish to deal with them in herself or in the client, so they are projected onto Satanic psychopaths. The therapist thereby saves the client from that most damning of all identities -- the pedophile. We may have in this little vignette a microcosm with which to interpret the larger picture. Let us hypothesize for a moment that there is a growing awareness in our society that sexual feelings between children and adults are ubiquitous, powerful, and mutual, and that the function and motivating force of the legend is to collectively deny to ourselves the reality of this fact. Is this interpretation consistent with known facts? Does it bring coherence to them? The Satanic cult abuse legend is about sex, and the current out-break of the legend, is, above all, about sex between children and adults. This legend tells us that hundreds of thousands of otherwise normal appearing adults have a shadow side. In reality they are sadistic perverts, obsessed with the desire to commit sexual perpetrations against children. Who are these perverts? Well, they may be the police officer, the step-father, the teacher, the minister -- they may be anyone. They may be you and me. And, in fact, that is just who they are. As Pogo once said, "We have met the enemy, and he is us." The Satanic stories are pictures of people with normal intergenerational sexual feelings seen through the distorting lens of fear. The fear is that if society gives up the myth of the sexless child, and the companion myth of the normal adult who is totally unmoved by the sexual attractiveness of children, people will descend into behaving like the Satanist in our legends. So we project such feelings onto the newly created folk demon -- the Satanic pedophile. Such an interpretation fits. And it brings an elegant coherence to the data we have been reviewing in this article. But is it consistent with the facts? In large part the answer to this question hinges on whether intergenerational sexual feelings are, in fact, normal and ubiquitous. The ubiquity of intergenerational Eros: Floyd Martinson, the author of *The Sexual Life of Children* makes some interesting observations about the experience of breast feeding.

"The physiological response to orgasm and to lactation are closely allied in nursing mothers. Uterine contractions occur during sucking and during sexual excitement. Nipple erection occurs during both. The observed increase in nipple length due to stimulation may lead to more effective sucking and even more stimulation for mother. The degree of milk ejection appears to be related to the degree of sexual response. Milk ejection for some nursing mothers has been observed to occur during sexual excitement with an adult partner as well as while nursing. It is not uncommon for a nursing woman to experience an orgasm during the process. Many feel a

great deal of guilt regarding this normal response to breast feeding, and may even give up trying to breast feed because of this. (26)

The parallels between breast feeding and coitus so vividly delineated in this passage raise an interesting point with regard to semantics. Should such feelings, even when the genital dimension is minimal or nonexistent, be called "sexual." In his study of infantile sexuality Freud did not limit the use of the term "sex" to drive states that necessarily had a genital focus. There is a rationale for this use of terms. It acknowledges the close kinship between all love feelings, and suggests a possible common origin. At the same time, to use the term "sex" to cover such a wide range of phenomena can be confusing. I would suggest it might be useful to use the term "Eros" to designate the full range of intense love feelings between people, and to reserve the term "sexual" for those erotic manifestations that have a specifically genital focus. I deal with this issue in more detail in a clinical paper entitled *The Phallic Child*. (27) The power of Eros takes on a genital focus from a very early age. Consider this detailed description of the interaction between two-year-olds in a kibbutz:

"Ofer (male) and Pnina (female) sit side by side on chamber pots. Ofer puts his foot on Pnina's foot, she then does the same -- this happens several times. Finally, Pnina shifts her pot away, then moves back, then away. They laugh... Pnina stands up, lies on the table on her stomach, says "ADINA," Ofer pats her buttocks. Nurse comes in, and Pnina stands up, sits on the table. Ofer puts his foot on her leg. She offers him a piece of bread, and he eats it. This is repeated twice. Ofer kicks Pnina gently, and they laugh... Pnina touches and caresses Ofer's leg with her foot... says "more more"... Ofer stands, then both bounce up and down ... both children are excited, bounce, laugh together... Pnina grabs Ofer's penis, and he pushes her away... she repeats, he pushes her away, and turns around... Pnina touches his buttocks. (28)

It is important to note that real and deep attachments can emerge out of such interactions:

"My little nephew of three and a little neighbor girl of the same age had a most affectionate love for each other, and were not at all shy about it. They would kiss each other when they met, and seemed to think it all right. The little boy used to tell me that they would marry when grown. This continued about two and a half years; then the girl's parents moved away, much to the grief of both children. The little boy would often climb up and take the girl's photograph from the mantle and kiss it. (29)

Such feelings may emerge between people cross-generationally. Richard Green provides us with the example of a boy he interviewed:

"R.G. Okay, now that you're older, you obviously know what sexual feelings are and what sexual attractions are. Looking back to seven or eight, do you feel that you had some sexual attraction for men?

Reuben: I feel that I did, but I just didn't know what they were.

R.G. Why do you think they were sexual attractions?

Reuben: I just know. I know now because of experiences that I can identify with that same certain feeling that I had back then, but I just didn't know what it was then.

R.G.: And what's the earliest that you remember those feelings?

Reuben: Seven." (30)

Whenever an intense love emerges between two people -- that is, whenever two people experience a strong desire for bonding or union, their relationship is erotic. The activities of feeding, grooming, cuddling, comforting, horse play and caressing that anyone would understand to be normal and desirable in close relationships between adults and children express this eroticism. Whether in breast-feeding or in wrestling on the living-room floor, such activity frequently leads to explicit sexual arousal in both adults and children. It is this profoundly erotic nature of all love relationships, and the ease with which erotic feelings become explicitly sexual even within a cross-generation context, that is so disturbing to the American consciousness today. The emergence of the Satanic cult abuse legend, with the Satanic pedophile as the new folk demon, is an effort to repress and mislabel any awareness of this dimension of our experience. The fact is that most, if not all, adults are capable of responding to children in a sexual manner, and the sexual interest of children in adults is equally universal. Evidence for this can be found in history, anthropology, psychoanalytic writings, literature and popular culture. It is well known that, at least with the upper class, man/boy love was an accepted and almost universal

phenomena in 5th century Athens. Felicity Goodyear-Smith summarizes a few examples of institutionalized man/boy love from anthropology. "All men and boys of the Siwa Valley, North Africa, were reported to engage in anal intercourse ... In the Aranda Aboriginal society of Central Australia, fully-initiated unmarried men would take boys aged ten or twelve to live with them as their wives for several years, until the older men married. The Kiwai men of New Guinea also practiced sodomy, which they believed gave their young men strength." (31)

History shows that erotic attachments between men and prepubescent or pubescent girls has also been common, and in many cases culturally normative. St Augustine, a "father of the church" living during the fifth century, betrothed a prepubescent girl and presumably would have consummated a marriage with her as soon as she came of age (had her first menstrual period), had he not first become persuaded that he should live a life of celibacy. Mohammed, at the urging of his followers, married a seven year old girl after the death of his first wife, and probably consummated the marriage after her first menstrual period. Gandhi slept with pre-pubescent and adolescent girls. Although he did not have sexual intercourse with them, they slept with him naked and they engaged in a cuddling and touching that must have been erotically arousing for all concerned. I think that it is fair to say that most psychoanalytic literature simply assumes that the capacity for sexual feelings is ubiquitously present in intimate intergenerational relationships.

The theme is also frequently encountered in literature, Henry James' *Turn of the Screw*, and Thomas Mann's *Death in Venice* simply being two of the more notable examples. A skeptic might argue that anthropological, historical and literary evidences are subject to the vagaries of interpretation. So perhaps it is worthwhile to point toward scientific research based on purely physiological measures.

A study by the Clark Institute of Psychiatry using a phallometer to measure changes in penile volume, as an objective indication of sexual arousal, showed pictures of nude children and adults to "non-deviant" adult males. One of their conclusions was that "with males who have no deviant object preferences, clearly positive sexual reactions occur to 6- to 8-year old female children." (32) This finding is qualified by the observation that "the generalizations drawn in this study do not imply that every adult male is equally erotically sensitive to little girls." (33) A more recent study at Kent State University based on a self-selected but otherwise representative community sample concludes that "20% of the current subjects self-reported pedophilic interest and 26.5% exhibited penile arousal to pedophilic stimuli that equaled or exceeded arousal to adult stimuli.

Research based on surveys support the research based on the direct measurement of penile arousal. Kathy Smiljanich and John Briere reported that in a University sample of 180 females and 99 males, 22.2% of the males and 2.8% of the females reported sexual attraction to at least one child." (35) In a study that also used a university population, Ethel Person et. al. found that 29% of the males and 5% of the females reported fantasies of "sex experience with a much younger partner." (36)

As this was a college age population, we must assume that the "much younger" sexual partner fantasized about was a child or very young adolescent. John Briere and Marsha Runtz surveyed 193 male undergraduate students and found that 21% of them reported sexual attraction to small children. (37) Briere and Runtz comment that "given the probable social undesirability of such admissions, we may hypothesize that the actual rates of child-focused sexual interest in this sample were even higher." (38) The degree to which love feelings between children and adults manifest themselves in genital arousal and excitement is highly variable both with regard to children and adults. It seems probable that constitutional and developmental factors, as well as the conscious or unconscious inhibition of impulses, all influence the strength of the impulses, the degree to which they are accurately labeled, and the behavioral outcomes. But the Erotic substratum of intense intergenerational relationships is, I believe, clearly evident to the careful observer.

#### *Conclusion:*

Recognition of the ubiquity of intergenerational Eros will give us a different starting point for one of the most important questions that needs to be debated in our society: what social norms and personal behaviors with regard to sex are most conducive to the psycho/social and spiritual health of society and its members? To provide an adequate answer to this question, even if I were equal to the task, would be beyond the scope of this paper. It is clear, however, that if we are to make progress, we must begin with reality. This means correcting the distortions created by the moral panic about the Satanic legend. It means recognizing, in a non-hysterical manner, the ubiquity of intergenerational Eros. It means avoiding the hysteria that clouds the issues in reckless and violent rhetoric. It means gathering evidence, thinking logically, and listening to each other as diverse views are shared. It means making distinctions. An affectionate pat on the behind of a junior high-school football player by

his coach is not the same thing as the rape of a five year old girl. Our use of the language of abuse and victimology should not lead us to think they are even similar events. In our innermost core we find Eros. It drives the developmental process; it pervades all relationships; it draws us to love those we need and who need us; it is the well-spring of love, joy, spirituality and growth. From a theological point of view, it is the Love of God in and for creation, planted within our souls. It is not always clear which expressions of Eros are helpful and which are harmful. But it is clear that to deny or condemn the reality of this Eros is to declare war on our essence. No good can come of this.

#### REFERENCES

1. Smith, M. and Pazder, L., *Michelle Remembers*. New York: Congdon & Lattes, Inc., 1980, p.95.
2. Ibid.
3. Goode, E. and Ben-Yehuda, N., *Moral Panics: The Social Construction of Deviance*. Oxford UK & Cambridge USA: Blackwell Publishers, 1994.
4. Ibid., p.57.
5. "Satanic Cults and Children." ABC News Special, November 19, 1987. Quoted in Victor, J., *Satanic Panic: The Creation of a Contemporary Legend*. Chicago: Open Court, 1993, pp.32, 33.
6. Smith, op. cit., p.158.
7. Goode, op. cit., p.34.
8. Bass, E. and Davis, L., *The Courage to Heal: A Guide for Women Survivors of Child Sexual Abuse*. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1988, p.417.
9. Ofshe, R. and Waters, E., *Making Monsters: False Memories, Psychotherapy, and Sexual Hysteria*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1994, p.193.
10. Goode, op.cit., p.36.
11. Nathan, D and Snedeker, M., *Satan's Silence: Ritual Abuse and the Making of a Modern American Witch Hunt*. New York: Basic Books, 1995 p.2.
12. Ibid.
13. Ofshe, oc. cit., p. 173.
14. Ibid.
15. Nathan, op. cit., p.72.
16. Ibid. pp. 79-80.
17. Goodyear-Smith, F. (1993). *First Do No Harm: The Sex Abuse Industry*. Auckland, New Zealand: Benton-Guy Publishing, 1993, p.47.
18. Loftus, E. and Ketcham, K., *The Myth of Repressed Memory*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1994, p.14.
19. Ibid., p.18.
20. Ofshe, op. cit., p. 241.
21. Ibid., p. 202.
22. Goode, op. cit., p.36.
23. Ibid., p. 199.
24. Nathan, op. cit., p.3.
25. Loftus, op. cit., p. 54.
26. Martinson, F., *The Sexual Life of Children*. Westport, Conn.: Bergin and Garvey, 1994, p. 8.
27. Hunter, J., "The Phallic Child: Its Emergence and Meaning in a Clinical Setting," *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, 1995, 49, 3, pp.428-445.
28. Higman, E., "Sexuality in the Infant and Neonate: Birth to Two Years," In Benjamin Wolman and John Money, Eds., *Handbook of Human Sexuality*. Northvale, New Jersey: Jason Aronson Inc., 1993, p.17.
29. Ibid., P.18.
30. Green, R., *The "Sissy Boy Syndrome" and the Development of Homosexuality*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987, p.158.
31. Goodyear-Smith, op. cit., p.67.
32. Freund, K., Mc. Knight, C., Langevin, and Cibiri, S. (1972). "The Female Child as a Surrogate Object." *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 2, 2, pp. 119-132.
33. Ibid., p.131.
34. Godeon, C., Hall, N, Hirschman, R., Oliver, L., "Sexual Arousal and Arousability to Pedophilic Stimuli in a Community Sample of Normal Men." *Behavior Therapy*, 1995, 26, p. 690.
35. Smiljanich, K., and Briere, J., "Self Reported Sexual Interest in Children: Sex Differences and Psychosocial Correlates in a University Sample," *Violence and Victims*, 1996, 11, 1, 39-50.

36. Person, E. et.al., "Gender Differences in Sexual Behaviors and Fantasies in a College Population," *Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy*, 1989, 15, 187-198.
37. Briere, J., and Runtz, M., "University Males' Sexual Interest in Children: Predicting Potential Indices of "Pedophilia" in a Nonforensic Sample," *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 1989, 13, 65-75.
38. *Ibid.*, p. 71.

## Robbing kids of their childhood and teaching parents to panic Let children be children and adults be adults, says Frank Furedi

Reproduced from *Living Marxism*, issue 113, September 1998

Since my son Jacob was born almost three years ago, I have been reminded constantly that a life of peril begins at birth. At the hospital nurses were quick to explain the security arrangements made to thwart baby snatchers. Other experts were forthcoming with the latest cot death advice. One doctor informed us that an X-ray indicated a very small possibility that something was wrong with Jacob's kidneys. When pressed for further clarification, the doctor stated - in confidence - that he had only mentioned it to cover himself against future litigation. When we got home we were bombarded with leaflets and more professional advice on how to keep our baby safe from harm. Within a matter of one week we were fully informed about the countless risks which apparently threatened our son.

Time and again I am reminded that children are now regarded as a kind of endangered species. The veritable army of professionals staffing the child protection industry takes every opportunity to promote the message that children are permanently at risk. Safety campaigns around everything from child abuse and cot death to stranger danger and sunbathing all reinforce the belief that childhood is a uniquely dangerous experience. With all of this helpful information and advice, it is easy to forget that children are safer and healthier than ever before.

This summer it was announced that home secretary Jack Straw plans to issue safety packs to parents, advising them how to protect their children from paedophiles. The packs, to be drawn up in cooperation with child safety charities, will 'advise parents not to let their children play alone in quiet places, suggest ages at which they might be allowed to run errands alone, and tell parents how they can vet people who work with children' ('Parents told not to let children play alone', *Independent*, 20 July 1998). 'Supervise young children at all times', warns a leaflet on playing in the garden published by the *Child Accident Prevention Trust*. This message is echoed weekly by numerous campaigns on child safety. Predictably, parents have become increasingly paranoid about their children's safety.

Surveys reveal a permanent sense of unease among parents about possible risks facing children in public places.

The transformation of child protection into an industry has had a devastating impact on parenting and the quality of children's lives. Anxious parents have become more and more reluctant to allow their children the space and the freedom that previous generations took for granted.

Parental concern for the security of children has fundamentally changed the meaning of childhood. It is increasingly rare to see children roaming free with friends or walking to and from school. The proportion of junior schoolchildren that are allowed to cross the road on their own has halved between 1971 and 1990. When, on average, a British schoolgirl walks for less than seven minutes a day, it becomes evident that something has gone seriously wrong.

One unfortunate consequence of the contemporary panic with outdoor safety is the consensus that it is wrong to allow children to spend time on their own. If a child is left to play unsupervised it is now seen as a sign of 'neglect'. Indeed the very idea of unsupervised children's activity - which used to be called play - is now defined by child professionals as a risk. Those who question the merits of the constant supervision of children are accused of reckless parenting.

Parents who allow their children to walk to school unsupervised can often become the subject of local gossip. Parental responsibility is increasingly associated with the willingness to supervise and chaperone children. 'Good parenting' now seems to mean protecting children from the experience of life.

The restriction on children's outdoor activity has predictable effects on their development. Numerous reports on children's health have warned about the negative consequences of their sedentary lives. Research has linked the decline in British children's fitness to the decrease in the amount of time they spend walking and cycling. The first national Travel Survey reported a fall of about 20 per cent in the annual distance walked and 27 per cent in the distance cycled between 1985 and 1993. The possible link between this decline in physical activity and the increasing trend towards obesity has been noted in the medical press.

Parental paranoia impacts on the very quality of childhood. Supervised play is virtual play. Children need to play on their own, and unsupervised activity is crucial for their development. Some of the most character-forming childhood experiences occur in peer-to-peer situations. Such unsupervised opportunities have allowed children to make mistakes, to learn from them, and to acquire important social skills.

For children to become responsible they have to learn to make decisions for themselves, something they can never do under a parent's watchful eye. Robbing children of their unsupervised activity hinders the development of their life skills. Why? Because when children are with adults they tend to remain 'childish' at precisely the time when they need to learn to grow up.

The current emphasis on creating a risk-free environment, where children's play can always be structured and supervised, is unlikely to stimulate initiative and enterprise. Probably the greatest casualty of this totalitarian regime of safety is the development of a child's potential. Playing, imagining and even getting into trouble contribute to that unique sense of adventure which has helped society forge ahead. A community that loses that sense of adventure and ambition does so at its peril; and yet that is where we can end up if socialising children consists, above all, of filling them with a fear of life.

So what is behind the panic? The level of parental paranoia has little to do with any increase in the real dangers facing children. And while numerous child protection organisations acknowledge that anxiety over children's safety has reached unprecedented levels to the detriment of both children and parents, they have little to say about its causes. This is not surprising, since they bear considerable responsibility for this tragic development.

Initiatives like the New Labour government's National Family and Parenting Institute can only serve to undermine the confidence of fathers and mothers in their ability to parent, reinforcing the notion that we all need outside professional help in order to cope with the basics of bringing up children. The paradox is that this professionalisation of child-rearing infantilises parents, who in turn end up treating their offspring as an endangered species.

The growth of the child protection industry has helped to transform parenting from a routine experience into something which is seen as a highly complex skill. As a result, every dimension of parenting has been turned into a problem. Even before a child is born parents are encouraged to study parent-craft skills. Every aspect of conceiving, bearing and raising children is subject to professional advice since, the experts agree, child-rearing is too important a task to leave to parents. Caring professionals now provide 'education for fatherhood' and run parenting workshops all over the place. These experts continually emphasise the 'difficulties' and 'complications' of parenthood. It is now widely assumed that parents are too incompetent to talk to their children about sex and other highly charged issues without an advice pack, a helpline or a counsellor on hand.

Raising children used to be seen as a routine expectation of what it meant to be an adult. Now parenting has been transformed into a skill. The implication is that, left to their own resources, most mothers and fathers are unlikely to cope today. Health minister Tessa Jowell now says that she wants the health, social services and education departments to intervene together 'to give



children the best start in life'. The clear message is that a child left to be brought up by its parents is getting second best.

Child professionals continually inflate the problem of parenting. Everyday tasks are continually represented as difficult and complicated 'skills'. It appears that parents are too stupid to discuss sex and other emotional subjects with their children. And since parenting has been transformed from an intimate relationship, involving emotion and warmth, into a skill, involving technical expertise, the role of the expert assumes a special significance. From this perspective, the solution proposed is to take parenting out of the family so that enlightened professionals can put things right.

Those like the government who advocate parental training justify their proposal on the grounds that it helps to empower otherwise confused adults. In fact, despite the claims of empowerment, this approach can only have the effect of further undermining parents' confidence in their abilities. It is difficult to get on and parent when child-rearing has been mystified and recast as a skill. No doubt it has been assumed that all this professional advice and intervention would lead to a more confident and informed generation of proud new parents. Instead it seems that today's parents are more insecure and unconfident than their own parents ever were.

The reason why the professionalisation of family life weakens the effectiveness of parents is because the relationship it tries to regulate cannot be reduced to a series of skills. A relationship between a parent and child is a qualitative one which cannot be improved through the intervention of technical experts. Such intervention can, however, undermine the integrity of the parent-child relationship. When professionals encroach on this relationship it necessarily weakens the authority of parents. And parents with weak authority are unlikely to become confident at handling their children.

The attempt to professionalise family life rests on the bureaucratic conviction that, because parenting has got to be learned, it must also be taught. This misguided approach fails to grasp the elementary relationship between human experience and learning. There are many things in life that we learn in our own way through experience. Confident parents learn from their experiences of life. Such lessons cannot be created through a course drawn up by a social work or healthcare professional. These courses only foster a climate where the parent develops a relation of dependence on professional advice.

To make matters worse, child professionals do not merely give advice. They intrude into parents' lives and undermine their confidence. Recently, when my wife took Jacob to his nursery and explained that he had bruised himself falling over, one of the staff joked that social services would have to be informed. Everybody laughed - if a bit nervously. Afterwards, one of the mothers whispered to my wife, 'Amy had two bruises last week - you have no idea how nervous I was in case people jumped to the wrong conclusion'. This exchange of confidences is symptomatic of the temper of our times. Parental anxiety is not confined to the actual wellbeing of their children. It extends to a preoccupation with how the parents are seen by faceless professionals. Something has clearly gone seriously wrong when parents live in fear that the most innocent incident can be interpreted as malign and lead to intrusive enquiries from nosy officials.

The professionalisation of parenting is damaging to children and parents alike. The fundamental question it raises is this: who knows what is in the best interests of children? Today, the authority of the expert overwhelms the claims of competent parents. It is an authority that feeds on inflating problems and provoking panics about every aspect of childhood. It is an authority that actively fosters mistrust. Unfortunately mistrust produces more experts. And faced by a growing army of child professionals, parents are even less likely to trust themselves than before. In such circumstances, parents are quite entitled to panic about their children.

## **Families for Freedom Child Safety Bulletins**

### **Safer than you think**

Families for Freedom was set up in June 1996 [in the United Kingdom], by a group of parents and professionals involved with children. We believe that the risks to children are grossly exaggerated. All the evidence points to the fact that children are safer, healthier, better fed, better read and more computer-literate than ever before. Prenatal, infant and child mortality rates have continued to decline over the past two decades. There has been no increase in the minuscule risk of child abduction and murder in the post-war period. And juvenile crime, despite all the scary headlines, is low and declining.

Instead, we would argue, children do face very real problems today. They are over-protected and prevented from developing any life separate from their parents. They are driven to school, watched at play and their activities are organised by adults. As a result, they have less and less opportunity to explore the world for themselves, to choose their own friends, and to learn what it means to be independent.

Parents also face unprecedented, often self-imposed constraints. Intensely preoccupied with their children's well-being they subordinate everything to it, including their own interests. Most parents feel they must put their own lives on hold while their children grow up, and even believe that they should consult their children before they make any decisions about the family's future. In subordinating themselves to their children they undermine their own ability to assert authority.

People are susceptible to the scaremongering around children because we live in a society that has lost faith in itself. There is also a profound sense of insecurity about the future, however insignificant, can have unforeseen and harmful consequences. This sense of risk and fear of the unpredictable is sharply focused on children and the way they are treated, which means that increasingly everybody is blaming parents. Not only are problems exaggerated but, where they used to be seen as having social roots, they are now seen as being caused by inadequate or irresponsible individuals. Reforming individuals rather than society has become the major objective for professionals and politicians alike.

Families for Freedom argues the case for less worry and fewer restraints. We urge parents to relax and enjoy their children. We implore everybody to resist the scares that may frighten the life out of our future generation.

The following fact sheets are part of a series that Families for Freedom plan to publish over the next few months.

- Stranger Danger
- Children and Accidents
- Secure Schools
- Beware the Anti-Bullies
- Youth - Vulnerable and Dangerous?
- The Cot-Death Guilt Trip
- Children, Sunshine and Skin Cancer

### **Stranger Danger**

For a few months after Jamie Bulger was murdered, some supermarkets displayed a poster showing a close-up photograph of an adult clasping a small child's hand. The caption beneath it said: *'Don't let go, it only takes a second'*. In the years that have followed we have witnessed an escalating

fear of the unknown and uncontrollable freak event - the stranger taking a child. Indeed, the recent responses to the events at Dunblane and of Dutrouz in Belgium have been characterised by the fear for every and any child from an unknown individual who could be lurking anywhere. *'No child now seems safe from what was unimaginable only a year ago.'* (Guardian Section G2, 20/08/97)

Most parents are scared of 'the stranger'. This was borne out by research conducted by FfF in June 1998 where, out of 200 parents interviewed, 76% put this as their biggest worry. Similarly the Campaign group Kidscape's report *'How safe are our children?'* (July 1993) showed that, based on interviews with 1,000 adults, by far the biggest fear of parents was possible abduction of their child by an unknown person. Ninety five percent of parents put this fear at the top of their list. In 1995 Barnardos published a survey in which they found that nearly 70% of parents felt their neighbourhood was unsafe, and half said they never let their children play out without adult supervision. Again their biggest single fear was strangers. Other surveys have supported these findings. Responding to the 'risks' posed by strangers, some 'parent-friendly' supermarkets and shopping malls have even offered to supply baby reins and have discussed the possibility of electronically tagging babies (*Independent* 14/01/96).

### **What is the risk?**

Very few books on Childcare mention risks from strangers. They tend to concentrate on issues such as accidents and nutrition. Indeed one of the first surveys into crimes children face found that the major problem was bicycle theft and did not mention strangers at all. In publications that deal primarily with children at risk from violence, attack or sexual assault there is also little or no mention of 'the stranger'. This is because the risk of a stranger harming a child is extremely small (see table below). A Home Office researcher into murder of children commented that, 'There are two messages to emerge: First, children are not becoming more vulnerable to homicide, and second, the evidence of homicide by strangers on children has been consistently low.' (Quoted by Stuart Wavel in *The Sunday Times* 06/08/95).

**Offences recorded as homicide where the victim was aged under 16 and a suspect was identified who was not known to the victim (Home Office figures 1996).**

1975:7	1976:6	1977:6	1978:8	1979:5	1980:14	1981:5	1982:6
1983:4	1984:6	1985:8	1986:10	1987:9	1988:6	1989:5	1990:4
1992:2	1993:5	1994:7	1995:6	1996:5			

### **Abuse and abduction by strangers**

Research conducted in Scotland in 1990 found that, out of the 89 families referred to the Dundee Royal Infirmary's Department of Child Psychiatry for sexual abuse and related problems, over a five-year period, the abuser was a stranger in only three per cent of cases. Abduction by a stranger is also very rare. It is hard to be precise as the legal definition changed in 1984. Before that date there was an offence called '*Child Stealing*' and it only applied to strangers. However, with the recognition that fathers were taking their children without the consent of the mother in cases of separation and divorce, the law was changed. The present crime of abduction includes parents, who cannot be classified as strangers. However, if every one of the convictions or cautions for abduction in 1992, for example, were against strangers, 54 out of nearly 12,000,000 children is still an extremely low risk.

### **Restricted lives**

On the whole parents take very little comfort from these facts and figures. They know that the risk is small but the fear remains - *'it could be my child who gets snatched'*. [Parent cited from '*Paranoid parents*', research conducted by Families for Freedom in June 1998). As a result they are in danger of fencing in their children into an increasingly limited experience of life. More and more children are being cocooned at home and denied the experiences that their parents had, in terms of exploring and interacting with their peers.

Many parents do not allow their children out to play without supervision. In the research paper '*Stranger Danger: parents' fears and restrictions on children's use of space*'. Dr Gill Valentine found that 95% of the parents she surveyed impose restrictions on their children's play in order to keep them

safe. They often established the restrictions collectively in local areas and parents felt 'a strong pressure to live up to these local norms'. Even if parents did not personally believe their children to be at risk they felt they had to conform to other parents' rules. As a mother interviewed said, *'I mean we all get together... and I think sometimes when we get together... and I think sometimes when we hear that some parents have allowed their children to go various places, you know, eyebrows are raised'* [Valentine 1996].

As result of these restrictions vital experiences that children need in order to develop into independent and confident adults are being denied them. A report published in 1990 showed just how quickly children have lost their freedom. In 1971 80% of English seven and eight-year olds were allowed to travel to school on their own or with other children. By 1990 it was down to 10 per cent. Dr Valentine found that 23% of parents described their children as 'outdoors children' compared to 60% of parents in study done in the early '70s. In contrast their childhood 'they felt that

children spent more time playing indoors or 'being chaperoned to clubs, societies and leisure centres'.

The Barnardo's report, 'Playing it safe', indicates that parents are organising their lives around the fear of strangers or feel they ought to be. Mothers in particular bear a great burden of being constantly on call to ensure that their children get to and from school and activities safely. They find they have less time for themselves or their partners and that not only are they limiting the range of experiences their children have, they are also restricting their own lives to a tedious and mind-numbing daily routine of supervising and ferrying children.

### **Everybody's a stranger**

Finally, the consequences of 'stranger danger' fear are damaging to the relationships between children and adults, creating a society based on fear rather than trust. Interviews conducted by FfF in early 1998 provide a vivid example of this:

Linda: *'I took James to Tesco's [supermarket] this morning and a man about 50 years old was talking to him. The first thought that came into my head was "get away from my child" and, of course, he was probably only being nice. I hate it, but I can't let anyone touch him or talk to him without getting suspicious'*.

As does this interview conducted by Gill Valentine: *'We went to this show...and this little kiddie came wandering up...and he's crying "Where's my mummy?" And my immediate reaction was "God, you know, keep the kid here where he's safe, don't let him go wandering round", but at the same time it was "God, I hope nobody thinks I'm taking this kid". And I was terrified to actually hold on to the child in case somebody thought I was taking him.'* (Valentine 1996).

Many adults are now reticent about talking to children they do not know, even when they are in the company of their parents or carers. People have changed their behaviour in the park and on the street and steer clear of children so as not to arouse suspicion. This creates a vicious circle with people becoming less trusting of other adults and less open to new experiences. It also means that children do not learn to interact with adults - how to talk to them and make an assessment of them as people they can trust, like, or not. It seems ironic that in a time when politicians are decrying a loss of community spirit they are supporting campaigns that teach children to 'Run, Yell, Tell' (Kidscape) when they don't like the look of somebody.

Fear of strangers thus poses a danger to children's early experience of life, undermining their development as independent individuals, and to parents who are increasingly putting the rest of their life on hold while they devote themselves to protecting their children from non-existent risks.

### **References**

- Barnardo's 1995 *Playing it Safe. Today's children at play*  
 Families for Freedom 1998 *Paranoid Parents*  
 Hillman M, 1991 *One False Move. A Study of children's independent mobility* PSI Publishers  
 Dr Gill Valentine - 1996 *Children should be seen and not heard: The transgression of adult's public space* Dept of Geography, Sheffield University.

Morgan and Zedner, 1992 *Child Victims of Crime; Impact and Criminal Justice* Open University Press.

## OPINION & DISCUSSION

### *Letter to the readers*

My name is Michael and I would like to address some issues that constantly amaze me like the allegations against us so called 'sex offenders and pedophiles' and even worse the convictions that are 'plagued on us at this time'.

In my eight years of incarceration, I have watched many talk shows, programs such as *20/20*, *Prime Time Live*, *48 hours* and *Oprah*. All of these talk show programs have addressed these topics and we are now hearing more and more about them every day. Something's wrong with this picture?

I wonder sometimes, what will it take to one day stop this crazed 'witch hunt' against us. It kinds of remind me of the puritan days when we burnt people at the stake or banished others from the community and even stoned some to death. Yeah, 'this sounds like America!'

With no more evidence than we have in most sex cases today, we have to ask ourselves how can the courts convict us with little or no evidence? 'Easy, this is how!'

The Constitutional Rights were drawn up by our forefathers that helped settle the United States of America - home of the free 'Yeah Right!' Anyway, the Constitution was set up to *protect our rights* and give each of us, man, woman and children, equal rights - or at least, this is how it's supposed to be anyway.

The problem here is our government and the people. We, the people, need to take back our government that was set up for the people, by the people to protect us from wrongful aggressions such as greedy high minded people like the Kings of England, dictators of Russia and our own District Attorneys today. Our juridical system has suffered greatly from power seeking attorneys looking for a prominent political career or a high powered practice.

Now to make matters even worse is to take a good look at our media system today. Our media system (tv's, radio's and newspapers) have gone way to[o] far running stories into the ground and making matters look worse than they really are or appear to be. Now, I don't know how most would feel but I think this about take the cake, yes / no. Today, the media are about 97% corrupted. I mean all we hear baout today is crime like robbery, murder, rape, arson, drugs, and etceteras. Looks like our whole legal system around the world is very corrupted and getting worse day and day. This is no fiction, it is reality.

This kind of reality we don't need, but only we can make the difference. Let's look at it like this:

1. About 100.000 to 500.000 people have gotten together in meetings and/or conferences about the age of consent laws. Well, these people are set up and waiting to take action to get new laws passed.
2. I come running alone in an election, then this 100.000 to 500.000 people come to me and say that I've got their votes if I do something about getting a lower age of consent set and passed.
3. Well, I know this amount of people will get me elected so, yes. I'm going to fight for my voters so that I may be re-elected again one day.

It's hard to say NO to those people that make our government *which is us, the people!*

Now to say a little about the organizations. Today, it shouldn't matter if a person is gay, lesbian or a boy lover. Here's the point. I'm a boy lover myself and I need the support of not only my fellows boy lovers, but the support of the gays and lesbians as well as they need our support to help them. Today, we have, that I know of: NAMBLA, Fag Rag, Gay Community News, Ipce, ILGA. These are just a few of many organizations out there that need our support and contributions to survive.

This is something that's very wrong. The United States of America is supposed to be 'freedom fighters'. We fought long and hard to be free but yet, in The Netherlands, a boy of 12 years old can now have a consensual sexual relationship with anyone they want. Yet, America is still in the dark with this 18 years of age to legally have a gay relationship. The people over in The Netherlands stood strong to achieve their goals which in the long run they got a positive outcome.

Please, people, all we've got to do is look at the facts. We need to stand together and support our organizations and make the government work for us, not for themselves.

Please, send your comments and/or suggestions to me and I will try to answer them but again, I am incarcerated so it might take me some time to respond back and keep the letters clean and to the point.

Thanks, Michael  
[Name & address known by the Ipce Secretary]

[Note from The Netherlands:

The Dutch law has not worked as Michael described here above. Factually, the authority of the parents was stronger than the legal 'freedom'. Recently, the Dutch Minister of Justice had declared to propose the parliament to change the law in this aspect. Frans NL]

## **Seven ideas for coping with a vicious and dangerous world**

By Don, Down South

1. Create a stock of words and phrases to replace such phrases as "sex abuse." Such words and phrases and what they replace could be collected up and distributed by web sites. [...]. Boy love activists could change the rules for the media games and shift the size and shape of the playing field, so we can become included rather than rejected. In capitalistic societies, boy lovers need strong financial muscles. Nudists state that they are "sensual," not "erotic." Such word-plays must surely be someone's forte. Boy lovers could coin similar phrases to emphasize a male nurturing instinct. The term "male mother" was useful but seems to have disappeared from public discourse.

The term "sex abuse" has beneath it hundreds of years of prejudice against sex not consummated between a man and woman within a marriage. What the sex abuse industry has done is to build their propaganda into their terminology.

2. Encourage [...] writers to compose op-ed pieces [for newspapers] that can be distributed [...]. The pieces would be commented on by anyone wishing to make improvements and the finished piece would then be available to persons to be adapted for their local newspapers, radio and TV stations.

3. Become advocates for democracy and pluralism. Democracy is inherently pluralistic. The job of government should be to build a consensus among minority beliefs, behaviors and lifestyles that exist in a community. The current emphasis on creating new laws, punishment, and law enforcement is anti-democratic. Man/boy love must become an integral part of a community consensus.

4. Become involved in political and other groups that encourage discussions, debates and other open-ended group problem-solving. Democracy is a practical way to solve problems. At its best, democracy is completely secular. Quoting from the Readers Digest Great Encyclopedic Dictionary: Secularism is "the belief that morality should be based on the well-being of mankind without any consideration of religious systems and forms of worship." The Libertarian Party {USA} was supportive of gay males, and in some places of man/boy love.

5. There appears to be a trend in the USA toward girls dressing in boy clothing and cutting their hair short. Much emphasis is being put into clothing styles to enhance the girl's sex appeal to boys. Such things as the bare midriff and short shorts may be an indication that heterosexual society feels it is necessary to either enhance the girl's erotic appeal for boys, or watch the boys fall in love with other boys and men. The other side of the clothing styles is a trend toward having boys wear baggy pants that extend below their knees. Newer styles discourage boys from exposing their midriffs. The trend in girls' clothing styles is so strong that teenage girls are attending less formal church services, in the area where I live, dressed in short shorts {hot pants} and a thin tee shirt that exposes the belly button and two or three inches in the middle.

One cannot stop girls from dressing like boys, but it should be possible to encourage a revival of boy styles that are equally suggestive. The man who loves boys can employ passive resistance to the girl takeover of boy clothing to good effect. On hot summer days a boy dressed in short shorts and without underpants can either wear a too-short tee shirt or go shirtless. Such a boy standing on or swinging from a tree limb above other children can enjoy hearing them talk to and about him and enjoy their undivided attention to him. Sitting in a circle with other kids, this modern-day Huck Finn is sexier than if he were completely nude.

6. All-boy dance groups could become popular. Existing groups, such as the Chippendiddys, draw large crowds of people, mostly girls. Boys dancing is a phenomena that defies description. They have boldly crossed over into an area that has traditionally been reserved for girls doing ballet. Dancing boys are like soft, cuddly teddy bears expressing a sensitivity to the expression of themselves that is downright eerie. They are living proof that people want the sexual stereotypes that underlie American Puritanism replaced. Boys dancing is remarkably sensual entertainment. We need to encourage boy dance groups. They can help popularize a sensual vision for boyhood and manhood that mirrors the pedophile's tenderness and love in his role of boy nurturer.

7. Recently I have noticed that J. C. Penney, K-Mart and other department store advertising booklets inserted into the Sunday newspaper contain fewer and fewer pictures of boys wearing a variety of clothing for sale. Is this shift a deliberate maneuver to protect these large companies from legal entanglements such as Calvin Klein experienced? These same booklets contain pages of women wearing only the skimpiest undergarments. Boys in underwear are noticeably missing. In many pictures even the youngest boy is shown holding hands with a girl. About a month before school starts these same booklets begin sales on boy and girl clothing.

Perhaps the lack of summer sales for boy and girl clothing indicates a basic change in what children wear. Recently, on a trip to the mountains, I was fascinated to see a boy about 8 yo riding a bicycle close to the highway. He was wearing a helmet and only a pair of underwear. Later, I parked my car at a state run facility and noticed another boy about the same age standing close by. He was also wearing only underpants {no helmet}. One wonders what boys wear when they are at home. Perhaps nothing!

8. The May 11, 1998 issue of "Newsweek" contains an article called "How To Build A Better Boy." Barbara Kantrowitz, Claudia Kalb and other well-meaning feminist women are encouraging boys to be kinder and gentler in their play. Isn't it a pity that the lives of boys must be shaped by women? This is an area just waiting for the man who loves boys and also has expertise in research and child development.

I have tried to brainstorm some ideas that may prove useful to boy lovers committed to social change through non-violent means. I am sure that you can add many more ideas that I have missed.

Don, Down South

## **A Difficult Childhood?**

A discussion thread from BoyChat

-----  
Submitted by Dgennero on August 18, 1998 at 23:55:05:

Now I have a question: Why is it so often that BL, TBL and so on seem to have a very difficult youth/childhood?

There are many examples where it shows that in their youth they were neglected, maltreated, abused a.s.o. Death, drugs and other bad things play a role.

I ask that because this is something I don't really understand. There are people who claim ALL BL/TBL follow that pattern.

Well, at least I am a "counter-example". My youth was sunny, my family is intact, I hadn't experienced more bad things in life than average. Do I have to ask now how one can become a (T)BL DESPITE his happy childhood?

Dgennero, quizzically.

-----  
Submitted by Seeker on August 19, 1998 at 22:11:39:

In Reply to: boylove and a problematic childhood submitted by Dgennero on August 18, 1998 at 23:55:05:

My Childhood was pretty fucked up. When I was growing up...I don't have a father (died before I was born) and mum is never home (she's out working to make some money so we can eat). I grow up with my grandmother who I called mother rather than grandma. When I was around four I was one sick boy. I got this lungs problem probably caused by lack of food. At the same time mum was sick too, she was spewing out blood (we got the same sickness but mum got it more worse 'cause she was working hard and not eating stuff like that)...

I remember wanting to go outside to see kids play but I couldn't get up on the bench where I lay all day long. I can remember how dark the room was and how noisy the kids outside. Every time I get up I fell down. When I couldn't get up, I crawled, but I ended up falling off the bench and hitting my head. I remember having to drink all this kind of medicine that makes me puke. I can even taste it now....peww.....and the smell of it didn't help....

Growing up without a father is something that I always seek. I never had a father figure when I was a toddler. I've always liked when my mum's boyfriend came over with a guy. I would ask mum or Grandma if that's my father....

I think you are right that Death and other things play a role. It did play a big role on my part. Me not having a father figure really effected me. I am still seeking a father figure which I really still need right now.....

Thats my basic childhood....

....Seeker.....

-----  
Submitted by BlueBear on August 19, 1998 at 09:44:54:

In Reply to: boylove and a problematic childhood submitted by Dgennero on August 18, 1998 at 23:55:05:

I am not sure if it is not a warranty (sic) problem. Since I was very small, I remember being attracted to the same age range before, during and after belonging to it. I rather think of this just as different wiring than what is normally "under the hood of a hetero/homo-sexual being '.

By the time life started beating me up I was already aware of my condition. I however have noticed that most of us BI do seem to share a very strong motherly instinct. I wonder if there is any type of relationship between these feelings and those of the sealant emotional attraction.

Could this be in part hormonal? I don't know. I think it might be some sort of screw-up between feeling paternal/maternal and sexual about the same individual...(yikes "cute little boy" does sound better than "individual" doesn't it?)

Ok I'm delusional. Somebody call Freud....

The Furry psychologist..

-----  
Submitted by Babel-17 on August 19, 1998 at 09:29:56:

In Reply to: boylove and a problematic childhood submitted by Dgennero on August 18, 1998 at 23:55:05:



This question comes up like dandelions and I have lots of thoughts about it. Are BLs BLs BECAUSE of a neglected/abused/etc childhood?

Let me begin by suggesting that we may be putting the car[t] before the horse here. Perhaps the reason it seems many BLs had dysfunctional childhood[s] is not because the abuse/neglect/etc "caused" them to be boylovers. Perhaps the fact that they were BLs (seen as simply another orientation, at least for purposes of this argument, and in my opinion generally) CAUSED the abuse/neglect....

To elaborate: In my experience on this board, I have found in general (and I loathe making generalizations but this one is remarkably accurate) that BLs as a group are MORE SENSITIVE [than most other] people. At least in American culture, sensitivity is not encouraged in little boys. Perhaps the "pattern" is set up in reverse: the more deeply sensitive little boys (i.e. the ones inclined by nature to be boylovers, pedophiles or perhaps in some cases transsexuals) are the ones most likely to be abused and neglected by hyper-macho dads and societally-programmed moms.

I note that this abuse/neglect pattern seems to hold true for transsexuals as well, as the same question has been raised on the numerous TS email lists to which I belong, rephrased as "Am I a transsexual because mommy/daddy/both abused and/or neglected me?"

And on a perhaps related note, it occurs to me that we might gain some insights here by asking: What exactly is it about a 12-year-old boy that is so darned appealing to us?

If I may venture MY opinion on that, compare a 12 y/o boy to the average 21 y/o male, just as an example. There are certain qualities in the 12 y/o that IMMEDIATELY leap to my attention. The 12 y/o is (and I KNOW there're exceptions to this, I'm speaking in generalizations again so indulge me) non-judgemental, open, affectionate, unpretentious, refreshingly naive and perhaps most importantly offers that cherished and difficult to find magical element called "unconditional love" Try and find a 21 y/o with even ONE of those qualities. Quite a challenge!

Looked at in this way, it seems amazing to me that EVERYONE is not a boylover or a girllover for that matter, for those so inclined, since the same qualities apply to kids in general.

No....there's not a darned thing wrong with us. There IS something desperately wrong with a society that attempts to program children into a certain social role (remember Brave New World?) If you consider many of the time-honored "do's and don't's" of parenting, it would seem that the intent of most so-called "child-rearing" is to produce obedient wage-slaves who will then in turn be heterosexual enough to breed MORE obedient wage-slaves to keep the powers-that-be in power....

The alternative of course is to raise happy, healthy, self-actualizing individuals who are capable of thinking for themselves. But it seems to be harder to control self-actualized individuals through mass-media generated propaganda and the likes (John said with tongue firmly in cheek)

Like CSNY said.....Teach your children well (;

Just some thoughts, love ya's  
John/Babel-17

-----

Submitted by Kabouter on August 19, 1998 at 10:14:10:

In Reply to: unable to resist this debate.....V submitted by Babel-17 on August 19, 1998 at 09:29:56:

Very nicely out and just the right blend of liberation politics and insight!!!

I home in on the question of needs. Everyone has needs and everyone has these satisfied to some extent. The greater your needs the greater the difficulty in having them satisfied however. The highly sensitive child has a greater need for insightful and enabling parenting than the less sensitive one. Probably needs more love as well.

I remember working with large working class families where just one child - usually the middle one on the younger end - presented problems for the family and society. (I am talking shop-lifting, fire-raising, running away etc.) Yet all the children in an otherwise happy family received the same share of love. All the others were content. The child in question was highly sensitive and needed much more than his siblings. This means that he was by default deprived. He had greater NEEDS! The argument then is that the child who becomes a boylover is the one who was more advanced than his peers in respect of his greater awareness of his need for love.

I tend to see other ways in which boylovers are ahead of their peers. Perhaps a higher general level of intelligence. Verbal skills?? Creativity?? Then I am not looking at a representative sample.

love  
Kabouter

---

Submitted by Kabouter on August 19, 1998 at 07:04:25:

In Reply to: boylove and a problematic childhood submitted by Dgennero on August 18, 1998 at 23:55:05:

I have a very wacky theory that goes something like this. It's based on my traumatic childhood life experience and in depth studies of environmentally and emotionally deprived boys.

Small children enjoy a measure of emotional and environmental security by virtue of the desire of their parents to cherish and protect them. Done in the right way this provides a suitable climate for true growth and the adult collaterally reduces this level of protection as the child develops because the adult, as a nurturing parent, is sensitive to the developing child's needs. The child thrives within the parameters of these relationships having no real need to breach them. As the child becomes sexually mature (in the biological sense) then these support structures become less essential and they detach. This enables the boy to bond with a sexual partner for example.

What of the child who has little or no nurturing family experience? This child is threatened by terrifying forces, by inner chronic insecurities and by a misunderstood and occasionally hostile environment. The need to make new attachments is paramount. Therefore the sexual drive kicks in powerfully at what could be seen as a premature (or earlier than expected) age. This child is sexually aware and sexually inquisitive because he is seeking a partner in essence to remedy his emotional deficits.

Its just a wacky theory - feel free to demolish it if you wish. I am not fond of it.

love

Kabouter

---

Submitted by Zerlegen on August 19, 1998 at 06:40:13:

In Reply to: boylove and a problematic childhood submitted by Dgennero on August 18, 1998 at 23:55:05:

Hi Dgennero. It is very nice to know that you have had a happy childhood and consider your childhood sunny and pleasant. As many know, my childhood was filled with great pain and some very difficult times. Perhaps I am a survivor who has learned to overcome my past, whereas you have learned from your past how to be happy from example as you have lived it. Either way, we both are people who keep a special place in our hearts for boys. This makes me feel special and indeed blessed.

Speaking as someone who lived through so much, I had no desire to help others for a long time. When my current young friend walked into my life as an abused child, there was something inside of me that refused to allow me to walk away from him and his problems. Had he walked into your life, I'm sure that you would have helped him as well because you already knew what or rather how life can and should be.

So you may be the exception as far as being a BL/TL who had a good youth, though a "counter-example" is a very positive thing. What is important is that we all go on helping the boys of this world as best we can. I feel confident that we always will as we know best what life can be like in our own ways. Zerlegen.

---

Submitted by White Mouse on August 19, 1998 at 03:32:50:

In Reply to: boylove and a problematic childhood submitted by Dgennero on August 18, 1998 at 23:55:05:

Hi,

I guess it might seem as though most BL's have had a troubled past because the ones who do, have a need to share the hurt in an effort to relieve the pain. What you don't hear for the most part are stories from those of us who have had happy childhood. I've even feel guilty at times for having had a normal one while others, like Scruffy and Joel, have endured such pain in their youth.

I don't believe that BLs have the troubled youth market cornered either. I'd be willing to bet that a cross section of other sexual groups, including those considered normal, have a similar percentage of members with troubled childhoods.

And ... we don't "become" a BL/TBL, it's all part of the package at birth. Well, that's a Mouses perspective of things, anyway.

Hugs,  
Mouse

---

Submitted by White Knight on August 19, 1998 at 01:46:03:

In Reply to: boylove and a problematic childhood submitted by Dgennero on August 18, 1998 at 23:55:05:

No, it wasn't, because I never had a friend. I was "frozen out", and outcast, and there was nothing I could do that could change that (or so I thought). All I can see, when looking back at my childhood, is an endless stream of gray days - with me standing alone, on my own, while my classmates were gathering in a circle, chatting. My family was nice to me. I was never bullied by my classmates (sometimes I wished for it - it's easier to fight an enemy with a face). Nobody picked on me. Nobody hurt me. And nobody loved me.

I know what could have changed it all, or rather *who* could have changed it all: a boylover. Sometimes I dream up conversations with my younger self, educate him a little, hug him, and let him cry.

Love & Luck,  
White Knight

---

Submitted by rtoodeto on August 19, 1998 at 00:14:10:

In Reply to: boylove and a problematic childhood submitted by Dgennero on August 18, 1998 at 23:55:05:

I was never abused sexually at home. I had a bitch of a stepmother, real cruel, but a loving dad. We were upper middle class, all the comforts, lotsa trips, lotsa fond memories, 'cept for my bitch stepmum

I split when I was 12, asked my dad to send me to boarding school, I ended up in a military all-boys school, by choice, it was that, or a Jesuit boarding school, ughhhhhh!!!

Never went home again, except on vacation.

That's my recollection of childhood.

Did that make me a boylover..? I don't think so

## Tolerance, please

A discussion thread on BoyChat

---

Submitted by BlueBear on August 20, 1998 at 11:24:03:

Humn..

Somebody here was asking a day or two ago what can we do to improve our situation as BL.. This morning I drove up to my Cookie Monster's house for a cup of coffee. His mom was up already but he was sound asleep.. I walked into his room and sat on his bedside. He looked so cute sleeping.. it was almost a shame to wake him...I had to since I didn't have that much time. I stoked his head gently and I could see him booting up [...]

He opened his eyes and just looked at me...He's not much of a morning kid so he just stretched out and closed his eyes again.. I rubbed his belly.. That always makes him smile. He opened his eyes and looked at me. He just sat down and wrapped his arms around me. That is a "take me downstairs I want breakfast.." So I did. His getting kinda big to be carried around like that, but who's gonna complain?

His mom said Good morning dear, but he just waved hello. I agree I'm nobody before my first bowl of Lucky Charms. He asked if he could have coffee? His mom just gave him a "Yeah sure look"

So he grabbed my cup and sipped some out of it. 2 creams 3 sugars, he likes it. Sometimes I wonder how much coffee is in there. His mom saw him but just ignored it; not worth a brawl.

I spent some time with him. We watched cartoons until I was in my limit of I'm already late but who gives a ...I'm the boss you know ;o) ...

It was a yucky morning so he dug his feet under my legs to keep them warm. He was having a Strudel and I was getting my share - 10% in my shirt, 20% in my face and he was gobbling down his 70% I think he just enjoys making me look like I had just gotten out of a pie eating contest. He was laughing his ass off.

As I drove of to work (you can imagine how much I enjoy doing that) I thought to myself that I really love that kid more than anything in the world. I figured out that the reason everybody considers us monsters is because they believe us incapable of love: we are just sick fucks who have only one thing in mind SEX Yes whatever it takes whoever it hurts. SEX is all there is to it. I think there might be people that apply to. I don't know...

I think the couple dozen of you I've talked to over the last several months are caring and motherly guys. I wish there could be a way to tell everyone out in the world that most of us really love children. Not in a sexual manner, but we really DO give a shit about them. We look at them and we smile, we don't grunt...

It's sad there are child abusers, even in here, but there's also some of us that deal with our emotions differently. Perhaps if people could see that there 're many of us around them that love and care for kids without looking for anything else.

Perhaps if people could see us as just another human being trying to deal with conflicting emotions, not just a Red-eyed demon lurking around the sandboxes in the parks.

I think our image is one of the biggest problems we have. Hey, perhaps we could chip in and hire an Image consultant... and pay a few TV commercials...Hell, it works for politicians and we are talking about real scumbags here.

Anyway. Love to hear your thoughts.

The Bear

---

Submitted by CBAF on August 20, 1998 at 15:47:20:

In Reply to: About LOVE and our image as BL's... submitted by BlueBear on August 20, 1998 at 11:24:03:

I loved your description of waking the boy up and bringing him down to breakfast. It reminded me very strongly of a relationship I had with a boy who was a very close friend of the family. I was close to his mother as well.

I knew all along that I was in love with him, but have just recently shed all of the denial and guilt over it. We had a great, prolonged friendship that lasted into his teens until we finally grew apart through natural progression.

Yes, I was sexually attracted to him and he was very physical when it came to wrestling, sitting on my lap, and unexpected kisses and bear hugs. I loved him so much that I could never have done anything to hurt or confuse him, nor did I want to shatter my relationship with his mother. I had to put his interests ahead of my sexual feelings. Somehow he knew I was attracted to him and often teased me about it. I'll never forget one time when we were wrestling he stopped for a second and said with a big knowing smile, "You're enjoying this, *aren't* you"., then continued his assault on me. At times he was very sexual in his behavior as boys often are... God, I loved him. He's a young adult now and doing fine. I miss the boy I once knew and wish him all the luck in the world.

---

Submitted by --wzzzy-- on August 20, 1998 at 14:00:41:

In Reply to: About LOVE and our image as BL's, submitted by BlueBear on August 20, 1998 at 11:24:03:

Hi BB.....

Ahhhhhhhh, are you saying you are a non-sexual BL ??? I mean that's OK and all. I was just wondering about the image you speak of. The people I hang with know I am gay, know I am a sexual person, know I like "Boys". And guess what there is no image problem.

WHY????? Because I do not try to be something to them I am not. I do have secrets, though.. :o)

So I think the best image is the truthful one.....

Wzzzy.

-----  
Submitted by Piece Peace Peach Fudge on August 20, 1998 at 11:43:20:

In Reply to: About LOVE and our image as BL's... submitted by BlueBear on August 20, 1998 at 11:24:03:

My thoughts are that you're a bigot who's passing judgement over me because I both love boys and enjoy them sexually. This statement alone says it all...

"Not in a sexual manner, but we really DO give a shit about them." You have a long way to go through all your denial, so I'll leave you to it. But you might want to stop presuming to speak for everyone here, because there are those of us who believe in and enjoy SEXUAL boylove.

-----  
Submitted by BlueBear on August 21, 1998 at 09:04:07:

Hum, amazing. I made just a little remark about non-sexual love with children and a day later I got over 30 messages from people complaining, criticizing and even burning the barn on it...

I wonder why is everybody so aggressive. (Don't get me wrong. I'm not whimpering.) I'm ready to discuss my points of view anytime, no sweat.

Yet it scares me to think that people... that some people here are so incredibly intolerant and aggressive [about] someone else's point of view. Wow, I would not like some of you near children even if you were not BL's. Somehow it would seem reasonable that the fact that we belong to a minority that is and has been so incredibly misunderstood and hunted, should teach us a lesson in tolerance and patience.

I wonder if it doesn't go through your mind what kind of influence you make on kids, that you are probably important on their life, that perhaps you are their role model.

My kid walks like me, dresses like me even talks like me. Somehow I think that I try to teach him to be a good guy, to be kind to people, to not be afraid to be caring. To say "I love you" when he means it. To be considerate and to think twice before he says things or does things that might hurt others...

Somehow I think I'm good to kids. What kind of person are you around kids? What do you think your kids will remember from you when they are 25?

Just some food for thought....

The Blue Bear

-----  
Submitted by not on August 22, 1998 at 05:37:06:

In Reply to: A lesson in tolerance, submitted by BlueBear on August 21, 1998 at 09:04:07:

Blue Bear, the greatest thing I have learnt as a BL is that there are a lot of things about the world that are widely accepted that I cannot accept ... and one of those things is intolerance. So do I avoid critiquing and working to change things because I have to be tolerant of what I see as people doing real harm? In particular, are you asking me to be tolerant of the revival of authoritarianism or of those who peddle fear to ensure their own incomes? My tolerance of them will not make them tolerant of me. The only thing that will grow tolerance is to discredit and destabilize the intolerant.

Australian politics has recently been blessed by the media circus, lifting a dysfunctional bigot who snuck into parliament on the wings of a protest vote (after her right wing party had disendorsed her) to the leader of the first "minor party" to win (eleven) single representative seats in an Australian parliament in a lifetime. And when those who are threatened by her racism protest noisily, she is first to demand "freedom of speech". Maybe the biggest lesson on all is that we should never talk about freedom unless we are prepared to give equal attention to responsibility.

You also said: "I would not like some of you near children even if you were not BL's". That reads as though you do not think BLs should be near children.

Trusting that was not what you meant

-----  
Submitted by BlueBear on August 22, 1998 at 09:24:41:

I myself am a boylover; lets say a platonic one, since my child is only 10, perhaps in a few years something may change, though I am not waiting for an age or a date. He might turn 20 and I might still think of him as my baby.

I think we boylovers have as much right as anyone else to enjoy the company and the friendship of a child, if the feeling is mutual. However I do believe that although we might be attracted to them sexually, which I am and I will never deny that.

Our responsibility as mentors or even just as friends is to put there interests above ours.. Oh it is very easy to trick any kid into you bed (and again I'm not implying that they can not enjoy it or be willing participants).

But it would very naive to think that this is an equal-equal relationship. Under any circumstance and I'm referring to someone under 15 (yes some mature faster yary-yary-yar.. you all know what I mean) you will have much more control and much more idea of how your relationship is going to evolve let's say those 10-20-40 years of difference have taught you something.

Again I am not saying sex is wrong [or] whoever tickles a dick is going to hell, or should be sent to an IRS audit. But the thing is it is a very sensitive thing (not in that sense you perverts). We are talking of a young man here. He's growing up and learning.

One of the most beautiful things in life is love and a sexual relationship. Chances are you are introducing him to something very important, and whatever you do is somehow going to affect his way of perceiving what a healthy and normal relationship is. I've taught my kid everything he needs to know about sex, but without digging into his underwear and showing him how it feels.

For some reason I think, some day soon when he falls in love. That fist love kiss, that first kiss that is so sweet and sensual is better off in some young girl's or boy's lips if he so chooses.

Some people here may tell me I'm in denial, and yes, I might cry a little when I go to sleep, but when I leave my cookie monster's house. and his mother tells me to take care of him, somehow I know he could be safer and more loved in anybody else's arms... and that makes up for everything.

The Boy loving bear

-----  
Submitted by Robbie on August 22, 1998 at 11:25:34:

In Reply to: About sex... and boys submitted by BlueBear on August 22, 1998 at 09:24:41:

Why do you assume that a relationship, which involves sex, is necessarily one of "control?"

I don't think either my YFs nor I "control" our relationships - it is, indeed one of "equal-equal" - and that is not a naive concept. In fact, it is the quality that my YFs enjoy MOST about our relationships - that there IS NO controlling partner. Most kids are pretty sick of discipline, bossing, forced behavior norms, etc. - all symptoms of the "adult-child" relationship syndrome.

When they are sick of being controlled, and they want to relate to an adult on equal terms, they come to visit me. WE choose the time, WE choose the duration, WE choose the activity, WE choose to allow the relationship to become sexual or not. There is no one who is in control. Instead, we rely upon mutual respect to guide our relationships.

Seems to work for us

Robbie

-----  
Submitted by tb on August 22, 1998 at 09:31:12:

In Reply to: About sex... and boys submitted by BlueBear on August 22, 1998 at 09:24:41:

I've been recently involved with 2 boys, brothers. I won't say their names or ages, or even my identity...But the younger one has brought a little sex play into the relationship and I thought about it the other day: why jeopardize this relationship, why chance losing my 2 boys?

I won't ever be in love with their mom...so I won't be their "dad" and their real dad is more than 1000 miles away from them, and he don't give a shit.

I'm going to (over the next month or 2) try to start slowly abstaining from sexual activities with the younger one (the older one has shown no interest). Yes, the younger one DID bring it on and we never have done anything that makes him uncomfortable, but...

## THE DOCTOR & THE REVEREND

### Dr Frits Bernard writes:

There is a new book on our subject on the market, by

David Sonenschein: *Pedophiles on Parade*, Volume 1: *The Monster in the Media*; and: *Pedophiles on Parade*, Volume 2: *The Popular Imagery of Moral Hysteria*

Includes bibliographical references, filmographies, and indexes.

ISBN 0-915289-02-4 (set), 1998.

Published by D. Sonenschein, P.O.Box 15744, San Antonio, TX 78212, USA

### FRITS BERNARD's Preface

#### A book:

Nils Engelmann: *LUFTRAUME*, a paedophile novel, (autobiographic).

Preface: Dr. Frits Bernard

published by Jahn und Ernst Verlag, Knoopstrasse 8, D-21073 Hamburg, Germany,

386 pages, DM 36,--

ISBN 3-89407-231-8

#### Vorwort

Die Fragen der Sexualität und der undifferenzierten Kriminalisierung der intimen Beziehungen zwischen Individuen verschiedenen Alters stehen heute wiederum vollauf zur Diskussion. Dies scheint ein stets wiederkehrendes Thema zusein. Während des Mittelalters und danach wandte sich das Strafrecht gegen sexuelle Beziehungen, die mit der herrschenden Auffassung ueber Moral und Anstand nicht uebereinstimmten. Es war u.a. die französische Revolution, die hierin eine Wende brachte. Nicht die Unsittlichkeit wurde fortan als Kriterium für die Strafandrohung bei bestimmten Arten des sexuellen Verhaltens benutzt, sondern die Schädlichkeit für den Mitmenschen oder die Gesellschaft. Damals gab es keine Schutzaltersgrenzen, wohl stand auf sexuellen Kontakt mit Gewaltanwendung (Vergewaltigung) eine hoehere Strafe, wenn das Opfer jünger als 14 Jahre war; freiwillige Kontakte waren jedoch nicht an Altersgrenzen gebunden.(Code Penal 1810).

Erst Jahre bis Jahrzehnte danach wurde in einigen europäischen Staaten die 16-Jahrgrenze eingeführt, wobei sexuelle Kontakte mit Kindern ohne Gewaltanwendung strafbar gestellt wurden. Plötzlich unterstellte man die Schädlichkeit fuer das Kind als selbstverständlich; eine objektive Untersuchung dieser Frage hielt man nicht fuer nötig. Vor allem in den siebziger Jahren unseres Jahrhunderts beschäftigte man sich mit der Frage nach der Schädlichkeit für das Kind. Es war die Zeit der wissenschaftlichen Forschung in sexualibus.

Die resultate waren sehr aufschlussreich. Es stellte sich heraus, dass bei freiwillig eingegangenen Kontakten im allgemeinen nicht gesprochen werden kann von einer Traumatisierung. Wohl kann die Haltung der Umwelt eine negative Auswirkung haben (sekundäre Folgen). Dies wird jetzt in den neunziger Jahren recht deutlich. Die Menschen werden ängstlich und verunsichert, vor allem verursacht durch die Medien. Sexualitaet wurde wieder zum Problem.

Die psychosexuellen Unterschiede zwischen Menschen untereinander sind nicht qualitativer Art, sondern eher quantitativer Art. Unterschiede zwischen Menschen sind graduell. Alles ist in allen Menschen anwesend, jedoch verschieden verteilt. So gesehen gehören sexuelle Gefühle gegenüber Jugendliche zum Fächer von Gefühlen, die Erwachsenen nun mal haben können. Menschen werden, auch unbewusst, durch mehr Reize aus der Umwelt beeinflusst als man denkt. Alle Gesellschaften sind im Kern multisexuell. Der Kampf gegen die pädophilie kann nicht siegreich enden.

*LUFTRAUME* von Nils Engelmann ist ein ergreifendes Buch. Ich kenne kein anderes in dem so detailliert ein pädophiler Lebensgang beschrieben wird. Man braucht nicht unbedingt die Meinung des Autors in jeder Hinsicht zu teilen, aber lesenswert ist der Text sicher. Die Folgen einer Unterdrückung werden deutlich.

Das Buch enthält eine Warnung. Beschreibt dieses Buch das Porträt des Pädophilen? Das ist vielleicht eine ueberflüssige Frage, denn das gibt es nicht, weil alle Menschen mit pädophilen Gefühlen verschieden sind, genau so wie auch alle Menschen die nicht zu einer Minderheit gehören.

*LUFTRAUME* erscheint in einer turbulenten Zeit. Die Zeiten der relativen sexuellen Freiheit der sechziger und siebziger Jahre sind lange vorbei, als ob sie nie existiert hätten. Man hat sie vergessen. Die geschichte lehrt, dass Auffassungen und Mentalitäten plötzlich, ohne zu wissen warum, ins Gegenteil umschlagen können. Geschichtsforschung könnte hier vieles deutlich machen.

Möge LUFTRAUME dazu beitragen die derzeit gesellschaftspolitischen Fragen dieses Themenkreises aus einer anderen Sicht zu erhellen.

DR.FRITS BERNARD

### SEXUELLE FREIHEIT IST NICHT UBERALL GLEICH

By Dr Frits Bernard

In letzter Zeit stehen die Schutzaltersgrenzen in sexualibus wieder zur Diskussion. Die neuen Entwicklungen in Europa, welche sich immer schneller vollziehen, machen deutlich, dass die unterschiedlichen Rechtsordnungen zwischen den Staaten zu einem Problem geworden sind. Europa kennt sehr unterschiedliche Regelungen, das Mindestalter für sexuelle Kontakte reicht heutzutage von 12 bis 18 (oder 21) Jahren.

Im Laufe des zwanzigsten Jahrhunderts fand mehrmals eine Revision der Gesetzbücher statt. Die erste umfangreiche (weltweite) Uebersicht der Schutzaltersgrenzen wurde abgedruckt in Magnus Hirschfelds Die Homosexualität des Mannes und des Weibes, Berlin 1913. Auf nicht weniger als 28 Seiten wurde hier ein Ueberblick geboten, der historisch genannt werden darf.

Im Jahre 1961 schrieb ich für die Monatszeitschrift des COC Vriendschap (Freundschaft) einen Text unter dem Titel Gesetzesgebungen und Sexualverhalten, worin die damals gültigen Altergrenzen einiger Länder beschrieben wurden. Vieles hatte sich inzwischen geändert.

Es ist erfreulich, dass in 1997 die Dissertation von Helmut Graupner Sexualität, Jugendschutz und Menschenrechte - Ueber das Recht von Kindern und Jugendlichen auf sexuelle Selbstbestimmung, Frankfurt/M, erschien (erster Band 678 Seiten, zweiter Band 748 Seiten). Noch nirgendwo wurde ein so detaillierter Ueberblick über die jetzige Lage in Sachen *ages of consent* gegeben. Es handelt sich hier um das beste wissenschaftliche Werk zu diesem Thema. Nach Graupner ergibt sich, dass einvernehmliche sexuelle Kontakte (ausserhalb von Autoritätsverhältnisse) straffrei sind: mit 12jährigen in 5% der Länder (3 von 57); mit 14jährigen in 44% der Länder (25 von 57); mit 15jährigen in 60% der Länder (34 von 57); und mit 16jährigen in 90% der Länder (51 von 57). Ueber das Weltrechtsprinzip berichtet Graupner in seinem Beitrag Sexuelle Mündigkeit ( Zeitschrift für Sexualforschung, Dezember 1997).

In mehrere Länder Europas gelten derzeit Gesetze, die die Bürger ihres Landes nach ihren Mindestaltersbestimmungen ohne Rücksicht auf den Ort des Kontakts selbst dann kriminalisieren, wenn der Kontakt in dem Land, in dem er stattfindet, legal ist. So kann z.B. in Belgien ein etwa zwanzigjähriger Deutscher, Oesterreicher, Franzose usw. vor Gericht gestellt werden, weil er in seinem Heimatland (legal) mit einer 15jährigen Freundin verkehrt hat (S. 289).

Die Gesetzesbestimmungen werden komplizierter und unübersichtlicher. Bietet ein Vereinigtes Europa mehr Freiheit? Ich bezweifle das.

Dr.Frits Bernard

Siehe auch:

Frits Bernard: Von Straffreiheit bis Todesstrafe, Sexualmedizin, Medical Tribune, 19. Jahrg. Nr 5; Mai 1997

### Pastorate and pedophilia

by Reverend **Hans Visser**, Minister of St. Paul's Church,  
Rotterdam, The Netherlands, , December 18, 1998.  
*Symposium: The other side of the medallion [coin]*

Translation: Desire, posted to <http://www.danpedo.to/pedo/messages/37-9.htm>



[The (Dutch) Ipce Secretary proposes to change "sexual orientation" into "sexual prevalence", because this is in his opinion a better translation of the Dutch "geaardheid" used by Visser; this word implies that 'you have no choice, you're born with it']

Recently I had a talk with a colleague about pedophilia. In that talk he made the following remark: "One must have to be mentally disordered to kick on children". I have thought about this line. First I did not want to understand it, later I tried to feel what the person in question meant. Pedophilia is a sexual orientation which we find hard to imagine. This is a way of experiencing sexuality that I and others cannot share with pedophiles. Yet we must try to accept with our mind that that is how pedophiles are. But pedophiles are more than just sexual creatures, because they also have many other qualities, which make them to nice and valuable fellow humans. Professor L. Gooren taught me how to accept people with different sexual orientations. We cannot understand at all that a pedophile falls in love with a child, and vice versa a pedophile cannot understand what inspires me. All those differences have to be accepted. These differences cannot be denied or reduced to complete irrelevancy. As Gooren says, our task is to live with these differences and accept them as long as they do not encroach upon the integrity of a human, of a child. Not every form of experiencing sexuality is acceptable. There is also sexual experience among pedophiles which is unacceptable because the integrity of a child is harmed. That has to be completely clear.

Pedophiles nowadays live in a difficult time. They are not accepted by society. They are even hunted, stigmatized and criminalized. There is no space at the time for a good dialogue with pedophiles about their orientation. Very sad is the attitude of the major Dutch churches. They do not distance themselves from the pedophile as a person, but do distance themselves from his sexual orientation. How is it possible to accept a person without his orientation? Every pedophile act is seen as abuse. It is my firm conviction that the present hunt on pedophiles is extremely counter-productive. These people are left to their fate. We push them into a big swamp, they have to manage on their own, "as long as they do not touch my children".

But now the pedophile himself. He is in love with a child, but does not want to abuse the child, he knows the resistance of society, he does not want to do things in secret. He is also not at all interested in dirty porn movies, in which children are raped, abused, manipulated, but he can enjoy a picture of a nude girl or a nude boy. The mere face of a child can evoke emotions. That's not allowed any more. Because it is illegal to possess those. Pedophiles have been advised by their relief workers to burn all movies and pictures. They were sent into the woods. Yes, there was a pedophile who went into the woods literally, cycled a bit and met a child on a bicycle. He was moved by the child. He would like to do things, but turned his head, and cycled back home fast. He did not want to encroach upon the integrity of the child. Extremely sad he sank into his chair.

There have been times that pedophiles were dealt with in a wiser manner. It was the time of the Ikon-pastor, Rev. A. Klamer, who reached out a pastoral hand to pedophiles, listened to them and was close for them. It was the time that PSVG (Protestant Association For Family forming), which in its later days occupied itself with many aspects of sexuality, published a pamphlet about pedophilia.

I want to dwell on that pamphlet once more. The pamphlet wanted to make clear that not every sexual contact or every sexual relationship between an adult and a child implies abuse of the child. Certainly, some horrible situations exist as well, they may not be denied. Because of this it is of the utmost importance to know more about the experience of sexuality of children, and of pedophiles. In the pamphlet we read that pedophiles are people who feel attracted to children, also sexually. If one is not allowed to have those feelings, then it is clear a pedophile is not allowed to be himself. Pedophile people want to show their feelings for children. Also physically. That does not mean that they feel a need for intercourse, for penetration, because they know that children aren't built for that yet, that this may hurt children, that it may cross boundaries. Many pedophiles will thus not do this kind of sexual activity. Dealing with a child mandates respect and caution. Sexual contact may not be forced. The adult may not abuse his power. The child may not be manipulated. Research shows that children experience a certain pleasure from mild sexual contacts. Especially if they experience affection as well. Sometimes children undergo this passively, they may also become active themselves. The pamphlet tells that it is a mistake to look at children's sexuality from the point of view of our own adult sexuality and the feelings that go with it. If we do so, we project our own opinions, feelings and experiences, upon children.

Often it is the case that a child experiences no problems in the relation with a pedophile. Problems often start when the environment, for example the parents, panics, so the child gets the idea that something terrible has happened. That can damage a child. The pamphlet also tells us that sexuality must not be burdened with what happens secretly in the dark, that it should not be experienced as something that is dirty and not really allowed. This causes feelings of guilt which have nothing to do with being really guilty.

What the PSVG with her pamphlet and Reverend Klamer especially managed to do, was thoroughly listening to pedophiles and thinking about modes of behaviour with them. It remains saddening that this way of working has been given up by the churches in our times.

As already noted, we know too little about our children's world of experience. Children are often belittled, sometimes not taken seriously. Freud assumed that for children a latent phase with respect to sexuality took place. Later research showed that that is not the case. Children between six and twelve can show budding sexual feelings as well. A child however is vulnerable and deserves to be spared. Above it was already mentioned, and I will repeat once more that adults should not just project their own feelings upon the child. It will be a meeting between an adult and a child, where the child's freedom is remained intact. A child should not be doing something that it does not want. When children are in puberty, the situation has changed. Then there are pubescent sexual feelings. The child is on its road to adulthood. In that phase too meetings will take place between pubescents and adults. The pubescent remains vulnerable and has a right of protection. Because of this every pedophile who wants to deal with his orientation in a responsible way, knows that no manipulation, no violence, no threats should take place. He also knows that position of authority should not be used, because in a position of authority, power can be used. On itself it is understandable that a teacher falls in love with a pupil, but such a relationship is liable to a danger of the power factor. It might be the case that an adult does not use such a power, it might be that the adult indeed does not go further than the child indicates. But we do not know that for sure. Force and the offering of presents are also taboo. Because they can spoil a relationship.

In our culture there is often a deep-rooted negativity with respect to sex. Despite the sexual revolution there still exists a taboo. For many people, children as well, sex has to do with something dirty. Sex approaches abuse. It is a pity that sexuality is not experienced as good and beneficial. Historically, the church has contributed significantly to these deep-rooted negativity. It is regrettable that in our time both adults and children sometimes are exposed to a sexual commerce that is not good for people's world of experience. There are also pedophiles who, often influenced by this commerce, become very sex-obsessed, directed towards fucking and orgasm, and it can also be the case that some children sometimes see images on videos and movies that are not suitable for them, which in the long term can lead to a certain decay of the experience of sexuality. It is clear that sexual contacts between adults and children can be influenced extremely negatively by that; that the danger is great that in that case things happen that should have been left undone.

In this account about pastorate and pedophilia we can of course not neglect to also talk about the possible damage that is suffered by children from sexual contacts with adults. There are children who do not have a pleasant memory of that. And often it was the illegal sphere, the experience of things that one did not actually want. This damage can break up later in life. But this damage can also be dramatized. Society can suggest that we have been damaged. Exactly in a time when people think very negatively about pedophilia this danger has grown. I have the uneasy suspicion that sometimes certain feelings of guilt are forced onto people. That people are suggested that things have happened that should not have happened.

Often when evaluating relationships between adults and children, one observes that sometimes there is no reciprocity. A relationship between an adult and a child should be reciprocal. Both must be able to tell what's pleasant in the association, both must be able to show this silently or in words. A pedophilic relationship should also always be a joint experience and certainly not remain unilateral. I think that sometimes pedophiles overstep the mark on this point. They often fix the way of intercourse unilaterally. In all fairness it should be remarked that this situation also holds for all other sexual relationships; also those between adults, because there the reciprocity can be missing as well.

We return to the pedophile himself. As said he lives in a difficult time. A pedophile lives in a threatening reality, he is pictured by society as sick, degenerate, abnormal and evil. Sometimes even as a rapist or sex murderer. That makes him confused, and sometimes it happens that he drives out his sexuality, but that can have a negative result too. His dark desire, not understood by society, not rarely leads to suicide. The pedophile is stuck. He experiences feelings that fall outside the norms of

society. It would be good for the pedophile if society adapted its norms slightly, in the sense of a piece of necessary acceptance. The reactions from society now are often extraordinary hard. Sometimes punishments are inflicted that are disproportionately severe. Where it should be noted that imprisonment of course accomplishes nothing.

Pastorate means that one protects people, that one pulls together with them, that one starts a conversation with them, that one listens to their motives. That protection also means that one does not walk away, that one does not hide behind societal prejudices, because then one lets the pedophile down. Pastorate also requires a carefulness in the taxations of interpretations that people give to their experiences. The pedophile has to learn to understand why there is so much aversion in society as well. Many parents feel their children as their property, want to protect that property and cannot stand the thought that an adult would experience something with their children. But children are not property, they are entrusted to their parents. They still require protection, and while growing old get more and more freedom to unfold. That protection must not imply that other adults are kept off. Parents also need to entrust their children to other adults, one can think of youth work, education and medical care. Parents then have a right to know that nothing happens to their children behind their backs, without deliberation, in secrecy.

The pastoral acceptance of the pedophilic fellow human implies understanding for his orientation. The pastoral acceptance does not imply that everything that happens is being excused. In the pastoral supervision there is always a ritual moment. Together the division is sought between what is good and what is not so good, between what is wise and what is less wise. Sometimes we will also have to advise the pedophile in these times urgently to abstain from certain things that perhaps on themselves would be ethically justified. The public opinion is merciless and against that harshness the pedophile has to be protected as well. We may not allow that people are destroyed or rejected by society. In the pastorate we also want to take the achievements of other sciences in account: medical science, psychology, sociology. It must be possible to refer pedophiles to good care workers, who can learn them to handle their feelings in such a way that they can be happy with them.

There are no recipes around about what is and is not allowed. Above we have noted that penetration is undesirable for several reasons. It can hurt the child and can be an adult form of sexuality that is strongly directed to orgasm. On the other hand I can't say that mutual masturbation is undesirable in all circumstances. It is imaginable that there are situations where it happens in a sphere of mutual respect and mutual enjoyment of intimacy. Then it would be ethically acceptable. But it is also imaginable that it is forced, that it does not happen spontaneously, and that the child does not like it at all. Then it is ethically reprehensible. It is not easy to decide that for someone else.

The reader will sense from the above that I want to accept the pedophilic human in a way that takes his orientation seriously. I also try to come to terms about that with him. Because he is entitled to that, that is one of the things I am a pastor for.

The Maastricht psychiatrist and sexologist Gerard Roelofs recently said in an article that not every pedophile is a swine. He stated it clearly, pedophilia is not a deviation, it is a normal, innate variant of the human sexual preference. We must not wish that it all happens underground, because that will leave us even further off. The conditions for a good pedophilic relationship should be discussed. Roelofs makes a sharp distinction between sexuality with children below and above twelve years old. In his opinion in the case of children below twelve, there is no mutuality. Above twelve that is possible, in his opinion; in that case a sexual relationship with an adult is not necessarily harmful. Roelofs thinks that it is also a duty of society to find a form in which the pedophile can express himself, without damaging the child. That we are able to make a good distinction between mutual masturbation and a hard-boiled, nonsensical sado-masochistic game. What Roelofs also wants, is make pedophilia discussable in society. It is courageous of this man that he treats the pedophile in such a way that he knows what he has: someone who thinks with him.

My colleague Joseph Douce also was engaged in pastorate for pedophiles in France in the eighties. In the end it led to his death. He was killed and there are strong clues that that was related to his pastoral care for pedophiles, which was completely misunderstood. Joseph Douce remains for me a good example of a pastor, a shepherd. The good shepherd risks his life for his sheep. In the same way Douce gave his life in the pastorate for these people.

I still hope that that was not in vain.

## DOCUMENTATION SERVICE List February 1999

### List of publications - from Ipce Newsletter E 5.

You can ask for copies of the material on this list from [i.etc@humanbeing.demon.nl](mailto:i.etc@humanbeing.demon.nl) or by snail mail from: Secretary of Ipce, Postbus 259. NL 7400 AG Deventer, The Netherlands  
 Items marked with an @ can be had by E-mail or on a formatted diskette in some formats.  
 Items marked with a B have already been shared with the BerryList,  
 Items with a BL are currently available to those who have access to the BLCafe web message board.

The documents are numbered by year and then sequentially. Documents that are available only in the Dutch language are not included in this version of the list.

Documents are E-mailed upon request without charge; include your email address and a format with your request for documents. For documents as files on diskette, the cost is Hfl 2,50 [Dutch Guilders] or 1 Euro or USA\$ 1.50 per disk. For photocopies, the cost is Hfl 0,25 or or 0,10 Euro or USA\$0.15 per page, and you are asked to pay the cost of postage to your snail mail address.

***Please send additional relevant documents for sharing to the IPCE secretary at the above address.***

99-001		70pp	De andere kant van de medaille (Title & Introduction in Dutch, but articles in English: Bauserman & Rind 1997, Psychological Correlates... Rind & Tromovitch 1997, A Meta-Analytic Review... Rind, Tromovitch & Bauserman 1998, A Meta-Analytic Examination...
99-002	@ B	25pp	Rind, Bauserman & Tromovitch, An Examination of assumed properties of child sexual abuse based on nonclinical samples, paper presented at the Symposium, 18 december 1998, Pauluskerk, Rotterdam NL. (Attached to Ipce Newsletter E4)
99-003	@B	11pp	The research of Dr Michael Baumann and Dr Robert Bauserman and their associates, by Dr Frans, Ted Bernie & others, Ipce Newsletter E4, Att 1.
99-004a	@B	3pp	Pastorate and Pedophilia, by Rev. Hans Visser, Pauluskerk Rotterdam NL, 18 December 1998
99-004b		7pp	Pastoraat en Pedofilie, rede van Ds Hans Visser, idem idem.
99-005	@B	3pp	Review of; Rind, B. (1998) Biased use of cross-cultural and historical perspectives on male homosexuality in human sexuality textbooks, The Journal of Sex Research 35:4, pp 397-407.
99-006		several	Krantenknipsels na het Symposium in Rotterdam 18-12-98 en Visser's rede.
99-007a	@	6pp	URTEIL im Verwaltungsstreitverfahren AG-Pädo gegen Stadt Frankfurt
99-007b	@B	1p	Statement and explanation about 99-007a
99-008	@B	14pp	UNESCO Experts Meeting, Paris, Jan. 1999, Pedophilia on the Internet: Introduction paper, press release and links, Partly in Ipce Newsletter E5
99-009a	@B	3pp	Open Letter to the UNESCO Expert Meeting, Paris, Jan. 1999, Muenich, Ipce Newsletter E5
99-009b	@	3pp	Offener Brief an die UNESCO-Konferenz in Paris, Jan. 1999, Ipce Newsletter E5
99-010	@B	5pp	Letter to the UNESCO Expert Meeting, Paris, Jan 1999, Amsterdam, Ipce Newsletter E5
99-011	@B	7pp	Declaration & Action Plan of the UNESCO Expert Meeting, Jan. 1999, Ipce Newsletter E5
99-012	@B	11pp	Children of War Newsletter 4/98, Dec.
99-013	@B	8pp	Pedophilia, Science and Self-deception, by Arne Frederiksen, <a href="http://www.danpedo.to/english/decept.htm">http://www.danpedo.to/english/decept.htm</a>

99-014	@B	9pp	References and abstracts of 25 scientific books/articles from a psychotherapy newsgroup about childhood sexuality; Bauserman cs, Brongersma, Santfort & others.
99-015	@B	4pp	Research into positive aspects of adult-child sexual relations, references and abstracts of reports and articles, alt.support.boy-lovers.
99-016	@B	3pp	Suit alleges frequent abuse of gay children in foster care, by Nina Bernstein, in: New York Times, 16-01-99.
99-017	@B	7pp	Canadian Court rules about the legality of possessing child porn, 4 press items.
99-018	@B	2pp	Review of: Contemporary Society - Childhood and complex order, by Georg Pfeffer and Deepak Kumar Behera, Eds, Manak Publications, New Delhi, by D. Raja Ganesan in: The Hindu, November 17, 1998.