

I p c e

NEWSLETTER

Number E 25, July 2008

Pag	
e	
2	Introduction
3	1. Statement & question
4	
6	2. A Very 'Typical' Immoral Panic - The Perils of Researching Intergenerational Sexualities
6	3a. Curley family drops case against NAMBLA
6	3b. Statement by David Thorstad on Dismissal of Anti- Free-Speech Suit
9	
10	4a. Adults 'scared to go near kids'
10	4b. Thou shalt not hug - Frank Furedi
14	
14	5. Australia debates about child nudity - "The evil is in the eye of the beholder"
14	5.1. The Bill Nelson case
22	
25	5.2. The case of the girl on the cover of <i>Arts Monthly Australia</i>
25	
32	6. Fear of photos
32	
32	7. It's ridiculous that we treat child nudity as a problem - Nan Goldin
32	8. Ipce's Internal Matters
32	8.1. Report of the secretary
33	8.2. Report of the webmaster
33	8.3. Two teams
35	8.4 Financial report
37	Documentation List # 25, July 2008

webmaster@ipce.org
webmaster@ipce.info

<http://www.ipce.org>
<http://www.ipce.info>

Ipce is a forum for people who are engaged in scholarly discussion about the understanding and emancipation of mutual relationships between children or adolescents and adults.

In this context, these relationships are intended to be viewed from an unbiased, non-judgmental perspective and in relation to the human rights of both the young and adult partners.

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

Introduction

Here is Ipce's Newsletter number E(lectronic) 25, a silver jubilee, one might call it. Before the electronic Newsletter, Ipce has had a paper Newsletter since 1989 and an electronic format (also in paper format) since 1997. The oldest Newsletters contained the papers before the meeting and thereafter the report of the meeting. Gradually, they contain more other articles and the documentation list. Far more articles have appeared on Ipce's website since Ipce entered the electronic phase in about the same period.

The Newsletter is made on line and in a paper version for those who have no access to the Internet or who want to download and print the Word version. But note that the Newsletter gives only some interesting files, but that the updates of the website and Ipce Magazine give far more information.

In this issue, there are indeed some papers for the coming Ipce Meeting 2008, at the end of the issue, whilst the 'Statement & Question', the start of the issue, also is meant for the meeting. But there is more.

- Read how difficult it is to do research on intergenerational intimate relationships.
Read about a quite absurd court case against NAMBLA that has cost eight year of proceedings (and lots of money).
- Read how difficult it is, in the UK nowadays, to do voluntary work with children. This is because the fear of 'pedophiles'. Read also how this kind of laws are destructive for the contacts in schools, clubs - and society as a whole.
- Read how Australia debated about child nudity on photos, and how photographing is hindered as if it were a terrorist act.

- Read a plea from an artist to see child nudity as beautiful instead of as a great problem. And then have a look at Ipce's papers and the documentation list.

Fear of child nudity, fear of intimacy with children, is this rational? No, its is *ideology*. But how to combat ideology?

Your Secretary,

Frans

2. Statement & question

During the Ipce Meeting in 2007, we have spoken about research as the main theme of the meeting. We have heard that

- Michael Baurmann found in his 1.058 cases that more than 50% of the 'victims' declared themselves not as 'a victim'. *None* of the boys felt themselves a victim.
- Rudiger Lautmann found that his 60 respondents who felt attraction to children had developed their own ethical rules and styles of living, especially with the help of self-help groups and such contacts.
- Michael Griesemer criticizes the usual research on intergenerational contacts as being flawed because its bad or lack of definitions, bad reasoning and other methodological faults.
- Horst Vogt found that the half of his respondents functioned well in society and were psychologically healthy, unless the stress they felt in society.

From earlier research, we had

- Theo Sandfort, who demonstrated that positive sexual relationships, in his project between boys and men, do exist.
- Rind *cum suis*, who found 4% lasting harm from early sexual contacts. Especially forced father-daughter incest was responsible for that 4%. He also found positive and neutral feelings afterwards.
- James Prescott, who found that societies that repress body pleasure in childhood are the most aggressive societies ...
- And so on and on.

My recent research showed how bad the diagnostics are of people alleged for pedosexual acts, and how full of force their treatment is, a treatment based on ideology more than on logical thinking.

But who thinks that children may have body pleasure, nudeness, hugs and intimacy with adults, is wrong in Western society nowadays. Excuse me, he is not *wrong*, he or she is *evil, pervert, sick, creep*, demonized and criminalized, if not exiled from society. In the USA, a teacher is sentenced to 200 years in prison for the possession of twenty child porn pictures. Another got *thousand* years for 32 of such counts. Child nudeness on a photo is seen as a great problem, as you can read in this Newsletter. And in the UK one has to have a license for hugging a child or even to ride a child to school, sports or church. Fear rules the world.

Is the answer: do more and better research? Yes, but this is nowadays nearly impossible, as you can read in the next article.

Can science give the answer? No, regrettably not, because all those fears, absurd laws, incarnations, flawed studies and behavior-changing 'therapies' are not founded in good science. It is - and this my **statement** - *ideology*.

And here is my **question** for the coming Ipce Meeting and the reader: How to combat ideology? Yes, first by revealing that it *is* ideology - but than? What more? How to go further? What to refrain from? What to do?

Frans Gieles, PhD.

2. A Very 'Typical' Immoral Panic

The Perils of Researching Intergenerational Sexualities

Researcher

[This report is a part of the report of the Ipce Meeting in October 2007, presented in the former Ipce Newsletter # E24. There, it is section 3.1, there for the time being named "Reflection, Research and Reaction". By making the former Newsletter, this section of the report of the Meeting was still not ready: the speaker had still to revise the provisional text. Here is the report as it is authorized by the speaker. Ipce's webmaster]

The empirical component of this research involved establishing a dialogue with an Internet-based group which seeks to work for a better understanding of child and intergenerational sexualities. Unbeknown to anyone this group had been infiltrated by a right-wing Conservative group. This group then passed on this information to a freelance tabloid journalist, who subsequently published articles in various newspapers.

The content and tone of the articles sought to paint the researcher as a paedophile, and that his/her University should not be supporting such research. This was followed up by further “revelations” a year later after sensitive interview transcripts had been stolen from his/her office and passed on to that particular journalist. Some excerpts from these were printed in a number of newspapers.

Throughout this period the researcher was also subjected to harassment from journalists, offensive phone-calls and emails, two lengthy University senate investigations into his/her work, having to explain the research to officers from the Serious Crime Squad; and experiencing a newspaper taking a photo of him/her inside his/her house when his/her father was close to death.

Throughout this period the media (both tabloid and broadsheet) presented the research as potentially dangerous. For example, one author stated that it would ‘play into the hands of abusers’, and that ‘victims of abuse sometimes report positive experiences, but this was often a result of manipulation by their abuser or a coping mechanism’. Others suggested in Orwellian fashion that ‘ethics’ committees should scrutinise any future research on what they deemed ‘sensitive subjects.’

Common experiences of critical researchers

The following represent common strands experienced by a range of other critical researchers on this topic.

The first concerns the particular form such attacks take.

For example, the media (in the form of newspapers, television, internet sites) present the individuals (and their findings) in specific ways as either: irresponsible, unsound, derisory, or with an underlying agenda. Such researchers are effectively “tarred with the brush” of their subject matter and accused of either being a paedophile, or having paedophilic sympathies.

Vern Bullough called this the ‘Pedophilia Smear’, whereby, ‘self-appointed guardians of American morality like Laura Schlessinger’ target sex researchers.

[* See V. Bullough, ‘The Pedophilia Smear,’ Accessed 10 October 2002.]

This involves demonising such research as somehow ‘beyond the pale’, and the researchers themselves as insensitive and/or monstrous – a depiction further consolidated by gathering the opinions of professionals and some academics (either in the field of child protection or sex offenders) in a ‘rent-a-quote’ manner, in order to counter (or rubbish) the research(ers).

In such presentations, professional discourses are often presented as 'higher truths' as experts and workers in the field, with 'obvious' superiority in the epistemological hierarchy, as opposed to the opinions of the researchers who are in turn presented 'through a discourse of derision' as in some way lesser or irrelevant.

Secondly, the researchers or commentators become the focus of sustained political attention from a variety of online and offline pressure groups, mainly based in the US but also in the UK. Here, the regional dimension of the attacks is superimposed with a political component, with the main groups involved usually Christian fundamentalists, or right wing conservatives, but also including professional children's charities and child sexual abuse (CSA) organisations.

The representatives of such organisation use their platform to proclaim a moral superiority: that they alone speak for children and/or victims, and that explains their right to attack the research(ers).

Thirdly, an institutional dimension emerges in which mainstream politicians (usually right wing conservatives either US Republicans or UK Tories) are either encouraged, or directly involve themselves in displays of pique or moral outrage that such researchers should even criticise the dominance of CSA, question notions of childhood sexual innocence, or discuss paedophilia.

This ranges from fairly low-level comments from local politicians, children's charity representatives or church leaders rebuking the researchers, stirring up populist opinion to their cause, and questioning whether public monies should even be spent on such work. Direct pressure is then exerted on a particular funding body or institution (academic or book publisher) to cease supporting such work.

A **final** common theme experienced by the researchers and commentators criticising mainstream views on CSA is the more personal and potentially distressing aspects of media harassment of themselves and their families, threats to career and future funding applications, and most sinister of all personal endangerment - including death threats - via phone, email or face-to-face.

3a Curley family drops case against NAMBLA

By Jonathan Saltzman, The Boston Globe, April 23, 2008

The parents of Jeffrey Curley, the 10-year-old Cambridge boy raped and smothered by two men who lured him into a car, have dropped their federal lawsuit against a group that advocates sex between men and boys, which the parents claimed had incited their son's 1997 murder.

Lawyers for Robert and Barbara Curley filed papers Tuesday in US District Court in Boston ending their wrongful death and civil rights lawsuit against the North American Man/Boy Love Association and 18 reputed members after almost eight years of litigation.

Robert Curley said his lawyer recently told him that the plaintiffs had only one witness prepared to testify that NAMBLA somehow spurred Charles Jaynes, one of the boy's convicted killers, to commit rape and murder on Oct. 1, 1997. A judge ruled the witness was not competent to testify, Curley said.

"That was the only link we were counting on," said Curley, a 51-year-old mechanic in the Cambridge Fire Department. "When they ruled that out, that was the end of the line."

Sarah R. Wunsch, a staff attorney for the American Civil Liberties Union of Massachusetts, which defended NAMBLA and most of the defendants in the civil suit, said the case never had any merit.

Jaynes did belong to NAMBLA for a year, Wunsch said. But, she said, there was nothing illegal about the magazines he obtained from the organization -- they are available in some bookstores -- or the association website that the Curleys alleged he viewed shortly before the murders.

"There was never any evidence that NAMBLA was connected to the death of Jeffrey Curley," said Wunsch. "It's been our view that for the last eight years, it's been the First Amendment that's been the defendant in this case. In America, there's freedom to publish unpopular ideas, and that's what this case was about."

3b.

Statement by David Thorstad on Dismissal of Anti-Free-Speech Suit

As one of the 'defendants,' I welcome Judge George A. O'Toole Jr.'s dismissal yesterday of the 'wrongful death' civil suit against NAMBLA et al. O'Toole, of the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts in Boston, should have done so years ago. I was one of

the defendants retained after NAMBLA as an organization was dropped from the suit because it could not be sued as an association.

The judge's decision, apparently unavoidable since the plaintiffs and their money-grubbing attorneys could not provide a shred of evidence, came nearly eight years after Robert and Barbara Curley filed suit seeking \$200 million from NAMBLA and its officers.

I myself was dragged into this exercise in wasting the court's time and harassing innocent men not because of anything I had written or said or done, but merely because my name appeared on the masthead of the *NAMBLA Bulletin*, until I resigned from the collective, coincidentally, only about one month after the Curley's ten-year-old son Jeffrey was murdered in 1997 by two young men who, I understand, were known to his family.

I myself knew neither them nor the family, and was not even aware of the murder at the time. The family filed suit three years later in what was clearly a fishing expedition and fund-raising tool. Their lawyer was one Lawrence Frisoli, who, like many in his profession, tried to use the case to catapult himself into public office, but he was soundly defeated in his run for Massachusetts attorney general in 2006. The murderers were Salvatore Sicari and Charles Jaynes. They are not the kind of people I would have known or associated with.

Not only was their murder of this boy beastly, but it caused such outrage, doubtless in part fed by hysteria about the Catholic priest sex scandal, and fanned by the media and politicians, that it nearly led to reintroduction of capital punishment in Massachusetts, one of the dwindling number of states without the death penalty.

The two men took young Jeffrey to the Boston Public Library, where Jaynes reportedly accessed the NAMBLA Web site. That site contains nothing inflammatory or illegal, or anything anyone in his or her right mind could construe as encouraging rape or murder of anyone.

Wendy Kaminer, in one of the few articles challenging the lawsuit (another excellent one was written by Patrick Califia-Rice), said the site 'seemed a lot less incendiary than the Bible.' But Frisoli, who was joined by the conservative Thomas More Law Center, which used the case as a fund-raising tool, including by running an appeal by Mrs. Curley'claimed that viewing the site turned the two young men into murdering monsters.

(The antigay Thomas More Law Center was also behind the attempt in Dover, Pennsylvania, to impose pseudoscientific 'intelligent design' on the public schools and, after losing that effort, it has now suffered another well-deserved defeat by the dismissal of this suit, which it used

as a cash cow.)

Jaynes, it turns out, using a pseudonym, had subscribed to the *NAMBLA Bulletin*, making him a 'member', but that is the only ever-so-threadbare connection he had to the organization. He never attended a meeting, whether of a local chapter in Boston or a national conference. He was not known by anyone in the organization, let alone the defendants. As a very large and overweight black man, he would have stood out in a gathering of mostly white people, and thus have been an unforgettable presence, and the plaintiffs never could provide any evidence to back up their wild claims of his involvement with the organization.

After Jaynes 'joined,' their suit asserted, he 'became obsessed with having sex with and raping young male children.' Even more crazy, it claimed that 'Prior to joining NAMBLA, Charles Jaynes was heterosexual!' This is a novel twist on the ridiculous 'prairie fire theory of homosexuality,' so dear to hetero-supremacists who find homosexuality disgusting, but at the same time so appealing that the merest exposure to it can turn a 'normal heterosexual' into a pervert.

'The absurdity of these claims makes it difficult to take them seriously,' wrote Kaminer. 'But this lawsuit has already had serious chilling effects on speech.'

NAMBLA's Web site was shut down for a while after the suit was filed.

'Unpopular speech, especially unpopular speech about sex, is regularly blamed for sexual violence and 'deviance,'" she observed. 'Pornography causes rape, according to antiporn feminists. Sex education causes teen pregnancy, according to their counterparts on the right. NAMBLA's advocacy of 'man-boy love' *causes* homosexuality and violent predatory behavior, according to the Curleys' lawsuit.'

Defense of NAMBLA in this case, and denunciation of the blatant attack on freedom of speech and association, was far from widespread, whether among progressive, libertarian, or gay groups.

Besides the two articles mentioned, the *Spartacist League* was one of the few to have rallied to the defense of constitutionally protected speech. NAMBLA itself did not promote coverage of the suit, preferring to keep a low profile. When the suit was filed, one gay group that supposedly defends same-sexers from defamation, the *Gay and Lesbian Alliance Against Defamation*, actually rushed to join in the attacks on NAMBLA. To their shame, national gay and lesbian organizations remained silent.

The case ought to have been dismissed years ago, because it was clear

from the start that it lacked all merit. The plaintiffs never even took a single deposition, despite the judge's granting them that privilege. Their harassment of innocent individuals with no connection to their loss of their son (a loss the defendants deplored, having had only sympathy for the parents' grief) and their misguided effort to destroy a legal organization have now ground to a halt. The case was dismissed 'with prejudice,' which means that it cannot be filed again. But what does it say about American 'democracy' that such a worthless case was allowed to continue for nearly eight years'

The hero in this sad tale is the *Massachusetts Civil Liberties Union* (MCLU). The high professionalism of their lawyers, John Reinstein and Sarah Wunsch, and the MCLU's commitment to principle, deserve all the credit for the victorious outcome.

My files from this case are a foot and a half high, and reflect not only eight years of outrageous harassment, loss of sleep, worry, and frustration, but also the wonderful and detailed lawyering of the MCLU.

Both sides will bear the costs of the suit, but in truth, the MCLU should be reimbursed by the Curleys, Frisoli, and the Thomas More Law Center, which brought this frivolous suit, capitalized on the parents' grief, and promoted harassment of innocent men. The MCLU not only saved constitutionally protected rights one more time, but it prevented possible financial ruin by the many innocent men whose names were dragged through the mud as a result of this vindictive suit. The ACLU is one of the few bulwarks against the creeping police state that the United States has become. It deserves the support of everyone who cares about civil liberties and justice.

4a. Adults 'scared to go near kids'

BBC News, 26 June 2008

The law says that adults must be vetted if they want to work with children. But have we gone too far and created a climate of suspicion. Professor Frank Furedi of Kent University has written a report that says we have. Many adults are afraid to interact with children for fear of being labelled as paedophiles, a report has claimed.

Think-tank Civitas said the "escalation of child protection measures" had made everyone from sports coaches to Santas seem like "potential child abusers". The Home Office said there was no evidence that vetting had deterred volunteers or eroded trust. It plans to tighten the rules further, so all parents hosting foreign exchange students will face background checks.

In its report, *Licensed to Hug*, *Civitas* said that child protection regulations had "succeeded in poisoning the relationship between the generations". While in the past, adults would have helped children in distress or rebuked those misbehaving, there was now "a feeling that it is best not to become involved", it said.

Report author Prof Frank Furedi, of Kent University, said: "From Girl Guiders to football coaches, from Christmas-time Santas to parents helping out in schools, volunteers - once regarded as pillars of the community - have been transformed in the regulatory and public imagination into potential child abusers, barred from any contact with children until the database gives them the green light."

Instead of relying on Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) checks, adults should be allowed to use their "discretion and professional judgment" to decide who should work with children.

Foreign exchange

A Home Office spokesman said the number of CRB checks on volunteers had grown year-on-year and in 2007, they stopped 20,000 unsuitable people from "gaining work with vulnerable individuals". "There has to be a way to identify and weed out unsuitable people, but such checks do not mean an end to common sense," he said.

Civitas called for child protection regulations to be relaxed, but the Home Office said that from October 2009, a new Independent Safeguarding Authority would be created to tighten the rules even further.

Beverley Hughes, minister for Children, Schools and Families, said it would become a criminal offence for a parent to let a child stay at their home on a foreign exchange visit without having a CRB check. If I'm not with my wife, I don't even look at a child, let alone smile at one steveL-G, United Kingdom.

"We also recommend that host families are given basic awareness of child protection issues and the contact details of the designated senior person within the school with responsibility for safeguarding issues," she said.

Speaking on BBC Radio 4's Today programme, ChildLine founder Esther Rantzen said there were some examples of child protection legislation descending into "politically correct madness". But she said the correct response was to take a more "sensible" approach rather than change the law.

"I am a volunteer counsellor for ChildLine - I want checks," she said. "I was delighted to be checked. There is nothing wrong with it. It doesn't affect my approach to children, my feeling of empathy for children."

4b. Thou shalt not hug

Frank Furedi, *The New Statesman* (UK), 26 June 2008

Frank Furedi is professor of sociology at the University of Kent. Jennie Bristow is a journalist and the mother of two pre-school girls

British society no longer trusts grown-ups to interact with children. In a controversial new report, Frank Furedi and Jennie Bristow argue that the culture of "vetting" adults is damaging relationships between the generations

British society no longer trusts adults to interact with children. Since 2002, growing numbers of people have found themselves required to undergo a Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) check simply because their work or voluntary activities bring them into contact with children.

This includes football coaches, cricket umpires, Guiders and Scoutmasters, volunteers in churches, charities and community centres, parents who volunteer for school trips or after-school clubs, and members of parent-teacher associations - as well as a host of others whose work is not to do with children, but might just involve having contact with them, such as bus drivers, or plumbers who fix school radiators.

This month the BBC calculated that one in four adults will have to register with the new Independent Safeguarding Authority next year. The ISA boasts that something like 11.3 million people will be affected by the new scheme for vetting adults.

In the report *Licensed to Hug*, published on 26 June, my co-author Jennie Bristow and I explore the implication of the steady expansion of criminal-record checks on intergenerational relations and community life. What we found is that the system of vetting adults has taken on a bizarre life of its own.

Already the question "Have you been CRB-checked?" has become part of everyday discussion at the school gates. We have talked to parents

who were told that they could not attend their children's disco because they were not CRB-checked.

Suspicion of grown-up behaviour towards children has fostered a climate in which it has become normal for some parents to trust only adults who possess official clearance. As one manager of a children's football team stated, "I only allow CRB'd parents to drive team members to training."

The research for *Licensed to Hug* indicates that most of our respondents in the voluntary sector accepted that a system of national vetting was now a fact of life. Many prefaced their statement with the word "unfortunately". Some were sceptical about its efficacy; others felt that it was burdensome and confusing. There were complaints about the enormous costs of maintaining the system and the amount of time it takes to process the paperwork. A significant minority of volunteers have been put off from working with children. One volunteer manager of an under-13s cricket team told us of his frustration at losing his "inspiring" coach who simply got "fed up with the hassle and paperwork".

Supporters of the new culture of vetting grown-ups argue that, whatever the critics say, the system protects children from adult predators. However, our experience of vetting as a society raises a question mark over the idea that the system "works", either in terms of protecting children from abuse, or in terms of increasing public confidence in those working or volunteering with children.

As the recent history of the Criminal Records Bureau has shown, the first consequence of more stringent vetting procedures has been a demand for even more stringent security procedures. This indicates that the effect of CRB checks is less to increase trust in those organisations and institutions that insist upon vetting than it is to fuel mistrust in those that do not.

Experience indicates that the institutionalisation of the vetting of adults has unleashed a logic towards increasing the number of people who are deemed to be in need of formal clearance. So, in February 2008, the government announced trials of a new scheme that would enable parents to check with police whether a "named individual" - a family member, a neighbour who looks after children, a new sexual partner - has child sex convictions. The Home Secretary, Jacqui Smith, stressed that the initiative would not be a "community-wide disclosure", with information given out to anyone who asks. The more this process goes on, however, the more arbitrary it becomes to say where vetting should stop and trust begin.

The alleged protective effects of a system of vetting are largely illusory. Aside from the fallibility of record-keeping and technical systems, vetting takes into account only what somebody has done in the past. The most sophisticated system in the world cannot anticipate how individuals with a clean record might behave.

Thus, the CRB provides little guidance about people's behaviour in the future. It provides the impression of security, but not the substance. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the national vetting scheme represents an exercise in impression management rather than offering effective protection. Vetting measures also fuel suspicion about adults. In that sense, they are not just harmless rituals, but negatively influence the conduct of adult-child relationships.

Although proponents of the scheme contend that it is designed to prevent "worst-case scenarios", the very institutionalisation of the scheme encourages worst-case-scenario assumptions to become the norm.

One consequence of this process is that adults feel increasingly nervous around children, unwilling and unable to exercise their authority and play a positive role in children's lives. Such intergenerational unease has not made children safer than in the past: if anything, it is creating the conditions for greater harm, as adults lose the nerve and will to look out for any child who is not their own.

Perversely, it inadvertently encourages grown-ups to avoid their responsibility for assuring the well-being of children in their community. One of the principal consequences of the vetting of grown-ups is the legitimisation of the idea that it is not the responsibility of the older generation to take a direct interest in the lives of children.

The most regrettable outcome of the new child protection policies associated with vetting is the distancing of intergenerational relationships. They foster a climate where adults feel uneasy about acting on their healthy intuition and feel forced to weigh up whether, and how, to interact with a child.

Such calculated behaviour alters the quality of that interaction. It no longer represents an act founded on doing what a mentor feels is right - it is an act influenced by calculations about how it will be interpreted by others, and by anxieties that it should not be misinterpreted.

In sport, the difference between a coach automatically reaching out to correct a child's position and a coach asking himself, "Is this all right?" before doing so is that the former is a spontaneous action based on a desire to improve the child's game, and the latter is a timid gesture, reflecting an uncertainty about authority that the child must surely sense.

In a community group, the difference between giving a distressed child a hug and asking that child, "Would you like a hug?" is that the former is given as an unprompted expression of human compassion, and the latter is a transaction that requires a child's formal consent.

Without doubt, children need to be protected from those who may prey upon them. However, the policing and formalisation of intergenerational relations does little to help this. The policy of attempting to prevent paedophiles from getting in contact with children through a mass system of vetting may well unintentionally make the situation more complicated.

One regrettable outcome of such policies is the estrangement of children from all adults - the very people who are likely to protect them from paedophiles and other dangers that they may face. The adult qualities of spontaneous compassion and commitment are far more effective safeguarding methods than pieces of paper that promote the messages: "Keep out" and "Watch your back".

Adults feel at a loss

During the course of our discussions with people working in the voluntary sector, it became evident that applying formal procedures to the conduct of human relations also threatens to deskill adults. Many adults often feel at a loss about how they should relate to youngsters who are not their children. When formal rules replace compassion and initiative, adults become discouraged from developing the kind of skills that help them relate to and interact and socialise with children.

This process of deskillling the exercise of adult authority may have the unfortunate consequence of diminishing the sense of responsibility that adults bear for the socialisation of the younger generation. Individuals who talked to us about the "hassle of paperwork" also hinted that they were not sure that working with kids was "worth the effort". And if adults are not trusted to be near children, is it any surprise that at least some of them draw the conclusion that they are really not expected to take responsibility for the well-being of children in their community?

5. Australia debates about child nudity

"The evil is in the eye of the beholder"

Since May 2008, two publicly showed photos of naked young children have started a public debate in which, among other questions, fear of child nudity and artistic freedom combated. Even the Prime Minister, but also the photographed children play their role in this debate. The two cases were an exhibition of photos of artist Bill Nelson and the cover photo on the magazine Art Monthly. We follow the cases by giving quotes from the media.

1. The Bill Nelson case

Start of the case: politicians, thus police, and a psychologist

The Herald Sun, May 23, 2008:

> Police expect to lay charges after seizing more than 20 photographs from a controversial photo exhibition featuring images of naked girls. Rose Bay Local Area Commander Allan Sicard said NSW Police expected to lay charges over the images - taken in a Melbourne studio - by artist Bill Henson, which were to go on display at the Roslyn Oxley9 Gallery in Paddington last night. The exhibition was shut down just before it was due to open. [...] Earlier, police seized several nude images of children from the gallery .

The news came as the gallery said it would take down the pictures after the Prime Minister Kevin Rudd described them as "revolting". The exhibition features photos of naked 12 and 13-year-old children. [...] "I don't understand why we can't allow kids just to have their childhood and just enjoy their childhood. I really have a problem with this," Mr Rudd told the Nine Network this morning.

NSW Premier Morris Iemma also weighed in from China, condemning the exhibition. "I find it offensive and disgusting. I don't understand why parents would agree to allow their kids to be photographed like this," Mr Iemma said.

NSW Minister for the Arts Frank Sartor saw the images - some of which may have been taken up to a decade ago - yesterday and said they

crossed the line. "I have been shown some of the images and I don't like them," he said. "I'm sure these images will be debated by the community. Ultimately, I think these images do push the boundaries and I can understand why people would be offended." <

The same newspaper on the same day wrote:

> Photographs of naked 12- and 13-year-olds by a leading Australian photographer could give people a taste for pedophilia, a clinical psychologist says. [...] "People who would never cross the line in the past, they would never have sought out photos of naked children are now doing it because it's so accessible," psychologist Jo Lamble said the Seven Network today. "They might look at something like that and think: 'Oh, OK, well that's art, so that's OK, it's tasteful', but it can give them the taste for it."

Ms Lamble says that although she believes Mr Henson is not a pedophile, his photographs still send the wrong message about the sexualisation of children. [...] "Even if they are beautiful, even if the mood and lighting and the composition is beautiful and it's a very talented artist, it's still giving the wrong messages because you don't know who's viewing them," she says.

And Newspaper **The West** wrote on the same day:

> Child protection advocate Hetty Johnston backed the move to prosecute, saying pornography and pedophilia were rife in society. "You can call it anything you want, but at the end of the day, these are images of naked adolescents," said Ms Johnston, of the children's organisation Bravehearts. "Putting naked photos up there on public display in a gallery, and even on the internet, is just totally betraying our duty of care to children."

> NSW Department of Community Services Minister Kevin Greene said the images were inappropriate. "As a father, and as a minister responsible for child protection services, I think some of the images in this exhibition, including those that were available online until late yesterday, are highly inappropriate," he said.

NSW Opposition Leader Barry O'Farrell praised the police response to the "disgusting" images. "As a parent of young children, the sexualisation of children under the guise of art is totally unacceptable," he said.

The debate starts

> Understandably the topic of the pictures provoked impassioned debate in our **LIVENEWS**.com.au newsroom, wrote Livenews already on the

same day in an article, titled "Paedophilia or art?"

> Politicians of all colours, sensing an easy free kick, have all lined up for a go over the last 24 hours since the story was beaten into an issue by right-wing columnist, Miranda Devine. [...] Sadly their [= The Daily Telegraph] extreme moral-panic style commentary has left little room for a community debate.

> While some thought the whole thing disgusting others claimed that if such images were more commonplace they would lose their value as titillation, that is, it's only the way we react to them that makes them dirty.

> But it isn't fair to say the images constitute the "sexualisation of children" as Opposition Leader Barry O'Farrell has charged. Having looked at them, I really have to wonder if these are the kind of images a sexual predator would desire. They seem altogether too dark and moody for that. But sadly, few will be able to form their own view. Not only have they lost the opportunity to see the images, but the water has been irrevocably muddied by the hysterical commentary of our socially conservative columnists and opportunistic politicians. <

A more rational approach appeared in **The Australian** the next day, May 24:

> Porn case is likely to fail; Chris Merritt: The success rate in obscenity trials in Australia is extremely low - and experts believe the looming case against renowned photographer Bill Henson will prove no different. [...] The case will almost certainly boil down to a decision by either a magistrate or a jury on whether the photographs are obscene. <

The Age gives on May 26 an article named "The controversial career of Bill Henson". Read: he has more nudes photographed in his career. The article ends with a quote:

> Forty years ago, artist Martin Sharp was famously tried for obscenity because of a piece he wrote for Oz magazine. Last week he received an invitation to Henson's exhibition, which features a topless 13-year-old. "It was a powerful image. I would call it very beautiful in its vulnerability rather than 'revolting' as the Prime Minister has done," Sharp said. The photograph suggested the girl "gave her trust to Henson - and this trust has been violated by the police and Kevin Rudd's comments."

The Herald Sun, May 26:

> Community Services Minister Jenny Macklin said the topic warranted further discussion. "I think the use of photographs and billboards, and the way in which children are portrayed in so many different parts of our society these days, is wrong," she said. "I certainly expect that as part of

the discussion around our national child protection framework we get some clear indications of where national policy should go on this issue."
<

SMH, May 27: Police widen Henson inquiry; Josephine Tovey, Les Kennedy and Jonathan Dart:

> Criminal investigations into Bill Henson have widened to include previous work by the controversial photographer, after police received complaints about several Henson works on display at a regional gallery. Police advised the Albury Regional Art Gallery to take down several photographs by the artist dating back to 1985, after they received a complaint from the public about "inappropriate" images, which they are investigating.

> Henson's work is held in a number of regional and state galleries, including the National Gallery and the Museum of Contemporary Art in Sydney, though no other gallery has removed any Henson work from display.

Here follows a row of names of "prominent arts figures" who have protested, but they are scarcely quoted in the article.

AFP wrote on May 29:

> Police said Thursday they had visited the prestigious National Gallery of Australia in Canberra as part of a search for the works of an art photographer accused of producing child pornography. Police in cities across Australia have been scouring galleries for photographer Bill Henson's work [...]. <

In **The Age**, June 1, Graham Dawson wrote:

> As a psychologist who worked for over three years in the rehabilitation of child sex offenders, I found they always believe there is something special about their situation that legitimises their actions. The point is, we can't accept one adult's offending behaviour because they're famous. That introduces a concept of gradations within a sexually offensive act. These gradations are what offenders rely on to excuse, and therefore continue, their behaviour. Any attempts by so called experts to legitimise Henson's work will make the rehabilitation of sexual offenders all the more difficult. [...]

Art appreciation may be subjective but the wellbeing and protection of children is not. We have an objective moral obligation, a duty of care, as a civilised society, to ensure children are protected from exploitation and abuse. Children should not be dragged into the adult world prematurely. But our libertarians and "art lovers" are more concerned about feeding

the desires and whims of adults than they are about the interests of the child. That is the real issue here, not some argument about what is art, and/or demands for "freedom of expression".

News.com.au writes on June 2: Artist to exhibit photos of nude 11-year-old boys as protest; Michelle Draper: A Melbourne artist will exhibit a series of nude photographs of 11-year-old children to protest against the recent censorship of the work of photographer Bill Henson. Thirty to 40 images of two boys, now aged 17, will be projected onto a screen during the exhibition, provocatively titled: "I am not a photographer nor a pedophile but an artist". [...]

> She said her intent through her photographs was to show vulnerability and fragility, not just of young people, but of everyone. "It's like the vulnerable side of everybody, the fragility of us all, we all grow. And I think it's beautiful," she said. Larielle said her models and their parents had given permission for the images to be used in the exhibition. <

'Thus', we read the next day in **The Age**: "Police say they will look into an exhibition of nude photographs of two young boys to be shown at a bar in Melbourne tonight to verify there are no issues with the works."

The decision

Abc.net.au quotes a minister on June 7:

> Federal Arts Minister Peter Garrett says a decision not to proceed with charges against photographer Bill Henson is the right one. [...] Charges against Henson and the gallery were dropped yesterday, after the New South Wales Director of Public Prosecutions told police there was no reasonable prospect of a conviction. Mr Garrett says the courtroom is not the right place to debate the merits of art. [...] "We shouldn't see the police knocking on the doors of art galleries to try to resolve matters which are really better resolved by the community having mature debate."

The debate goes on

The Australian on the same day:

> Children's rights activist Hetty Johnston declared it was "a great day for pedophiles, a sad day for Australia".

> NSW Law Society president Hugh Macken said the Henson photographs did not offend the Crimes Act because they did not show children in a sexual

context. [...] "Nudity is not obscenity."

> Ms Johnston told **The Weekend Australian** last night she was one of the three people who issued a complaint to police about Henson's photographs, and she intended to continue her fight against state and federal laws that allowed images of naked underage girls to be taken and circulated as art. <

The Australian News continues on June 12:

> Child activists yesterday threw their support behind a letter published in *The Australian* that said the bigger issue was not the art-child pornography debate, but the rights of children. "Basically, I was shocked that people were not seeing the real issue," said child psychologist and writer Steve Biddulph, one of the 30 signatories to the letter. "It wasn't about pornography, or even about pedophilia - it's about children's rights." <

The Age continues on June 13:

> Henson foe says artists do nothing to protect children; Annabel Stafford: Child protection campaigner Hetty Johnston has called on the arts community to set up a board to decide what constitutes an artist and therefore who can take photos of naked children. [...] "The arts industry does nothing that I can see in terms of meeting its obligation and responsibility (to protect children)," she said. "There have to be checks and balances." [...] Ms Johnston also said she had asked the NSW Attorney-General to look at tightening child pornography laws. <

At least, critical thinkers have their say

The famous **Germaine Greer** wrote in **the Blog of the Guardian** (UK) on June 16:

> **Would Australia's PM ban Botticelli?** - Australia's prime minister Kevin Rudd has hit out at photographer Bill Henson's pictures of naked adolescents. Would he ban Botticelli?

When New South Wales police removed half the work from photographer Bill Henson's show at a Sydney gallery last month, they were *responding to a complaint by a child protection campaigner*, who had seen *an invitation to the opening featuring a nude 13-year-old girl*. The gallery presumably chose this image as the most likely to boost attendance. Their little bit of sexploitation misfired: nobody came to the opening, because it was cancelled. The gallery had to make do with a heated media debate instead.

Some said that mere policemen couldn't be expected to tell the difference between art and pornography,

others that the suppression of the pictures was censorship and not to be borne by a free society; some felt the young models had been exploited and their privacy breached.

Two weeks later, the NSW department of public prosecutions informed the police that there was no reasonable prospect of a conviction. But the offending picture is now known to millions; Henson and the gallery must be laughing all the way to the bank.

Seizing the moment, Prime Minister Kevin Rudd announced that he found the pictures "absolutely revolting". What revolted him was the image of a well-fed 13-year-old, back-lit, her face shaded, eyes downcast, her hands modestly keeping her shadowed parts private.

Rudd would not recoil in horror from Botticelli's Birth of Venus, one hopes, but that, too, is the image of an adolescent. For some months, travellers on the London underground have been unable to escape the image of a naked pre-teen, fully lit and meticulously detailed down to her faint cloud of pubic fuzz. But no child protection campaigners have picketed the Royal Academy; the gallery selected the image likely to get the most punters into its Cranach show, and got away with it.

Cranach and his mate Martin Luther might have been unhappy with the unprincipled use made of a tiny exquisite image meant to be enjoyed by the refined gentleman in private, but they would have made no objection to this model's evident youth.

Anxiety about children's bodies and what adults might do with them seems to have surfaced in the 1970s. In 1978, with the passing of the Protection of Children Act, it became a crime to take pornographic pictures of children or to permit their being taken.

In 1995, staff at Boots reported that film left for development by the newsreader Julia Somerville and her partner Jeremy Dixon contained pornographic images of a child. The couple had photographed their seven-year-old daughter in the bath making patterns on her body with foam. Both were arrested; no charges were brought.

The photographing of pubescent bodies is even riskier.

In the 1970s, Will McBride's sex education book *Zeig Mal!*, published in English as *Show Me!*, was the subject of four obscenity trials, all of which failed.

The photographer Sally Mann was accused of incestuous feelings for her pre-pubescent children, simply because she photographed them without clothes on and published the (ravishing) pictures in her 1992 book, *Immediate Family*.

In 2001, the Saatchi Gallery was threatened with prosecution for

showing Tierney Gearon's photographs of her own children, described as a "revolting exhibition of perversion under the guise of art".

Coming of age is the subject matter of the *bildungsroman*; most of our art is concerned with it one way or another. The chief inspiration for any artist is her childhood and youth, yet even when young people give their own account of their experiences, the result is deemed indecent.

In Florida last year, teenagers who made videos of their own sexual activity were charged with "producing, directing or promoting a photograph featuring the sexual conduct of a child".

Meanwhile the models on our catwalks are, or pretend to be, gangling adolescents. Every year, fashion magazines produce a new crop of schoolgirl models. Mothers may look at pictures like Henson's and howl with fear; but the man who rejects them with exaggerated horror is appalled not by the works themselves but by his own response to them. Innocence is not an option. <

Lots of comments react to her Blog.

TV show of *Insight: the naked eye* on June 24 may end this subsection.

The video (included the photos concerned) can be viewed online here:
<http://video.sbs.com.au/player/news/index.php?mmid=12493&chid=15>
&
http://news.sbs.com.au/insight//the_naked_eye_549822

Here, we give only some quotes. The full text of the transcription is on the given links. In the case they sooner or later will disappear from the web, the full text of the transcription is also given in the documentation section of this Newsletter under # 08-068. Text only - Ipce does not allow itself to publish possibly debatable pictures. The other articles quoted are stored under # 08-067.

Ms Hetty Johnston, director of *Bravehearts*, was also there. She repeatedly gave her opinion just as we have seen here above in several newspapers: "You can't use a naked child for artistic purposes or for film. You just can't do it."

The girl, photographed by Bill Nelson, was present in this show and she has spoken. Earlier, newspapers have mentioned that the girl has been sought by police (because Bill Nelson refused to speak to police), that she was found, but that she refused to speak, thus cooperate with police. Also other 'declared victims' were present ... to declare that they absolutely not felt themselves as 'victims'.

> JENNY BROCKIE (presentator, hereafter JB): Marina, they're photos of

you, the ones that we've just seen. You're 25 now - how do you feel looking at them now?

MARINA: I enjoy them just as much as I did when they were first taken.

J B: Did you feel exploited or do you feel exploited looking at them?

MARINA: No. At no point was I ever stripped naked. I was already naked. I did not wear clothes at that age. Um, so Sandy taking photographs of me, she would have had to actually clothe me to get the photographs of me clothed.

J B: I know a few kids like that. Do you think you were able to give informed consent about being photographed at that age? How old were you when those photos were taken?

MARINA: About 11 or 12, yeah. When the exhibition was planned, Sandy and my mum both came to me and asked me about it and it was a very open discussion. They both told me all the repercussions...

J B: 'Repercussions', meaning what?

MARINA: What the photograph would be used for, who would be looking at

the photograph, where it would be put on display - all those.

J B: Was that important to you as a child knowing those things?

MARINA: It was important for them for me to know, I can see that now, and therefore I felt at all times safe and supported and able to give my opinion for what it was at that time in my life. <

Zoe is another nude photographed teenager, then 16, now 26.

> J B: Do you think you were able to make an informed decision about having them taken?

ZOE: At 16?

J B: Yeah.

ZOE: Absolutely. Two years off 18 which is old enough to have an informed decision to vote. <

> J B: Leela?

LEELA: I think being around that age, like I'm 13 years old, not that I'd be comfortable to like pose nude for an artist, but I think I am of age to be able to like - I know what's right and what's wrong, like I think I know what's right and what's wrong and I think I would be able to like give consent and tell an artist whether I feel comfortable or not and... <

About another case, presented on a video:

> CONCETTA PETRILLO, ARTIST: I took some pictures of my boys. Some were

clothed, some were partly unclothed and some of them were nude.

REPORTER: Were your children uncomfortable having the photos taken?

CONCETTA PETRILLO: No, they're just children.

The photos were to be part of a series based on famous poses used by classical masters, she wanted to merge photography and painting together to give a contemporary spin. Connie usually developed her own images but this time decided to drop her film to a local photo lab. When she collected the photos the police were waiting. [...] 60 images of her children were seized by police - even family shots were called into question.

[...]

The case went to trial two years later. The jury, although divided, found her not guilty. The images were not pornographic but it didn't end there.

CONCETTA PETRILLO: When I got home there was another summons at my

doorstep with a lesser charge that was being laid which was possession of pornographic material. [...]

Six months later the case finally came to an end. Connie was free to practise her art but found it hard to get back mind the camera. [...] The photos have since been exhibited here, at the Perth Institute of Contemporary Arts. <

> J B: Allan Leek, you were a police officer for 34 years and you also own an art gallery which puts you in a very interesting position in this debate. I wonder what you think about the debate?

ALLEN LEEK: The artworks I don't find sexually... They're not a sexual item at all. In fact, they're quite charming. [...] I think censorship can be very ugly. That Western Australian story is quite ugly and it's the thin end of the wedge that we're in danger of putting into the art world.

J B: Did you ever deal with paedophiles when you were a police officer?

ALLEN LEEK: Yes, I did.

J B: You did, and did you ever find images like this when you arrested people?

ALLEN LEEK: Not like that, no, no, not like at that all. [...] Now that was clear right from the start. This action didn't need to be taken in this way.

<

> J B: Michael, you're a part-time photographer and you recently got into trouble for taking photographs of your child at a netball game, can you tell us what happened because I think it's quite an interesting story in the context of this debate.

MICHAEL BIANCHINO: Well it was this pleasant Saturday morning and I was

just there taking shots and an official came up to me and said, "Do you have permission to take pictures of the netball team?" I said, "Yes, my daughter plays in the team and I give myself permission to take pictures of her," and then she said to me, "Well no, do you have permission from the rest of the team?" And I said, "Well yes", I said, "I've discussed with the manager and she discussed it with all the parents that I would do the

images "and produce a disk at the end of the season for everyone." Then she went "Well no, do you have permission from the other team as well?" I said "Well, they're the other Beecroft team" and I said "I think I might but I'm..." "By the time I go and ask permission the game's going to be over."

J B: So can you understand the thinking behind that in one sense, that perhaps it's about protecting some of those kids.

MICHAEL BIANCHINO: No, no, no, no definitely not. No this was a direct result of Bill Henson saga. They never informed us at the start of the season about taking images of our children playing netball. <

> J E: Ok, last word on the discussion, first of all from you, Marina.

MARINA: I hope that this can continue so that there will be other young ladies out there, young men, who have had a beautiful upbringing with people admiring my body.

J B: Zoe, what about you - what do you think about what you've heard tonight?

ZOE BAILEY: Yeah, it's a healthy debate and I think as long as the subjects themselves are comfortable with their images being projected into society and as long as everybody is aware there is a process between the artist and the subject. <

Parents banned from snapping kids at sport; The Sunday Telegraph (Australia),

June 22, 2008

> Parents are furious after being banned from taking photographs of their children at weekend sporting events. They say the Bill Henson affair has made sports clubs paranoid about allowing them to photograph their children. [...]

Netball, basketball, rugby league, AFL, cricket, soccer and baseball clubs have imposed rules to prevent photos of young players being taken without the consent of all parents and coaches. [...]

"The Bill Henson (saga) brought it to a head. It's made people more aware ... and it brings debate around the topic."

[...]

One father said he was made to feel like a pedophile while photographing his eight-year-old daughter on the netball court. Michael Bianchino lodged a complaint with the Hills District Netball Association after it forbade him to photograph his daughter, Mia, during an under-nine match at Pennant Hills Park on May 31. "The way I was treated, I was made to feel like a pedophile," Mr Bianchino said. [...] <

Conclusion:

The evil is in the eye of the beholder.

2. The case of the girl on the cover of *Arts Monthly Australia*

Just after the Bill Henson case, the magazine *Arts Monthly Australia* published a cover photo with a young girl, six year, playing in the sand. The articles quoted, and other articles from the newspapers, are stored as document # 08-069 in the Documentation section of this Newsletter.

The Age, July 6, 2008, Mischelle Grattan:

> The picture, taken in 2003 by Melbourne photographer Polixeni Papapetrou of her daughter Olympia appeared on the cover of this month's Art Monthly Australia. The edition also has photos of other naked children. <

> But The Age art critic Robert Nelson, Papapetrou's husband and father of Olympia, now 11, said the family had no regrets and the photograph was a great work of art. [...] He said Olympia often posed for her mother and this photo, which had been exhibited in major galleries in Australia and New York, was one of her favourites. <

> The NSW Government yesterday announced it would refer Art Monthly Australia to the Classification Board. [...] Papapetrou's work has been shown in Canada, New Zealand, Japan, Argentina, India, Singapore, Spain and across the United States. <

Again, we hear the comment of the Prime Minister and of *Bravehearts'* executive director Hetty Johnson. But also the girl and her father.

Here is the PM in **abc.net.au** on July 6, 2008:

> Prime Minister Kevin Rudd earlier told ABC1's Insiders that the cover goes against the interests of protecting children. "How can anyone assume that a little child of six years old, eight, 10, 12, somehow is able to make that decision for themselves," he said. "I mean I don't think I can [assume that] - that's just my view and that's why frankly I can't stand this stuff." <

And here Hetty Johnson in the same issue:

> Bravehearts says the decision by Art Monthly Australia to put a naked six-year-old girl on its cover is evidence the arts community clearly can't be relied on to self-regulate. The organisation's executive director Hetty Johnson says new legislation is required across the country to make it illegal to take photographs of children for public exhibition, publication and sale. "Hopefully what we get from this is collective views around the country, from states and territories, and that's what needs to happen and

it needs to happen urgently, to introduce legislation that removes artistic merit from the child pornography laws and introduce this legislation that controls what artists can do in relation to the use of children in art," she said. <

And here is the girl Olympia, in **smh.com.au**, July 7:

> The young girl whose naked image appears on the cover of an art magazine says she is "really offended" by Prime Minister Kevin Rudd's criticisms of the photo. [...]

Olympia, now aged 11, does not believe the photograph of her amounts to abuse and is upset with Mr Rudd, who said on Sunday he "can't stand" the shot.

"I'm really, really offended by what Kevin Rudd had to say about this picture," Olympia said as she stood outside her Melbourne home alongside her father Robert Nelson, an arts critic at The Age newspaper and a professor at Monash University.

"I love the photo so much. It is one of my favourites, if not my favourite photo, my mum has ever taken of me, and she has taken so many photos of me. I think that the picture my mum took of me had nothing to do with being abused and I think nudity can be a part of art."

And the father:

> Professor Nelson said his family had no regrets about the photo's publication, for which it had given permission. The photograph was a great work of art and there was nothing pornographic about it, he said. "(It) has nothing to do with pedophilia. The connection between artistic pictures and pedophilia cannot be made and there is no evidence for it. No one's producing any science," he said. "People are losing their cool over this matter."

News.com.au on July 10:

> Robert Nelson, art critic with The Age, has responded angrily to criticism of the nude pictures of his six-year-old daughter Olympia in the magazine's most recent issue, which may be pulled from the shelves after NSW authorities ruled it needed to be classified.

But, as revealed by Herald Sun columnist Andrew Bolt in his blog this morning, Mr Nelson has previously written of the specific sexuality of such pictures, arguing that "the sensuality of children is integral to parental fondness".

In the essay - which features on the website of Mr Nelson's wife Polixeni Papapetrou, who took the pictures of Olympia - Mr Nelson says some photographs taken of Olympia by his wife in 2000 when she was just two years old were taken "at the instigation" of their daughter: "'Mummy, come and photo me', she would exhort." The "taboo" of such images is described as "the fear of the child's latent sexuality and its potential for

exciting inappropriate and sinful desire".

The discussion goes on: **The Australian**, July 9, Janet Albrechtsen in an article headed "Just naked exploitation":

> The decision by Art Monthly Australia to put the photograph of a nude six-year-old girl on the cover of its July magazine is barefaced abuse of an innocent child. It is overt political exploitation of a naked child by a group of adults done solely for their own political gratification.

Opposition Leader Brendan Nelson summed it up neatly when he said the editor, Maurice O'Riordan, was sending a "two-fingered salute to the rest of society".

Nothing artistic about their offensive gesture. It's politics, pure and simple. And that's why it's distasteful and deserves censure.

[...]

O'Riordan's decision to use the photo of Olympia Nelson was the flagrant exploitation of child nudity, not for the sake of art, but to advance his own political agenda. <

> And let's not be seduced by the dulcet voice of 11-year-old Olympia Nelson, who says she loves the photo her mother took a few years ago.

[..]

Olympia's mother Polixeni Papapetrou wants us to listen to what her daughter has to say. "Children are aware of everything that goes on around them," she says.

Perhaps her parents think that by treating their child as an adult they are liberated from heavy parental responsibilities. They are not. And Olympia's voice adds little to the debate. This is a child, once again, doing the bidding of adults. First, Art Monthly. And now, her parents. She's 11, her baby voice a reminder that her ability to judge the merits of posing nude for a public photograph is encumbered by her youth, not to mention the influence of her parents. <

Two ministers speak in **smh.com.au**, July 10:

> The federal Minister for Families, Jenny Macklin, joined the chorus condemning the pictures yesterday, saying children were being sexualised in ways that robbed them of a childhood.

The federal Minister for Arts, Peter Garrett, who has described the publication of the photos as "needlessly provocative", said the Government would call on the Australia Council to devise a set of protocols addressing the use of images of children in art and publications that receive government funding. <

Conclusion

What we hear is: 'Do not listen to the child, the victim. Listen to the victimologists. They know better.'

However: the evil is in the eye of the beholder.

6. Fear of photos

Some cases

Two foreigners arrested for photographing children; Puerto Vallarta, Jalisco (Mexico), Informador, December 17, 2007 - Translated from Spanish.

> Offended parents reported two gringos from Denver because they were secretly taking photographs of their sons, which they *might* be using and uploading to the Internet, and they don't rule out that it involved [thus: *might* involve] child pornography. According to police, citizens complained to police that two North-Americans were taking pictures of their sons without the parents' permission.

This led to a confrontation [...] and led to physical blows and the gringos fled to the Church of Santa Cruz, where they were identified, then arrested by the municipal police. Jose Socorro Nava and his companion decided to file a complaint because of fear that the foreigners *might* use the photographs in the business of child pornography. <

Thus, photographing children is in itself suspect and even dangerous. The fear concerns pedophilia. A pedophile *might* see the photo and place it on the internet, after which other pedophiles *might* see it - and this is, we all know it, a disaster in itself.

Appeal after man photographed children, edp.co.uk, 22 April 2008

> Norwich, UK - Police are appealing for information following a report of a man seen photographing children. Officers said there was no suggestion any youngsters were approached and the man could have had legitimate reasons to be taking photographs of the children, who were crossing Eaton Road near the junction with Newmarket Road in the afternoon of Monday, April 14. He is white, in his 40s to 50s and heavily built with dark hair, dark clothing and glasses. Call PCSO Hannah Alexander or the safer neighbourhood team at Earlham police on [...] <

Internet Phobia - Fear of Paedophiles Reduces Number of Child Photos

javno.com (Croatia), May 20, 2008

I am against publishing eroticised photos, but it is not good that photographs of children are no longer published, says Matijevic Vrsaljko. For a long time now, advocates for the protection of children's rights have been warning the media, editors and journalists concerning the issue of publishing photographs of children. However, parents and educators will need to be more careful as far as putting photographs of children online is concerned.

[...]

In order to lessen the possibility of paedophile abuse, the Croatian Ministry of Education has advised schools and kindergartens to refrain from placing pictures of their children on the internet.

[...]

"We can not prohibit parents from publishing pictures of their children", says the ministry. But parents then risk that a paedophile, who is often a skilled computer user, enters the email and misuses the photographs.

"Paedophilia will not be reduced with the absolute removal of children's photographs from the internet" [... says] Ljubica Matijevic-Vrsaljko, a former children's rights attorney. [...] "Photographs of the child's achievements are for good of the child, and are not bad." [...] She added that there is no clear logic that the photographs of a child that are published on the internet will be misused.

[...]

Kiddy Porn or Family Photo?? bloggerparty.com, June 7, 2008

[...] Presently child porn is in the eye of the beholder. What Grandma might consider 'cute, a hardened criminal investigator might consider child pornography.

The test is not what is in the mind of the child or the person taking the photo. The test is: can a law enforcement officer create a sexual fantasy out of this photo? [...]

David Urban took photos of his wife and 15-month-old grandson, both nude as she was giving him a bath. A photo lab turned him in and he was convicted by a Missouri court.

A gay couple decided to shave their bodies and then take pictures of their lovemaking. A photo clerk at Walgreen's decided one of them looked too young and called police. The couple is suing the Fort Lauderdale Police. [...]

William Kelly was arrested in Maryland after dropping off a roll of film that unknown to him included nude photos of his ten year old daughter and younger children that they had taken of each other at bed time.

Cynthia Stewart took a picture of her eight-year-old daughter taking a bath. She was arrested because in the background of the picture was a

showerhead. The prosecution somehow decided the shower head proved the eight year old was masturbating.

All these parents and grandparents are now sex offenders. They have to register with the police department, and are subject to the laws requiring sex offenders live a certain distance from any school, park, church, library or any place children might congregate. Not only does it affect where they can live but also it affects their ability to get employment.

This type of law puts all of us at risk of being arrested as sex offenders. It also radically limits the idea of free speech protection by insisting that a photo of a child is equivalent to molestation. Legally, it is not what is in the picture that counts. It is what is in the mind of the beholder that counts legally. It is actually necessary to fantasize a sexual context to the photo in order to make it child porn.

[...]

If the test is can we put this photo into a sexual fantasy, then yes, every photo we take of a child is child pornography.

So how do we know which pictures we should hide and which we can show to

our friends? My advice to you is DO NOT TAKE PICTURES OF CHILDREN. A

grandmother can take a picture of her grandkids jumping into bed with pj's on and some nut can make a sexual fantasy out of it. Some dad can take a picture of his daughter licking an ice cream cone and some nut (police officer) can make a sexual fantasy of it, especially if the child is wearing a bathing suite.

I implore you to write your congressperson. Tell them we need [...] porn laws that are well defined as to what is child porn. We do not need a nation of grandparents and parents in jail for creating and capturing memories. <

Asda refuse to print baby snap of son for 21st birthday cake... because he's naked; James Tozer, Daily Mail (UK), 25th June 2008

> It was meant to be a gently embarrassing centrepiece for her son's 21st birthday. But when Gail Jordan asked bakery staff at Asda to print a photograph of him as a baby on to a cake they didn't see the funny side. After one look at the photograph - which featured her son David at about five months and lying on his front - they declared that putting it on the cake would constitute pornography because his bare bottom could be seen. [...]

'It's sad that because of the world we live in such an innocent photograph could be misinterpreted as something perverted. It's crazy how politically correct the world has become.'

Her son, who works at a bookmakers, added: 'It's just my bare bum, it's obviously totally harmless. It's stupid that they could suggest something so innocent could be pornographic.' [...] <

Police pursue child photographer; BBC News, 2 July 2008

> A man who stopped to take a photograph of children outside a primary school in southern Scotland is being sought by police. [...] A black Peugeot 308 car pulled up and a man inside took a photograph of the group of children before driving off. The man is described as [... ...].

Father branded pervert photographing children in public park; David Wilkes, Daily Mail (UK), 16th July 2008

> When Gary Crutchley started taking pictures of his children playing on an inflatable slide he thought they would be happy reminders of a family day out. But the innocent snaps of seven-year-old Cory, and Miles, five, led to him being called a "pervert". The woman running the slide at Wolverhampton Show asked him what he was doing and other families waiting in the queue demanded that he stop. [...] One even accused him of photographing youngsters to put the pictures on the internet.<

The newspaper publishes the photo with the caption: "Picture of innocence: The photograph Gary Crutchley took of his sons Cory and Miles".

> Mr Crutchley, 39, who had taken pictures only of his own children, was so enraged that he found two policemen who confirmed he had done nothing wrong. Yesterday he said: "What is the world coming to when anybody seen with a camera is assumed to be doing things that they should not? This parental paranoia is getting completely out of hand. I was so shocked. One of the police officers told me that it was just the way society is these days. He agreed with me that it was madness." [...] Mrs Crutchley [...] said: "I was shocked by the reaction of those women. It is very sad when every man with a camera enjoying a Sunday afternoon out in the park with his children is automatically assumed to be a pervert." [...] <

An overview - in a broader context

The war on photographers - you're all al Qaeda suspects now;

John Ozimek, The Register (UK), 23rd June 2008

Analysis

When you hear the phrase "helping police with their inquiries", does an image of dedicated selfless citizenry instantly spring to mind? Or do you wonder whether the reality is not slightly more sinister? How about "voluntarily handing over film to the police"?

Stephen Carroll is a keen amateur photographer, with an interest in candid portraiture: "street photography", he calls it. In December 2007, he was in the centre of Hull taking photos.

Unfortunately for him, his actions were spotted by two local policemen. They stopped him in the middle of Boots and asked him to accompany them outside. There they told him that he had been taking photographs of "sensitive buildings". One said: "I am taking your film".

Mr Carroll requested an explanation. He asked whether he was "obligated" to hand over the film. In vain! Every time he asked, back came the same response: "I am taking your film". Robocop is alive and well and apparently working in Humberside. When he eventually handed over his film, he was asked to turn out his pockets and to show what other films he had on him.

The police filled out one of their ubiquitous forms - this one labelled "Stop and Search" - and went on their way. On the form, quite clearly written, are the words: "seized films".

What are we to make of this?

A statement from Humberside Police re-iterated that Mr Carroll had been photographing sensitive buildings. In remarkably bullish mood, they added that they "would expect other officers within the force to act in the same manner if given a similar situation." But what situation? According to Mr Carroll, the police subsequently amended their story to say they had stopped him because of concerns that he was photographing young people. They did not mention this at the time because they were worried he might be embarrassed. They also told him that, contrary to what was said at the time, they had received no complaint from any member of the public. Nor had he been subject to a "stop and search" - merely a "stop and talk".

This is seriously alarming stuff. It is bad enough on its own - but coupled with a long catalogue of other incidents that have been reported

recently, it begins to look like a pattern.

A long catalogue

There is the Ipswich photographer Phil Smith who went out to snap ex-EastEnd Letitia Dean turning on the Christmas lights in Ipswich. He was stopped by two Special Constables: told he needed a licence; that photographing the crowd was against the law; and finally required to delete the pictures already taken.

Then there's the freelance photographer who attempted to photograph the tragic aftermath of a young woman killed by a falling tree at Tower Bridge in London. According to Jeff Moore of the British Press Photographers Association, Police at the scene were very intimidating: they demanded that she hand over her memory card or else they would confiscate her cameras and she would probably never get them back.

And on and on and on and on.

Amateurs and professionals alike are becoming seriously worried. Chris Cheesman, News Editor of Amateur Photographer, is compiling a list of incidents where Police or other officials have threatened photographers.

The Bureau of Freelance Photographers (BFP) is pioneering a card - the "Blue Card" - for members to assert their freelance status. BFP chief executive John Tracy says: "With the increasing number of members being stopped by police officers - or more commonly, police community support officers - from legitimately taking pictures, we felt we had to do something".

The National Union of Journalists (NUJ) is up in arms, too. In March, NUJ General Secretary Jeremy Dear, staged a one-man protest on the issue outside the headquarters of the Metropolitan Police. The union is sending a delegation to see Home Office Minister Tony McNulty.

In the same month, its Parliamentary spokesperson, Austin Mitchell, MP put down an Early Day Motion which gained support from a further 224 Members of Parliament. This stated that many of the official claims that photography is illegal were, themselves, false and asked Police and Home Office to set up national guidelines on the issue.

So just what is going on?

Is photography, along with freedom of speech and other cherished rights, about to go out of the window?

Probably not. The fact that these incidents make news suggests that they are atypical. There are still millions of people taking photographs every day of the week, without the least interference from anyone. Do you have

a license for that camera sir?

The law in this area - with the exception of recent provisions on terror - is much as it was a decade ago. There are some restrictions - though most of these relate to the manner in which individuals take photographs. You are prohibited from trespass, harassment, obstruction: almost never from photography itself.

So what has changed?

The answer probably lies in two places:

photo panic; and
vicious officialdom.

It began with our obsession with paedophiles. *Anyone* taking photos of children was *automatically* suspect - and even when they weren't, our risk-averse culture meant it was better to be safe than sorry.

Here is not the place to rehearse the wealth of "pc gone mad" stories that particular panic gave rise to. It is possible the panic would have subsided: there is no law against photographing children. There are also enough parents who want to be able to create a photographic record of their child's significant school moments for the arguments to pull in opposite directions.

However, since the London bombings of 2005, there is a new impetus to paranoia. The public is scared. The police have responded.

The Met recently ran a campaign that pointed a finger of suspicion at photographers. This cannot help but whip up public fear of anyone with a camera.

The irony, of course, is that anyone taking photos in preparation for a terrorist atrocity would most likely be discreet. They would use small or mobile phone cameras. Yet those who have been stopped have frequently been individuals with serious high-powered SLR equipment. Have the police not thought this through? Or do they suspect terrorists of running some form of elaborate double bluff?

Once an activity falls under the shadow of suspicion, it is inevitable that other officials will get in on the act. They are now empowered to bend the law. Jobsworths of every shade - from traffic wardens to PCSOs to Park Keepers - have attempted to prevent the public taking photographs, for all manner of thoroughly fictitious reasons.

Equally, those who wish to carry out what is a perfectly legal activity begin to feel intimidated. Not just by officials - but by the wider public as

well. So they self-censor. They skulk. They begin to buy in to the view that there is something odd about wishing to take photographs.

As Austin Mitchell puts it: "We are seeing a lot of isolated incidents creating a pattern that will in time lead to an inhibition on taking photos. Photographers need to assert their rights under the law as it stands. Or they will lose them."

Guidelines have been negotiated with a number of Police Forces. In theory, Police should be well aware that they have no powers to remove cameras or take film without a court order.

Campaigners on the other side are far blunter and increasingly bitter. They point out that Police who seize items are guilty of theft - a criminal offence. Where journalists and members of the public come into contact with the police, they are urged always to keep their cool. The bottom line, however, is that attempts to remove film or camera should always be resisted.

When white is black

It is accepted that most police understand and play by the rules: but a consensus is growing that there is a small but determined minority who have no interest in doing so. The Humberside incident does nothing to reduce anxiety on this front.

We should point out that reports of the language used during this incident are based solely on statements from Mr Carroll. But broader points, such as the grounds for stop or the 'voluntary' nature of the seizure have been confirmed by Humberside.

If private individuals were as cavalier with their language and statements to the police as Humberside appear to have been, they would run the risk of being charged with perjury. At the very least, their statements would have been produced in court to demonstrate that they were unreliable witnesses.

On the strictest of strict interpretations, the police did not "seize" Stephen Carroll's film. They were merely incredibly unhelpful in their use of language, to the point where he was intimidated into "volunteering" his film.

Any similarity between this incident and the remarkable confessions that used to take place in the back of police vans before suspects arrived at the station is purely coincidental.

The grounds on which Mr Carroll was stopped are also interesting. The reference to "sensitive buildings" suggests that the police were trying to

situate this stop in either official secrets or terror legislation. Specifically, s. 44 of the Terror Act 2000 where the police carrying out the stop "consider(s) it expedient for the prevention of acts of terrorism".

The reference to photographing young people appears to be pure flannel, as we are not aware of any law that would prevent Mr Carroll doing this.

Meanwhile, a seriously worrying aspect of all the various guidelines - as well as the new BFP Blue Card - is that they appear designed to attack the general right to photograph by dividing us all into photographic sheep and goats.

Or rather, the accredited and non-accredited. According to John Toner of the NUJ, this is certainly not the intention: "by and large, the public have exactly the same rights as professionals - although in some instances, police may decide to extend some additional professional courtesy to professionals".

A spoof

from 1 April this year warns us all where this might go. It reports the Met piloting a scheme to issue fluorescent waistcoats and RFID chips to the accredited. What a giggle.

Having said that, the accompanying quote is either very funny or chillingly accurate: "photography presents a unique problem for law enforcement", mutters a non-existent spokesperson for the Met, "because it is not illegal".

Conclusion

Police is using anti-terror laws to catch 'pedophiles' - that is: everyone who photographs a child. They rely on a public opinion that fears that a photo *might* be give someone pleasure, that the photo *might* be placed on the internet and, thus, *might* pleasure other 'pedophiles', which is a shame, a scandal and a disaster *per se*. If child nudity is included, a *moral panic* awakes in the public.

So, our children are effectively taught that nudeness and body pleasure is evil, wrong, dirty and perverse. James Prescott has published research that concludes that societies that suppress body pleasure of their children, are the most aggressive societies with great problems with its youths, especially the boys in puberty and adolescence. That is exactly what we see nowadays.

7. It's ridiculous that we treat child nudity as a problem

Nan Goldin, *The Independent* (UK), 8 July 2008

Perversity is in the eye of the beholder. Children are born without a fear of sexuality or a fear of their own bodies. That fear is imposed on them. Children are sensual beings, they touch and they like to be touched. It's the adult who sometimes takes advantage of this situation.

It's not about what the children in an image are doing and there's nothing sick about a nude child. It's so ridiculous we treat this as a problem in society. It's one of the joys of life, the human body.

My little nephew grew up in Scotland and when he'd visit America with his parents, he'd run around the beach naked and people would be incensed. The more we are around nudity, the more it is demystified and the more we realise that the body is beautiful.

Pornography is another issue altogether. I used to work in Times Square and a lot of the people who worked in a bar there were sex workers who made their money from being in porn magazines. I would say the difference between pornography and art is that (in the first instance), children are abused to act out adult's version of their fantasies. Child abuse is all about power and I am not encouraging anyone to have a relationship with someone under-age.

Last year when I had my exhibition at the Baltic, the assistant director called the police and said there's a piece here that you might not like. The image was of two little sisters belly-dancing. They decided to belly dance for me, I didn't set anything up. They were acting completely naturally. Afterwards I got a letter from the parents of the girls I photographed to tell me how much they had enjoyed the images.

But even respected publishers are now afraid of using that image in a book of my work because they think it could prevent its US distribution.

Art can't and shouldn't be regulated by the state. Politicians have nothing whatsoever to do with art or artists except to become anonymous collectors if they choose.

Nan Goldin, 54, is an American fine art and documentary photographer based in Paris

8. Ipce's Internal Matters

8.1 Report of the secretary

Since July 2007, I have done a check of Ipce's membership by twice writing or mailing to all members and asking them to reply if they want to continue their membership and if they would be able and willing to pay the dues. Members who were enduring unreachable and members who did not reply at all are removed from the members' list. New members have been added to the list. The result is a list of 53 members in 18 countries on July 15, 2008. In addition, four members have a temporary pause, and we have two guests.

8.2 Report of the webmaster

Ipce's website has six sections now:

Section	Where	Files	MB Room
Ipceweb [*]	Ipce's domain	443	7.5
Library Two	Ipce's subdomain	202	10
Library 3 [**]	Ipce's domain	661	33
Newsletters	Ipce's domain	213	13
Host	Ipce's domain	220	12
Booksreborn	Ipce's domain	103	67.5
Total		1842	143 MB

[*] With Library (1), Statements, Documentation lists, Links and all registers

[**] With "New" and the Ipce Magazine

We also have our internal forum IMO: *Ipce meets Online*, placed by our third provider, with 27 members on July 15, 2008

The *Ipce Magazine* is started in January 2007. This is factually an update of the website, be it concentrated on one theme. The first theme was *Laws*, the second one *Women and 'pedophilia'*. The *Newsletter* is on the website, but is also made in a printable Word version, sent by paper post, especially made for those who have no connection with the Internet.

In the year we overview now, July 2007 - July 2008, there have been three Newsletters, one Magazine and several normal updates. Lots of files are still waiting. Your webmaster is 'sometimes a bit busy'.

8.3 Two teams

Ipce has two teams, to be (re)installed by the annual Meeting.

A Conflict- & Emergency Team (three 'wise old men'), but there has been no conflict and no emergency since the former report and meeting. [*]

A Membership Team: four members who invite and accept new members after some kind of acknowledgement by them or by a member from the same country or speaking the same language. The criteria for admission can be found in the Report of the Meeting in October 2007, section 2.

This team has worked reasonably well in the year we overview now.

The Meeting will be asked to add one member.

The Meeting will also be asked to decide on criteria for the admission of guests.

[*] There have been two (more or less) attacks on Ipce's website.

The team has decided to ignore the first one, because the writer of the message seemed to be quite megalomaniac. From him, there was no reaction.

A second letter was more serious. It was written in French and in bad English, so the webmaster has sent him a reply in French, here below translated in (better) English. We have gotten no reaction.

Monseigneur [...]

> [Lettre:] Je vous informe que votre site fait malheureusement de la publicité à des sites et des réseaux pédophiles. En effet, plusieurs associations ont relevés à cette adresse :
<http://www.ipce.info/ipceweb/links.htm>
 divers liens vers ces sites :
www.alicelovers.org , www.nambla.org ,
www.glgarden.org , www.pedagora.com
 , www.boychat.org ,
www.jungsforum.net ,
www.girlloverforum.net ,
www.legarcon.net et d'autres. <

[Réponse:] Ces adresses sont relevées pour rendre service aux personnes avec des attirances pédophiliques. Cette attirance cause souvent un isolement.

C'est important pour eux de pouvoir

Sir [...]

> [Letter:] I notify that your website sadly gives publicity to pedophilic websites and networks. Actually, several associations are mentioned, giving the next addresses:

[... ← ...] <

[Reply:] Those addresses are given to help people with a pedophilic attraction. This attraction often causes social isolation.

For them, it is important to have communication with other people with the same feelings, in their own language, in order to find a style of living that is legal

communiquer avec des autres, dans leur langage propre, avec les mêmes sentiments, afin de trouver un style de vivre qui est légal et social.

Voyez-vous [URL changed now into: < <http://www.jorisoost.nl> > .

> [Lettre:] Sachez que même si vous ne contrôlez pas le contenu de votre site, la publicité mettant en scène des mineurs de moins de 15 ans, ou faisant l'apologie de la pédophilie est illégal. <

[Réponse:] Non. Ces sites de web ne sont pas l'apologie de la pédophilie. Ils sont pour discuter. Discuter n'est pas illégal. Toutes les états de l'Occident ont des Constitutions dans lesquelles la liberté de l'opinion et la liberté de l'union sont garanti.

Par exemple 'Le Premier Amendement' des États-Unis et les Constitutions de la Grande Bretagne, La Douce France - et des autres états.

Des actes pédo-sexuelles sont prohibés, des sentiments pédo-philiques sont légales.

Et avoir opinions est légal.

> [Lettre:] Je vous demanderai donc de bien vouloir retirer ces sites de vos pages, et de nous confirmer leurs suppressions dans les plus brefs délais. <

Non. Combattez-vous des actes pédo-sexuelles au moyen d'assister les personnes avec des attirances pédo-philiques...

Voyez-vous par exemple

<
<http://www.helping-people.info/assistanc>

and social.

Have a look at [... ← ...]
(with a French section).

> [Letter:] Remember that even if you do not control the content of your site, advertising featuring minors under 15 years, or advocating pedophilia is illegal. <

[Reply:] No. Those websites are no apology for pedophilia. The allow discussion. Discussion is not illegal. All Western states have constitutions in which the freedom of thought, speech and association is guaranteed

For example, the First Amendment of the USA and the constitutions of Great Britain, France and other states.

Pedosexual acts are forbidden, pedophilic feelings are legal.

Having an opinion is legal.

> [Letter:] I would therefore ask you to kindly withdraw these addresses from your pages, and confirm their deletions to us as soon as possible. <

[Reply:] No. You might better combat pedosexual acts by helping people with pedophilic feelings...

[e.htm](#) > &
<
http://www.ipce.info/library_3/files/latifa.htm
>

Cordialement,

webmaster@ipce.org

For instance, have a look at

[... ← ...]

Sincerely,

webmaster@ipce.org

8.4 Financial Report

About the half of the members have paid their dues. Because the members who have paid usually haven't given more than had been asked, the paying members have compensated the not paying members.

Financial Report Ipce - July 3, 2007 > July 15, 2008				
	Report	Expected	Report	Expected
	2006-07	2007-08	2007-08	2008-09
Starting balance	475,22	-122,77	-122,77	635,84
Income				
Dues	225,00	800,00	571,16	500,00
Gifts	269,16	400,00	894,91	500,00
Other: rent	3,91	2,00	0,35	PM
Total income	498,07	1.202,00	1.466,42	1.000,00
Start + Income	973,29	1.079,23	1.343,65	1.635,84
Costs				
Newsletters	-129,06	-200,00	-157,83	-200,00
Meeting	-164,30	-100,00	0,00	-250,00
Secretarial costs:				
Postbox & stamps	-56,30	-60,00	-78,90	-75,00
& copies				

Web site				
Providers *	-735,70	-630,00	-513,60	-513,00
Other costs	-10,70	-25,00	-58,48	-50,00
Various costs	0,00	-25,00	0,00	0,00
Total costs	1.096,06	1.040,00	-808,81	-1.088,00
Final balance	-122,77	39,23	534,84	547,84
ASN Account	2,80		20,15	
Postbank acc	-125,57		514,69	
Total	-122,77		534,84	
* 2006-07 is 14 months, 2007-08 is 12 months				
Providers	month	year		
Xs4All	-23,80			
Wannadoo	-8,95			
Bluebox	-10,00			
Total	-42,75	-513,00		

Documentation List # E 25: July 2008

[From Ipce *Newsletter* # E 25, July 2008]

An @ means that the document is electronically available
at webmaster@ipce.info

08-044 @ 2 kb	Saudi 11-year-old marries 10-year-old cousin - An 11-year-old boy has married his 10-year-old cousin in the ultra-conservative Muslim kingdom of Saudi Arabia, a newspaper reported on Tuesday. Mohammed al-Rashidi and his unidentified cousin will seal the marriage they contracted under the sharia laws of
------------------	---

	Islam and move in together after a ceremony to take place in the summer, Al-Shams newspaper said.
08-045 @ 5 kb	Hannibal man pleads guilty in FBI sting; Catie O'Toole, April 01, 2008 An Oswego County businessman who thought he had arranged for a sexual tryst with an underage girl in Costa Rica found himself snared in an FBI sting as he tried to leave a Miami airport, federal agents said.
08-046 @ 5 kb	Child [sexual] abuse 'widespread' in South Australia; Tim Dornin, April 01, 2008 - Report about CSA in state care institutions - mostly Aborigines.
08-047 @ 3 kb	Hundreds feel child abuse shame; Jamie Walker and Jeremy Roberts, The Australian news, April 02, 2008 Hundreds of children in state care in South Australia were sexually abused by their carers and exploited by pedophile rings in a "foul undercurrent" laid bare yesterday.
08-048 @ 3 kb	Criminals seek compensation for childhood abuse; The Courier-Mail, Robyn Ironside, April 02, 2008 More than 350 serving and former prisoners have put their hands out for State Government payments of up to \$40,000 each for the abuse and neglect they suffered as children in the care of Queensland institutions.
08-049 @ 3 kb	Ark[ansas]. appeals court overturns sex abuse case due to testimony; Jon Gambell, Associated Press, April 9, 2008 A Jackson County man convicted of rape and sexual indecency with a child should receive a new trial because his half brother shouldn't have testified about prior sex acts they performed together as children, the Arkansas Court of Appeals ruled Wednesday. [... Because of the] "pedophile exemption" - a ruling that allows evidence of past child abuse if it shows a defendant's tendency to commit similar crimes.
08-050 @ 2 kb	Man spared jail after sex act {...], Jon Surtees, Southwark News, 11 April 2008 A judge at the Inner London Crown Court handed Peter Cornwell, 64, from Greenland Mews in Deptford, a twelve month suspended sentence, after he pleaded guilty to two charges of sexual activity with a child. [...] The 'News' understands that Cornwell and the child were inside a well used public toilet on the peninsular whilst the boy was masturbating. There is nothing to suggest that there was any 'full sex' during the

	incident or that the sexual activity was not consented to by both parties.
08-051 @ 4 kb	Crown wants jail time for man convicted on child porn charges; Danielle Mario, The Star Phoenix, April 14, 2008 A man who <i>wrote</i> sexual <i>stories</i> about children and infants and posted them on a website should see two years of jail time, a Crown lawyer said in court Monday. [...] Houston had posted the stories on a website called the North American Man and Girl Love Association (NAWGLA).
08-052 @ 4kb	Rise in human trafficking largely unnoticed in Canada, experts say; Jonathan Montpetit, The Canadian Press, April 09, 2008 Human traffickers peddle young girls to work as sex slaves in Canadian cities for as little as \$2,000 - a situation most people believe only happens in foreign lands, activists say.
08-053 @ 4 kb	Human trafficking report may be critical of Canada; Suzanne Fournier, Canwest News Service, June 03, 2008 On the eve of a major U.S. report about human trafficking, a Canadian expert condemned Canada's "shocking" record in human trafficking.
08-054 @ 5kb	Grand Prix brings human trafficking and sex trade to Montreal; Andy Blatchford, The Canadian Press, June 4, 2008 The Canadian Grand Prix weekend means big business for Montreal's sex trade as partying race fans roar into the city on their annual pilgrimage. [...] Many of the sex workers who are used to fill the commercial void are unwilling participants, human rights activists say.
08-055 @ 4 kb	Age of consent rises to 16; Denise Ryan, Vancouver Sun, May 04, 2008 The age of sexual consent in Canada has risen from 14 to 16 under a new law that is part of the Conservative government's omnibus anti-crime legislation.
08-056 @ 4 kb	Paedophile escapes jail for abusing girl, 11, after judge says 'she welcomed sex'; Andy Dolan, Mail on Sunday (UK), May 8, 2008 A paedophile who molested an 11-year-old girl escaped jail yesterday when a judge ruled the victim had "welcomed" his advances.
08-057 @ 8 kb	The young ones; William Sparrow, A Times (Japan), May 10, 2008 The practice of an older man taking a young, school-aged Japanese girl out on a "date" in exchange for money in Japan is referred to as <i>enjo kosai</i> , or "compensated dating". To say that <i>enjo kosai</i> is prostitution or - in a Western view - child

	prostitution, may not always be accurate. The date may not necessarily include sex, and the inherent cultural complexities can strain perceptions of the practice.
08-058 @ 3kb	Former MP Orkopoulos jailed for nine years; May 21, 2008, AAP (Australia) Former NSW Labor minister Milton Orkopoulos has been sentenced to at least nine years and three months' jail for child sex and drug offences.
08-059 @ 4kb	Peacekeeper child abuse 'rife'; David Clarke, NZ Herald, May 28, 2008 Sexual abuse of children by aid workers and peacekeepers is rife and efforts to protect young people are inadequate, said a report published yesterday.
08-060 @ 5 kb	The Fugitive; Robert Abele, NY Post, June 8, 2008 It was 30 years ago that Academy Award-winning director Roman Polanski was arrested and indicted for having sex with a 13-year-old girl. Now, a new documentary recounts the controversial story of his crime and the legal quagmire that surrounded his case.
08-061 @ 12 kb	Other side of Polanski case; HBO documentary argues judge treated noted filmmaker unfairly in 1970s trial for sex with girl, 13; By Rich Heldenfels, Beacon Journal. June 08, 2008
08-062 @ 5 kb	Defending freedom to abuse; Police rape of Afghan boys ignored; Don Martin, National Post (Canada), June 17, 2008 Afghan officials insist the notion of men and boys getting together the night before the Muslim holy day for sex is a myth. And, sure, it's theoretically possible the cops were merely good-deed-doers giving these teens reading lessons. But Canadian soldiers insisted we had just witnessed the regular Thursday evening negotiation for sex between Afghan men and boys, apparently for gifts or money.
08-063 @ 3 kb	345 arrested, kids rescued in prostitution busts; Lara Jakes Jordan, Associated Press, June 26, 2008 Hundreds of people have been arrested and 21 children rescued in what the FBI is calling a five-day roundup of networks of pimps who force children into prostitution. The Justice Department says it targeted 16 cities as part of its "Operation Cross Country" that caps off five years of similar stings nationwide. Many of the children forced into prostitution are either runaways or what authorities call "thrown-aways" - kids

	whose families have shunned them.
08-064 @ 4 kb	Child-sex scourge clogging Queensland's courts; Jason Gregory, The Courier-Mail (Australia), July 07, 2008 Queensland's struggling court system is being increasingly clogged by thousands of child-sex cases in what has become the state's hidden scourge. [...] New figures show almost 6500 child-sex charges were laid across the state between July 2005 and June last year.
08-065 @ 7 kb	Fighting teen prostitution in NYC; Michael Clancy, New York City, May 1, 2006 "The primary challenge in serving this population is that most of them have run away from home for reasons," Lloyd said. "It's not always somewhere safe for them go home. You have to meet their needs and offer them an alternative, a safe alternative to life on the streets."
08-066 @ 4 kb	Sex offender claims he has an 'illness'; Laurence Cawley, eadt.news.uk, 05 July 2008 A former teacher has told how he was arrested by police after he sought medical help for his sexual interest in children. [...] "The criminal justice system isn't designed to manage the problem, it does, in fact, contribute to it because it does not encourage people to find help."
08-067 @	Articles from Newspapers about the Bill Henson case, Australia, stored as a series of e-mails.
08-068 @ 53 kb	Transcript of <i>The Naked Eye</i> , tv show <i>Insight</i> , Australia, about the Bill Henson case and other cases. Wit a link to the video.
08-069 @	Newspaper articles about the <i>Arts Monthly Australia</i> case, stored as a series of e-mails.
08-070 @	Newspaper articles about the <i>fear of photos</i> , stored as a series of e-mails.

