

# PEDOPHILIA REVISITED

ESSAYS ON LAW, POLICY AND PSYCHIATRY  
PETER FRITZ WALTER

---

CODEPENDENCE

Coping with Addiction, Sadism and Abuse

EIGHT DYNAMIC PATTERNS OF LIVING

Base Elements of True Civilization

EMOTIONAL FLOW

A Holistic Approach to Healing Sadism

LOVE OR LAWS?

When Law Punishes Life

MINOTAUR UNVEILED

A Historical Assessment of Adult-Child Sexual Interaction

NATURAL ORDER

Thesis, Antithesis and Synthesis in Human Evolution

PEDOPHILIA REVISITED

The Making of a Crime for Justifying Lacking Social Policy

THE COMMERCIAL EXPLOITATION OF ABUSE

A Study on Social Policy

THE LEGAL SPLIT IN CHILD PROTECTION

Overcoming the Double Standard

THE ROOTS OF VIOLENCE

Why Humans Are Not by Nature Violent

# PEDOPHILIA REVISITED

THE MAKING OF A CRIME  
FOR JUSTIFYING LACKING SOCIAL POLICY

DR. PETER FRITZ WALTER

# Public Domain Edition

Essays on Law, Policy and Psychiatry, Vol. 7

Designed by Peter Fritz Walter

Publishing Categories  
Law / Criminal Law / Sentencing

Author Contact Information  
[pierrefwalter@gmail.com](mailto:pierrefwalter@gmail.com)

## ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Parallel to an international law career in Germany, Switzerland and the United States, Dr. Peter Fritz Walter (Pierre) focused upon fine art, cookery, astrology, musical performance, social sciences and humanities.

He started writing essays as an adolescent and received a high school award for creative writing and editorial work for the school magazine.

After finalizing his law diplomas, he graduated with an LL.M. in European Integration at Saarland University, Germany, in 1982, and with a Doctor of Law title from University of Geneva, Switzerland, in 1987.

He then took courses in psychology at the University of Geneva and interviewed a number of psychotherapists in Lausanne and Geneva, Switzerland. His interest was intensified through a hypnotherapy with an Ericksonian American hypnotherapist in Lausanne. This led him to the recovery and healing of his inner child.

After a second career as a corporate trainer and personal coach, Pierre retired in 2004 as a full-time writer, philosopher and consultant.

His nonfiction books emphasize a systemic, holistic, cross-cultural and interdisciplinary perspective, while his fiction works and short stories focus upon education, philosophy, perennial wisdom, and the poetic formulation of an integrative worldview.

Pierre is a German-French bilingual native speaker and writes English as his 4<sup>th</sup> language after German, Latin and French. He also reads source literature for his research works in Spanish, Italian, Portuguese, and Dutch. In addition, Pierre has notions of Thai, Khmer, Chinese, Japanese, and Vietnamese.

All of Pierre's books are hand-crafted and self-published, designed by the author. Pierre publishes via his Delaware company, Sirius-C Media Galaxy LLC, and under the imprints of IPUBLICA and SCM (Sirius-C Media).



# CONTENTS

---

INTRODUCTION	11
The Tao of Love	11
WHAT IS LOVE?	11
LOVE OR ABUSE?	16
CHAPTER ONE	23
Toward a Functional Understanding of Love	23
INTRODUCTION	23
THE CULTURAL CONFUSION	30
THE CULTURAL FEAR OF EROTIC NOVELTY	34
CHAPTER TWO	47
On the True Nature of Human Sexuality	47
INTRODUCTION	47
THE SILENT TABOO	51
THE MYTH OF PEDOPHILE PREDATOR SEXUALITY	65
CHAPTER THREE	71
The Demonization of Adult-Child Erotic Love	71
INTRODUCTION	71
WHAT IS CHILD PROTECTION?	75
CONSUMER PROTECTION?	83
FROM PROTECTING CHILDREN TO SERVING CHILDREN	87
SEX OFFENDER	91
CHAPTER FOUR	97
Does Pedophile Love Equate Abuse?	97
INTRODUCTION	97
CHILD-ADULT SEX VS. CHILD-CHILD SEX	101

A) Positively indifferent	119
'Love with children, and sex, possible, I don't know.'	
B) Negatively indifferent	120
'I don't care; I'm not aroused by small stuff.'	
C) Positively subjective	120
'I liked it as a child. It enriched me emotionally and sexually.'	
D) Negatively subjective	121
'I had such an experience. I felt like a stone, victimized, abused.'	
E) Moralistic, judgmental, projective, defensive	122
'That's abject behavior. People who do that have to be killed.'	
F) Positively affirmative, subjective, conscious	123
'I think we have to distinguish between violence and love.'	
POSSIBLE ETIOLOGIES OF PEDOPHILIA	125
POSSIBLE ETIOLOGIES OF CHILD RAPE	136
PEDOEMOTIONS ARE UNIVERSAL	138
AESTHETIC AND POETIC LOVE OF CHILDREN	140
AFFECTIONATE VS. SADISTIC PEDOPHILIA	154
DOES PEDOPHILIA EQUAL CHILD RAPE?	160
FREE CHOICE RELATIONS FOR CHILDREN?	162
LOVER VS. OFFENDER	164
<b>CHAPTER FIVE</b>	<b>169</b>
Lovers or Abusers?	169
INTRODUCTION	169
WHAT ARE SEXUAL PARAPHILIAS?	172
IS PEDOPHILIA 'SICKO' BEHAVIOR?	181



## CONTENTS

---

AN ETIOLOGY OF BOYLOVE	186
AN ETIOLOGY OF GIRLLOVE	194
CHILDLOVE VS. PERVERSION	202
<b>CHAPTER SIX</b>	<b>213</b>
Free Choice Relations for Children?	213
INTRODUCTION	213
The Psychological Aspects	213
The Legal Aspects	217
SHARING A SECRET	232
PEDOPHILIA AND INCEST	238
OVERCOMING THE SPLIT	250
THE GREAT SINNER	255
<b>CHAPTER SEVEN</b>	<b>273</b>
Pedophilia Needs to Be Socially Coded	273
THE 'LITTLE MAN' RULE	286
A DIFFERENT STORY	294
EVALUATION	301
THE TRAP OF CHILD PROTECTION	302
THE TRAP OF MORALITY	306
<b>GLOSSARY</b>	<b>311</b>
Terms coined and defined by the Author	311
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b>	<b>335</b>
Contextual Bibliography	335
<b>PERSONAL NOTES</b>	<b>355</b>



# INTRODUCTION

---

## THE TAO OF LOVE

### WHAT IS LOVE?

*What is love?* Krishnamurti said we can never define what love is but well what love is *not*. Is pleasure love? Is love something we can quantify and receive in well-defined portions? Is love something we can store and accumulate in the warehouse of our mind, or in our heart? Is love a thing we can run after, chase, conquer, and possess?

Can we pursue love as a deliberate activity?

Is love something that can be damaged or hurt, or is it rather a quality? Is love perhaps a quality of relationships, and as such, something related to something else?

I know it is confusing to ask such questions, and yet they open doors. I do not pretend to know answers to all of these questions, and in case I know them, I do

not pretend that these answers are valid for others as well, let alone that they are eternal. I rather think that it's the questions that are important, and not so much the answers, as answers to all essential questions in life are in most cases temporary and volatile.

When I look at relationships, I can see there are loving ones and ones where love is painfully lacking, and I instantly understand that when love is lacking in relationships, they tend to be formal, cold and 'calculated,' and hurt is only a step away. I can also see that in relationships ruled by power, and where people play power games, love is absent.

This seems to point us to the truth that where power is, love cannot be. But power in which sense? What kind of power am I talking about?

Is it self-power or soul power? I have answered the question in my scholarly article *Soul Jazz (2015/2017)*, and concluded that soul power is well compatible with love, and that the power that only is destructive, and that defeats love, is worldly power, which is power born by the ego.

I think when we direct our focus toward loving relationships instead of reflecting about love as such, we are getting closer to the truth, for love is something

that bears fruit only in relating. When the sage says ‘I love the world,’ he means ‘When I relate to the world, I feel love.’

You may never have reflected about love yet when a child comes to you, smiling at you, stretching out his or her hand toward you in full trust, you may be permeated with one thought: ‘Relating to this child, I feel love.’ And you may, or not, conclude ‘I love children,’ while the latter statement bears something volatile and abstract. One may ask you back ‘Do you mean you really love all children?’ Or does it mean you love certain children, or children who relate to you?

And you may think that at times, when you saw a very naughty and unruly child who drove their parents crazy in a hotel, or in a restaurant or department store, you thought you did *not* love that child. And as this is so, and for all of us, the statement ‘I love children’ may not be taken for granted as it were as total truth, but as a *generalization*. Hence, if we want to avoid generalizations because they always bear an element of untruth in them, then we can honestly only talk about love as far as a relationship is concerned that is mutually felt as loving.

We all experience love and have experienced love when we were children; some of us have experienced

lack of love, because their relationships with parents, relatives and educators were not felt as loving; hence, their main behavior trait and attitude is not loving, but rather cynical and revengeful. When we observe this by studying various kinds of people, we quickly realize that those who experience loving relationships early in life become 'loving' people, and those who have been deprived of love early in life lead conflictual lives or even end up with long prison fines.

As a young law student, interested in the psychological reasons for violent crime, I came to realize that as a general rule, people tend to give to the world what they themselves have received when they were children; when they received love they give love, when they received hate and violence, they give hate and violence. As, contrary to many psychiatrists, I do not believe that life cycles are lifelong conditions, I have been thinking for many years how an accidented life cycle can possibly be rerouted and thus become constructive again? I studied criminology and visited people in prisons, and what I saw shocked me; it shocked me not only because of the humiliating conditions these men were subjected to, which could be called the outside reality, but how these people, after I got to know some of them more closely, were torn up inside. Their

inner reality, I felt, was locked; they were bathed in guilt and shame, and caught in denial; most of them as children could not accept one or both of their parents because of the caretaker's abusive behavior.

Generally speaking, *none* of the inmates I met who were in for violent crimes had experienced loving relationships when they were children; they could not build a positive self-image and identity. What then happens is that the person comes up with projections, which means that a large part of their inner drama is projected upon 'the world' or 'society.'

The projections, as I found later, are in turn the effect of *repression*, the constant denial to recognize and embrace an inner conflict or psychological complex.

This, then, in turn and over time leads to building a characterological and muscular armor around the inner shell, the heart and the soul, which effectively shields from feeling *inside*, and feeling *with*, thereby reducing compassion and empathy to a minimum.

Once the negative and projective worldview is built, it is reinforced through experience, for we attract in outside reality what we bear inside, in our thoughts and feelings. The negative experiences that occur, and occur necessarily once the inner setup is distorted

through denial, fear and shame, again reinforce the person's negative setup, thereby triggering a reinforcement of the original negative proposition about life.

Such statements can be reduced to one single base affirmation they all share. This base affirmation is 'There is no love.' Once you are on the 'There is no love' track, the way back to a normal and harmonious way of relating is rather difficult; it is difficult because willpower to effect the opening of the closed door is not enough; thus *some work on the deeper levels of consciousness is required*, which in most cases asks for assistance and empathic care from the side of a counselor. For example, it is of little help to give such a person an auto-hypnosis manual and tape, for working on their inner mind because their negative self-talk and their shame-based identity will invariably lead to a defensive reaction of the kind 'What should I do with all this gimmick? There is no love in this world. They are probably out to manipulate me or it's altogether useless.'

## LOVE OR ABUSE?

Any kind of work to be engaged at this point needs empathic support from an expert who knows to untie



the inner knot. It's really like a knot, an entanglement situation, both inside and in outer reality. Relationships, when the loving response has been thwarted early in life, tend to be strained and 'calculated;' they tend to be either 'icy' or are outright codependent and fusional, which are both conditions not conducive for love to blossom.

The silent question I start out with is 'What was first, love or abuse?' I ask the question not as a matter of personal fancy but because today, after a glance at the content of our international media, you really gain the impression that what controls the public debate is *abuse*, not love. And yet, it seems to me that love was first, as love is the natural condition. In a society that has forgotten about love, it is not astonishing to see scientists and researchers focused on abuse.

From a simple perspective of common sense, one should think that logically, what first should be elucidated is love, not its accidented variant. It's very similar with Western medicine that equally is focused only upon the pathological, instead of finding out, first of all, what *health* is about.

As in the times of religious perversion, crusades and witch hunts, today again, at the start of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, certain forms of love have been declared

anathema. This may not surprise when you consider the general level of fragmentation in our society; where life has lost its wholeness, where love is schizophrenically split into acceptable behavior and unacceptable behavior, people tend to create fictitious concepts in a virtual reality of fake-values.

It seems to me that only poets and lovers are able to see through the thick layers of hypocrite life denial that is currently the invisible paradigm of the majority of humanity—at least in the part of the world that has incorporated *postmodern international consumer culture* as its new credo and lifestyle. In a climate of bewilderment where erotic love is today again equated with abduction and abuse, there is only one step to end up in hysteria—individually and collectively. Western society has done that step, and thoroughly! It has ended up not only in hysteria, but in public paranoia.

Today we should do a retrospection and ask how this was possible, after Freud? And how it's possible that after the turn into the 21<sup>st</sup> millennium we have ended up in the Middle-Ages? *Timewave Zero*, it is true, shows us cyclic patterns in human evolution— and it indeed shows that the present times are most closely related to the early Middle-Ages. However, a time-lined

view of human history hides the spiraled growth patterns that characterize all evolution.

When we progress, this is not a linear movement, but a spiraled one because the spiral is the only form in nature that ideally combines the line with the circle. And when we advance, we not only relocate farther but also higher. While the line leaves its root, the circle stays with it, and the spiral, while advancing, carries its root along. When that happens, we are again within that pattern, but at a higher level of it. In modern systems theory, this is expressed in the formula ‘all growth is nonlinear.’

Applying this insight for humanity’s psychological evolution, we see that right now we are evolving from the *Pisces Age* to the *Aquarius Age*. During this transition, we not only assimilate more of the qualities associated with the Aquarius, but we also go through a catharsis regarding the Pisces qualities that have hurt us collectively, such as ruthless group pressure, dogmatism, absolutism, fanaticism and a ‘sectarian,’ limited, shell-based worldview. This means that we are now more instrumental for dealing with the pattern effectively, and perhaps dissolve it completely.

What kind of pattern is that? Astrologically it is the *Pisces* archetype, as opposed to the *Aquarius* archetype.

It is a pattern of energies that puts the collective, the group and the majority's rules, opinions and feelings higher than the individual's. It values the group before it values the individuals who compose the group. It considers standard solutions before it considers intelligent solutions. It typically fears the marginal and original and blesses uniformity and herd thinking. Its educational paradigm is one of mass indoctrination and mass alphabetization. It educates by disempowering the child, and by using threat and authority-based hierarchy, and strong competition. It basically positions the human as opposed to nature or as 'master over nature' and, as a result, is rather hostile toward the child's expressing their natural emotions, feelings and desires.

This paradigm is the reigning educational paradigm of the great monotheistic religions and it often serves for justifying ritual abuse and even the torture of children as a disciplinary measure and in the name of some religious authority, savior, leader, ideology or dictator.

Now, what we face, especially in controversial matters of public discussion is a resistance that operates in the masses' collective unconscious because of their fear to progress into the unknown. This unknown is not so unknown after all. It's the *Aquarius* paradigm. The

Aquarius Age will definitely be one of more individuality, more democracy, and more choice at every level of life. The Aquarian energy which is the energy of the planet Uranus, as opposed to the Neptunian energy that reigns Pisces, will help us face and confront rather than repress our hitherto unconscious desires and render them conscious so that we can deal with them on a more rational basis. We will then be able to see love as love and abuse as abuse, or love as encompassing erotic love (erós) and abuse as a form of psychological, physical or sexual distortion that is created by the psychological mechanism of repression, and that is regularly acted out in a violent manner.

To see this will render us sensitive to the fact that nonviolent and consenting forms of love are not abuse.



# CHAPTER ONE

---

## TOWARD A FUNCTIONAL UNDERSTANDING OF LOVE

### INTRODUCTION

In the present chapter we shall realize that love is quite a difficult and for the least atypical research object; in fact it can be rightly doubted with Michel Odent if love can be scientifically scrutinized without being violated in its cosmic and all-encompassing nature.

—See Michel Odent, *The Scientification of Love* (1999).

Because of this caution, I have abstained from any of the modern methods applied to sexological research topology, the whole modern tool box of ‘phallometric’ sex research that is after all an entirely Cartesian business, and that therefore bears little truth outside of its own little universe of ‘Newtonian’ assumptions and projections. Despite the fact that historically, love was looked at through the eyes of wonder and magic, fairy

tale, novel, autobiography and the whole folk lore of romanticism—with all the distortions that such an anecdotic and unsystematical regard inevitably brings about—this does not prevent us from going a step ahead, and research on love based on the insight that love actually cannot be different from life itself, which implies that systems theory, with its functional regard, should be applied to it, as it is applied to research on living systems.

—See, for example, Fritjof Capra, *The Web of Life* (1997), *The Hidden Connections* (2002) and *The Systems View of Life* (2014).

In the fore-field of modern systems research, Dr. Wilhelm Reich (1897-1957), as one of the first Western researchers on love and sexual behavior, had a truly systemic regard, that saw the *Gestalt* of the loving behavior, before it saw the details of the pattern. After now twenty-five years of research on love and human emotions, I came to create a pattern-based research topology that sees *relationships* where the old Cartesian view saw ‘sexual acts;’ based on this view, it appears strikingly obvious that *sexual behavior is a variant of social behavior*, a form of nonverbal communication between humans that is based upon the ‘truth of the body’ rather than the often to be found untruth of verbal communication.



I have retraced in this chapter the cultural confusion between natural sensuality and conditioned ‘black-booted’ sexuality as a ‘rape pattern,’ while the original ‘love pattern’ was never thought of and conceptualized in the first place, in our culture.

I have shown in my research on tribal cultures for the *Eight Dynamic Patterns of Living* that most tribal and native cultures have well a functional *love pattern* in place, a love paradigm, which explains the world and human relations primarily as motivated by love and other positive expectations, and not, as in our culture, as a network of entangled negative motivations that is characterized by expecting humans to sexually violate other humans, if not kept in check by drastic and coercive laws and a police machinery to enforce them.

—See Peter Fritz Walter, *Eight Dynamic Patterns of Living: Base Elements of True Civilization* (Essays on Law, Policy and Psychiatry, Vol. 2, 2018).

However, it has to be seen that ‘a society that needs zillions of police is on shaky ground,’ to quote career consultant Laurence G. Boldt.

—Laurence G. Boldt, *The Tao of Abundance* (1999).

Of course, psychologically, when humans foster this negative general outlook on life and human beings, it is not surprising that they see children *highly*

*endangered* when in possible naked closeness to anybody who is not father or mother. It is this fear-based worldview that brings about much of the irrational and myth-engendering stuff around the topic of adult-child *emosexual* relations, and much of the explosive climate around it, in the public discussion.

### **Emosexual / Emosexuality (Definition)**

I have created the term *emosexuality* in order to emphasize that sexual orientation is based upon emotional predilection and not vice versa, upon so-called sexual drives, as sexology assumes. The term is not simply a composition of the words *emotionality* and *sexuality*. It does not only express that emotions and sexuality naturally swing together, but that this union creates the unique experience that we call love.

The term has nothing in common with the same term used by popular culture as in the latter case it denotes a sexuality deprived of penetration, of a mere fondling nature. This is not the case in my notion of *emosexuality* that encompasses full sexuality but also full emotionality, as distinct from the robotic scheme of sexuality made up by modern sexology, which defends an artificial concept of sexuality that is somehow detached from human emotions and that is of an automatic, self-executive character.

*Emosexuality* describes the complex process of interrelations between our emotions and sexual desire that we strongly experience once we love somebody. The term *sexuality* has in fact very little significance because it is restricted to genital activity. *Emosexuality* is much larger a concept and is destined to serve sexology and cognitive psychology to better formulate the results of their research in the significance of love and of love relations between people.

Whereas formerly only the mind, and even more reductionist, the brain was considered to be the source of intelligence, today we know that our emotions have their own unique intelligence, that in many ways surpasses the intelligence of the mind, and that our erotic emotions, including our sexual desires, have their own intelligence. They in fact intelligently contribute to our holistic understanding of the world and reality; thus homosexuality is a form of cognition, and at the same time of communication.

I can only say, sorry folks, but this is not *my* problem, and it's not my fault either, so if this society wants to go on in its eternal blasphemy and regard the human being as a defective creation, this may interest the clergy, but doesn't concern a modern researcher, lawyer, and social policy maker.

There is no paradigm and no natural process that could prove in any way that human beings are by nature *sexual predators*, if they are not kept from bringing shame and dishonor to their sexual mates.

Much to the contrary, it was shown that in all sexually liberal cultures, people engage in *mutually pleasurable sexual unions*, both within and outside of marriage. Hence, the one-sided, egoistic and coercive behavior of males 'jumping females' is typical for repressive cultures, for cultures that are highly moralistic on paper, but very little *moral* in real life!

The culprit in all of this, obviously, is *fear*, and this fear has many layers. It goes from the general fear of life that is part of *degenerative neurosis*, so typical for end-phase cultures such as ours, to the specific *fear of erotic novelty*, which is linked to the fear of freedom so typical for authoritarian and authority-craving hierarchies.

Our whole corporate culture, not only our religious dogma, is based upon this fear of the son murdering the father, and the vassal taking the position of the superior. *Fear of erotic novelty* is marked throughout, while without this fear, our culture could have rejuvenated itself from its origins, and we wouldn't be where we are now, in a destructive death cycle namely, for not only our culture but the entire human race, through the accumulation of weapons that represent the eternal phallus that is the centerpoint of the cultural fear of 'sex as rape' that is the ghost in the kitchen with our clean modern techno-culture.

The self-fulfilling prophecy nature of the whole of the abuse culture cannot be overlooked; it needs abuse to happen and has established corporate empires to do exactly what it most wishes, that is, *more abuse to happen* with every coming year, because more abuse

means more revenues for all involved in the swinish theater.

—See Peter Fritz Walter, *The Commercial Exploitation of Abuse: A Study on Policy* (Essays on Law, Policy and Psychiatry, Vol. 8, 2018).

I go as far as saying that this scenario is *more pornographic than pornography* because it sees life itself as pornography; it's a form of *mental pornography* to see eroticism as something related to the devilish satisfaction of explosive rape urges with small sphincters that are torn apart. If we want it or not, this is the single monolithic group fantasy behind all of the smear of the public 'pedophilia' debate!

It goes without saying that when we do research, we have to abstain from even looking at such irrational group fantasies that are bred by fear and denial, namely as a projection of the cultural shadow on the social scene. Functional and honest research is and must remain untainted by the specks that religious denial and political correctness create since millennia in the human aura.

## THE CULTURAL CONFUSION

A society that is confused about its value system tends to come up with *arbitrary assumptions* as they today pervade the entire public discussion about abuse, especially in the puritanical Anglo-Saxon world with its long tradition of moralistic life denial, emotional and sexual repression, touch anxiety and physical, sexual, domestic and structural violence.

As long as one is part of the wheel, turning with the crazy machinery of a paranoid society, one cannot really grasp the psychological implications of what Krishnamurti called *Freedom from the Known*.

It is impossible to perceive truth when one has been brainwashed for years or even decades, obediently consuming the lukewarm soup of standard media gossip with its half-truths, its hypocrisy and its false securities. It is absolutely impossible if one is not motivated by some kind of inner Kantian imperative that says a definite no to all this at a certain point in time, followed by a clear decision to remain, at least for a few years, if not for life, *untelevised, unchurched and unnewspapered*.

It took me about thirty years to get away from ingesting this dangerous soup and begin perceiving what

it means to be myself! If I had not taken this essential diet, I could not have written this book, let alone publish it and stand for it in a highly aggressive, manipulative and violent society that has lost its humanity long ago.

What credit can we grant a society that goes out to kill, in drug wars, wars for *worldwide democracy* and witchhunts of various kinds, that maintains intelligence services that engage in abuses worse than all it projects onto its scapegoat groups, and that lets more than half of its scientists work for the military?

What can we expect from a society that calls itself enlightened, that has enacted an admittedly revolutionary Constitution, but goes around the world to publicly emasculate fascist and terrorist regimes, practicing, against the protection of this very Constitution, exactly, and worse, what those regimes do? Should it not be a good moment to wake up from the thousand-and-first nightmare of public and pretendedly scientific cover-up and *turn to your inner voice* that knows the truth, if only you got enough civil disobedience to listen to it? I believe it is so difficult for most of us because of our past that favors male supremacy, monotheism and what Joseph Campbell called the *Murder of the Goddess*.

To secure the paradigm of *parental control* that is the exact pendant to an all-pervasive punitive and jealous male Gee-Oh-Dee, a set of values is inflicted upon the community that publicly and legally denies children's rights and power to decide for their own bodies and their own pleasures as far as love is concerned—*while icecream is allowed*. Icecream and plastic toys, industrially produced for the child that is not allowed to accept their body as a pleasure organ—that it of course originally is—are among the most powerful conditioning devices of modern society. They ensure that the human being is transformed into a consumerist robot that is needed for the functioning of a robot society.

An abuse-centered culture needs abuse to happen. It will turn events in such a way that what it silently and openly predicts and projects will eventually be part of tangible reality.

I believe that a large part of all abuse happening in families around the world is the simple result of self-fulfilling prophecies and a generally very negative outlook upon life—and the lack of creativity that results from such a stiffening point of departure. Instead, people tend to invoke the 'good old times' which represents the most stupid argument ever brought forth in human history.



This kind of statements are psychological chewing-gum; they keep people fixated upon the past, rendering them unable to live in the present and thus unable to solve present problems. It is the strategy of the fascist worldview that always operates on an irrational level while manipulating the masses into accepting fake-solutions that sound grandiose but in reality represent old errors in a new costume, or no solutions at all.

Thus, after this short look over the fence, you may realize that society, or the main and obvious part of it, will not help you heal your own distorted emotional setup, and will not be of help for you to become, for example, a *good enough parent* in the sense Bruno Bettelheim understood it. And if this society, that seems to hide much more than it reveals and admits, is so outright judgmental that it tears down even those who have the best intentions, then you will stop looking for solutions there. Then perhaps you will turn inside and look to become resourceful by yourself and develop a set of tools that will help you healing your inner split.

Or you may turn to somebody who has done it before you, such as myself. And believe me, I am fully aware of the daring approach of the present book. It's a

subject that is not ‘nice’ which is why most people, for obvious reasons, don’t like to tackle it.

Abuse is and always has been among the best-kept secrets, as it’s the shadow part of the family lore in most of our well-groomed and highly protected modern world.

—See, for example, Florence Rush, *The Best Kept Secret: Sexual Abuse of Children* (1980).

## THE CULTURAL FEAR OF EROTIC NOVELTY

Abuse, if we want it or not, is part of our fantasy world, our collective unconscious, our mythologies, our dreams, and our fairy tales.

We are not an innocent race. The 1960s view of American child psychology that believed an infant was born as a *tabula rasa* is since long superseded by a more holistic and spiritual view of human intentionality, life cycles, personal growth and reincarnation.

To put it in a handy formula, we come here with an *agenda*, not as pure souls. There are no pure souls, as we are all subjected to karma as cause-and-effect, independently of our intentions. *There are no pure souls and there are no pure children.* This is not the result of

my research, but was my very starting point of it. I was not pure as a child, I was not innocent—never. And I bet, you neither. And I guess that those who smear their lukewarm credo of inborn innocence in our daily news haven't been either. (Only that they make money with paying lip service to the contrary!)

But they definitely suffer from childhood amnesia; as they were not free and sane as children, and as they themselves have been abused just like you and me; however, they have repressed those memories. Had they lived sane childhoods, they would remember all, all and everything, and the slightest details, and not just their 'official' childhood. And they would know that they have been *sexual* as children, and intuitively knowledgeable, and not pure-and-ignorant as our fascist child protection paradigm decrees them to be.

This is exactly how abuse is perpetuated from one generation to the next: the causes and events become repressed and forgotten, and a belief system is created that serves to keep hidden what is hidden. Consumer fascism reinforces this mechanism through keeping abuse as hidden as possible, because abuse itself serves a purpose. It serves the purpose of disempowering a large portion of the population, and keeping them in a state of fear, procrastination and humiliation, for such

kind of people are *ideal consumers*. They need a lot of toys to play with in order to compensate for their ongoing depressions, their recurring feelings of unworthiness, their culturally bred shame and their hot-and-sweaty guilt.

Now, you see that healing the scars of abuse means for you not only developing *emotional and sexual sanity* and feelings of wellbeing and power, but also liberation from manipulation.

*As we were manipulated in an abusive family, we are manipulated in an abusive society.* And ours definitely is abusive, it's manipulative, it's false, abject, violent, hypocrite and ignorant about the truths of life. All the good it preaches through well-paid religious and commercial advocates, it tears in the dirt by doing exactly the contrary of what it preaches! It tells us that murdering is abject, and then murders the murderer. So it does exactly the same wrong that it so vehemently condemns.

If our society were a parent, its children would all since long been in the madhouse and on the cemetery. But fortunately we are not identical with society; what we call 'society,' in fact, is but the main herd of the meta group. We of course belong to the meta group,

which is humanity, but we do not forcibly belong to society, because we can stray from the pack.

As an abused child who was highly conscious of the reasons of abuse, I knew that society had nothing to tell me, nothing to teach me, nothing to do with me, that I was immune against its rampant falseness, hubristic arrogance and abysmal ignorance. And fortunately, two years before the baccalaureate, I could quit the religion class and say good-bye to the fat little perverse teacher who liked to pinch our cheeks out, and change over to philosophy, where we got a highly intelligent and serious instructor and were reading Plato, Hegel, Kant, Spinoza, and even Erich Fromm.

From that time, I began to coin my own reality. And I began to live my own life, including my own sex life. In fact, from age ten, when I entered the boarding school, until I was eighteen, and left it, I lived and enjoyed a wonderful erotic love relation with a peer boy that compensated for much of the frustration and pain I had experienced as a small child in the abusive catholic home. Thus it was not because of reading Wilhelm Reich quite early in life, but because I had experienced the truth of his research on orgiastic discharge that I became devoted to helping others develop their full emotional and sexual potential. In the

boarding, they began to call me 'sex professor' as I was lecturing the other boys at night what I had learnt and found out about the hidden connections between happiness, sexual satisfaction, emotional truth and success in school and in life. Hence, what I am teaching today has matured over more than fifty years until it saw its day in publishing. And as convinced as I was as a boy that my early peer sex experience would only bring good, and in no way create a tendency for homosexuality, I was my whole life basically heterosexual, while the age of my partners varies greatly. But interestingly so, I have no interest for men and boys, while there was a phase in my life, in my thirties, where I was exploring boylove as a lifestyle. But that was transitory, and nothing I would identify with. And this, together with the extended research I have done on boylove has convinced me that *boylove is meant to be transitory*, as it was indeed for the Greek and Roman lover, and that those who remain fixated upon it are not aware that they are caught in a narcissistic hangup, and instead of healing their own wound, try to unconsciously heal it in the boys they love and identify with, thereby projecting the early wounding of their younger self on the boys they love and care for.

This is of course not bad as such, as it's actually conducive for healing; it is even beneficial for the boys who somehow become the little psychiatrists of their big friends. That is why I am saying that despite the fact that boylove somehow is the result of a psychological twist, it's a very useful thing to happen in the world at large. It's socially useful. It's conducive to peace, to more intelligence in social exchanges, and it helps many boys to cope with their sometimes painful transition into adulthood.

—See, for example, Edward Brongersma, *Loving Boys* (1987) and Theo Sandfort, *The Sexual Aspect of Pedophile Relations: The Experience of 25 Boys* (1982).

To conclude, I wish to summarize my research findings on boylove with the simple statement that while this form of love may seem outlandish to certain people, it's a fact that if man-boy relations were recognized and coded socially in our society, much good and a strong healing current would be the result. Unfortunately, at present, our collective consciousness is far from being nonjudgmental enough for accepting this truth.

There are manifest reasons why Western society has this strong hangup with boylove and homosexuality, while in Asia all this is really of minor importance. The

Asian lover may not be very discriminative about the age of the girls he loves, but that he loves girls and woman, there is hardly a doubt. The great majority of Asian men are definitely heterosexual, while most Western men engage in what I call *fake heterosexuality*, and are under the spell of what psychoanalysis calls *anality*, which means something like an unconscious homosexual overlay. I simply call this overlay *sadism*.

**Sadism (Definition)**

Sadism is a blockage of the natural emotional flow through a predominantly moralistic or puritanical education, often accompanied by physical punishment, which leads to a repression of the natural streaming of the hot and melting sexual energy and as a result, to demonic emotions, and violence, because the naturally deep sexual discharge becomes shallow or even is inhibited. As a result, the naturally hot and tender sexual feelings are disintegrated and distorted into a compulsion for sex targeting at strong explosive sexual discharge, as a matter of abreacting an urge, instead of embracing a mate. Sexual discharge in fact temporarily alleviates the fear armor but tends to entangle the person, who is unconscious of the affliction, long-term in sexual aggression, assault and generally a bullying, racketing or abasing behavior, that degrades and dehumanizes the mate to a passive dummy.

Western society, with its strong punitive superego, however, clearly suffers from a sadistic overlay that can be observed in both private and professional relations, and even in the ways governments relate to their citizens.



Apart from this cross-cultural observation that was meant to be a side remark, the centerpoint of my theory is that human sexuality is *naturally not a predator sexuality* in the sense of an animal-like, predetermined rigid and instinctual automatism that Western sexology has made out of it.

And it's not the conditioned character setup either that is assumed by the generation of psychologists who grew with a misunderstood Marxism in the back of their heads, and that wants each of us to be and remain 'the victim of childhood.' No, we are not the victims of our childhoods, we are not predetermined, and *we are not automatons*. This is the first thing. And the second is that sexuality is first of all not a stick put in a hole, but an *energy phenomenon*; it not a matter of accomplishing identifications either, as Freudian psychoanalysis wrongly believes. And as it's energy, it's moving, flowing, shapeshifting and transforming itself constantly, subject to change and renewal. However, when sexuality becomes fixated, it almost always turns to be pathological.

—See Peter Fritz Walter, *The Energy Nature of Human Emotions and Sexuality: A Systemic Analysis of Emotional Identity in the Process of the Human Sexual Response* (2017).

This monograph of mine is a clear antithesis to all those mechanistic theories of instinctual predetermination, and to all those people who affirm 'I am born a homosexual,' or 'I am born a pedophile,' assuming they could not do anything about their sexual preferences, summoning society to change and eventually recognize their 'sexual nature' and integrate them.

To begin with, neither homosexuality nor pedophilia are sexual orientations, but simply are *strayed vital energy streams* that are not integrated in the whole of the personality because of the lacking *social code* and our rampant and dysfunctional moralism as a cultural group addiction. Both forms of marginal sexual behavior result from distortions of psychosexual growth, while they are not for that reason perverse or pathological forms of sexual behavior.

Most in this field is still today highly controversial. What is important to see here is that these forms of sexual behavior become pathological and perverted only through their *repression*.

The next point to see in this context is how some people may actually create a fake identity from their credo to be a *sexual paraphiliac*.

I studied this uncanny phenomenon that other research on sexual paraphilias seem to have overlooked and found that this fake identity results in these subjects having a reductionist regard upon themselves that, in turn, pretty much interferes with their inner mind's attempt to building true, complex and complete identity.

Thus, they are stuck in self-projection, and precisely for this reason attract projection from the side of others, and become a despised scapegoat group, labeled with a generic term, *The Pedophiles*, a phenomenon we all know from the our everyday media soup.

Nobody can build true and lasting identity as well as soul power, and become highly effective in their profession as long as they are caught in a mythic worldview, with a dominant inner child, an adolescent mindset, or generally, with that I came to call the 'Peter Pan Worldview.' Even in film, photography, the world of musea and theater, and in show business, a firm and solid sense of reality is required if one wants to find one's niche there.

I have given free email-based consultancy for more than a decade to what turned out to be pedophile males, and found most of them simply do not want to

see their hangup with the puer archetype, which is why, in turn, they cannot grasp why they, as a group, tragically failed to being recognized socially. It's because they live, write, discuss, argue and come over from a shame-based identity that is not their real identity, not their soul identity, but the tragic dreaming of a wounded inner child in need to be healed and integrated.

Sexual belonging is not a social category; hence, when it is taken as a hanger for personal identity we enter an unmapped territory. We are not identified by our sexual longings, as these longings are eternally flowing, transitory, and subject to constant change. If one remains fixated and locked for life in a certain sexual behavior pattern, well, that's a form of neurosis, not an inherent part of that particular sexual behavior.

Many pedophiles are neurotic, as many homosexuals and lesbians are, and the percentage of neurotics in these communities may be higher than among heterosexuals for various reasons that are not related to that sexual behavior per se, but have to do with higher levels of guilt, shame, stress and social pressure that is the price for being too different in a highly labeling society.

The bad thing with neurosis is that it gets you stuck, not only in your professional life, your relation-

ships, and your general prosperity, but also and specifically your sexual orientation. It's not because they are too different but because they are neurotic that people take their sexual orientation for granted and eternal, even to a point to become activists of their particular sexual hangup. And this then gets coined into something like a paradigm when a whole bunch of psychologists and psychiatrists, ignorant as they are about the real nature of human sexuality continue publishing about what they believe is the absolute character of sexuality once resulting as a final product of the so-called *Oedipus Complex* or at last after leaving adolescence. Myths.

Suffices to say at this point that in our emotional and sexual lives, all is subject to change, and that there is absolutely no reason why we should not be able to change our emotional and sexual addictions, just as we can stop our addictions to alcohol or cigarettes. In my view, and after more than twenty years of research on the matter, there is not a doubt that we can change sexual behavior. The real question is if you *want* to change it.

If in culture A your sexual behavior is considered abject, criminal and perverse, and in culture B it's tol-

erated, why would you not want to change your culture rather than changing your sexuality?

Changing your culture costs you a flight ticket and some money for the movers, while changing your sexuality costs you years of therapy or self-therapy, and a lot of frustration on the way. While I affirm it's possible, I am not one of those with simplistic views. I know it's not easy and it requires from you a lot of determination and a certain stoicism to achieve it. And the other thing is that we hardly find reasons for drastic change if we do not have a problem with it, if our behavior is not pathological or outright perverse, in the sense of being violent, oppressive and harmful to others.

I know that pedophile attraction can be lived in ways that does no harm to the child partner, but I am aware that most people are lacking out on information on such a controversial topic, which is one reason of many why the public discussion of sexual paraphilias tends to be heated and widely irrational.

# CHAPTER TWO

---

## ON THE TRUE NATURE OF HUMAN SEXUALITY

### INTRODUCTION

In this present chapter we are going to inquire what the true nature of human sexuality is, to see that it has very little to do with what official rhetoric claims to be true; more precisely, we are going to see that neither human sexuality in general, nor pedophile sexuality, in particular, is per se of a *predator nature*.

To begin with, I will make it clear in this chapter that I do not deny the existence of sexual predators, both in the field of general sexual behavior, and in the particular field of pedophile sexual behavior. But those cases are, as I have demonstrated, *pathologies*, not the regular case. I have assumed that the main pathology that brings about *rape desires*, which are what is at the basis of sexual predatorhood, is *neurosis*, a stuckness of the emotional flow that is brought about through fear, denial and large-scale moralism.

—See Peter Fritz Walter, *Emotional Flow: A Holistic Approach to Healing Sadism (Essays on Law, Policy and Psychiatry, Vol. 3, 2018)*.

We have to see that the predator myth is something much more fundamental to postmodern industrial culture, and not only to be found in the discussion of abuse, and pedophile sexuality. It's to be found in our daily TV channels, almost everywhere, it's on children's wear, it's on fashion wear, it pervades the toy and video game industries, it's a great part of cinema, with Steven Spielberg movies on top of the list that exploit this group fantasy.

Now, psychologically speaking, what is it that this myth originates in? Is it a breed of Darwinism? If yes, why is Darwinism so popular, while it's scientifically outdated?

—Darwin's main assumption of random mutations was clearly disproved, but generally speaking, his 'evolutionary' theory is on very shaky ground as well, as systems research has shown, and increasingly shows more of the fact that all in nature is intentional, based on what is theorized as 'cosmic intentionality,' which is a scientific expression for what religions call the 'creator vision.' See, for example, Fritjof Capra, *The Turning Point* (1987), *The Web of Life* (1997) and *The Hidden Connections* (2002), with further references.

I argue that it's a makeup myth born by the corporate world that is, psychologically speaking, a projection of the general aggressiveness of a society which



could best be described with the slogan ‘eat others, or you are eaten by others.’

As a next step, I am arguing that the pedophile predator myth is a psychological projection of the fact that, what I call the *silent taboo*, sexuality is generally understood in our Western society as a ‘black-booted’ violent acting out of sexual lust, in a rape-like manner, which is seen by the culture as ‘normal male aggressiveness,’ but which in all other cultures is considered as a pathological level of aggressiveness that is bordering criminal psychopathological behavior.

Hence, the cultural distortion that is at the basis of the very discussion of sexuality in our culture has as good as nothing to do with pedophilia; it’s a projection of the original *heterosexual scheme* that is taken as the ‘normalcy standard,’ and which is a paradigm where *sexual sadism* is as much part of the ‘game’ as going out for gambling once in a while is.

And when we look back in history to see where the wind blows from, we see that the modern image of the ‘phallic dummy’ originates from the old model of the patriarchal male hunter, the outdoor guy, the cowboy, who considers the female as a child bearer and kiss-puppet that has to be conquered, and possessed. Hence, the typical sex position that signals to be ‘al-

ways on top,’ and the institution of marriage as ‘legalized rape!’

The sex laws, as I have shown in other publications, clearly show that this analysis is true, for they punish and demonize behavior with draconian punishments that otherwise, within a valid marriage, would be considered as ‘normal’ and socially adequate. The very institution of ‘statutory rape’ shows the utter perversity of this whole system that dates from the times of the Church’s Inquisition and has nothing ever to do with modern lawmaking.

—See Peter Fritz Walter, *Love or Laws: When Law Punishes Life* (Essays on Law, Policy and Psychiatry, Vol. 4, 2018) and *The Legal Split in Child Protection: Overcoming the Double Standard* (Essays on Law, Policy and Psychiatry, Vol. 9, 2018).

When such a biased and violent sex paradigm looks at pedophilia as a variant of sexual behavior, then we may not wonder about the abstruse projections it creates and propagates by system-conform outlets as ‘scientific insights about sexual perversion.’

The truth is that this very mainstream sexual paradigm is by itself justifying rape and abuse with the pretended ‘sexual nature of the male predator,’ that is perhaps a *cultural perversion*, but has nothing ever to do with the true nature of sexuality in human beings.

I am going to quote the late Dr. Wilhelm Reich (1897-1957) often in this chapter for his insights into the functional nature of human sexuality, and its regulatory and health-preserving function are marking the sexological research standard until today; and with the *smear politics about pedophilia* since about the mid-1980s, there is anyway hardly any better research to expect in our present time, and the near future. In addition, it has to be seen that the myth of the pedophile predator has a political function in that it serves as a projection myth for discarding out a minority that serves as the *scapegoat*, as this was formerly done with the Jews, and ethnic minorities. In a time where political corruption and a general decadence regarding our value system is on the rise about everywhere in the world, it is not a surprise for the political observer that new scapegoats are forged that serve for nurturing the wars and civil wars of the future.

## THE SILENT TABOO

I call the true nature of human sexuality a *silent taboo* because all appears to be sane and safe here in the sense that our society today joyfully boasts with being rational-minded and open for scientific research and 'clinical' observation of human sexual behavior. I

question this assumption with the simple observation that if our society was matter-of-fact and knowledgeable about the true nature of human sexuality, it would never have come up with the *predator myth* in the first place.

This myth really pervades our mass media to a point it trickles out of every major magazine almost every fortnight, to be endlessly and neurotically repeated as a *new form of mass hypnotism that is based upon a pitiful ignorance of the real workings of human emotions and their sexual expression.*

Let us ask the pertinent questions here and try to give honest answers instead of ideological answers, answers based upon the facts of nature, not the myths of nature that are the relict of the notorious patriarchal ignorance of all the basic life functions.

Is human sexuality of a predator nature? Let me first assert that I do know sexual predators, the real ones, men who conform with the profile of the sexual occasion-catcher, who use boys and girls and females of all ages as pleasure cuties, more or less regardless of their consent, shunning with a grin any kind of societal, cultural, legal and moral rules and prohibitions. To say, I am not denying the existing of sexual predators, but I am saying that this form of human sexual

behavior is the result of *emotional stuckness*, not the natural way human sexuality unfolds and manifests in human social interactions.

By the same token, looking at *pedophilia*, I am saying that the predator pedophile that is so often nowadays a favorite and sensational item in our media, is a pathological variant, while the majority of pedophiles are not sexual predators.

The negative image the media present on these matters is true in so far as, from a case-study point of view, and without generalizing the findings, predator pedophiles in some cases really create havoc in the lives of those they use for their ruthless and unhampered ego-satisfaction, thereby creating hurt and destruction also in their own lives as a result of the bad karmic response they trigger.

What I am saying is that these men are *pathological cases* and not natural lovers, nor natural childlovers, while the official rhetoric uses them as dummies for upholding and backing up the myth of *all pedophile sexuality* being of a coercive, violent and predator nature.

These men, reported almost daily in mainstream journalism as ‘international pedophiles’ who prefer

destinations like Thailand, the Philippines, Indonesia or Cambodia as their erotic playground, are not, to repeat it, representatives of the psychoemotional particularity called pedophilia. These men are somehow targeting a mythic object for abreaction that could be called 'the doll of all ages,' also in its variant of the 'sweet small boy' to be anally raped for 'teaching them modesty,' as a cult object to be lavishly degraded, spoiled, debased, humiliated and mutilated 'forever.' For these men, small boys, because of their softness and their female characteristics, are dolls and pleasure toys; which does by no means imply that these men were homosexuals. In most cases they are not.

With this group, the macho-type of man is the most common to be found. In my observation, these men are often sworn against society for various reasons; some of them were themselves hurt and abused in childhood. As a result, they built a revenge pattern, and may once in a while act out against children as poison containers for their accumulated hate.

The revenge pattern psychologically is a psychic defense mechanism that veils the original wounding these men have suffered. They are most often scarce in their communications, rather mute and strong-willed, and they display many obsessional patterns in their

overall behavior; in fact, they are not seldom paranoid. More often, I found that they are *narcissistic* in the sense to experience difficulty for 'vulnerable' communications that bear a chance for their true self to emerge.

The interesting fact is that the official image of the patriarchal male hunter type is exactly conforming with this kind of pathological sex robot who is actually an emotional torso and sexual Frankenstein. It's after all the mainstream image of the 'good old male' who, to be true, is depicted as a predator animal *in all respects*, not just in his sexual communications. And the 'modern' American male, as the prototype of the body-built, doped huge phallic dummy in our emerging postmodern international consumer culture is but a vintage and more subtly spiced broth of the traditional mold. From there to the skinhead lust-murderer is but a step.

The latter is a dummy just as the former, only that the latter went a step out of his comfort zone, to experience some 'spicy novelty' ahead of time and space, a small defenseless baby to be mutilated for life, a tender female to be sacrificed to the god of 'phallic superiority,' a little boy to be rendered 'modest and servile' through brutal anal rape as a matter of 'uphold-

ing good old traditions' or a maid to be 'taught good manners' how to serve *The Lord* by raping her 'to the blood once and for all.'

After this clarification, my answer to the initial question is that *human sexuality originally is surely not of a predator nature*. And it's a sign of simple cultural perversion when a public morality, as it is the case today, signs up for declaring perversity to be the rule, and nature to be the 'serpent seducer' of humanity into sin. We are facing the same dilemma here as during the Middle-Ages, the same mental and emotional darkness, the same misconceptions about 'nature.' To say sexuality is an urgent desire for uprooting another into a chaotic experience of piercing a yielding corpse with a stick is about as intelligent as saying that a baby is the inevitable outcome of mutually consented rape, or that the earth was created through a violent eruption called the 'big bang' as a cosmic rape of 'matter' by the divine phallus. While all these myths ghost in humanity's collective unconscious, as part of our world religions' erotic phantasmagory, they are what they are, myths, not reality. They are as much myths as Stalin's vision of a world united by violent coercion and political rape, in the Soviet empire.



We are still on the side of myths and mythology, still in the realm of political paranoia when considering such slogans, and far from nature's wisdom. Nature is smooth, yielding and intelligent in coordinating desire, not harsh, brute, coercive and disruptive. As early as in 1949, Wilhelm Reich wrote in his book *Ether, God and Devil*:

The unarmored organism does not know an impulse to rape and murder little girls, or to get pleasure through violence. It is therefore indifferent toward all moral rules that try to repress such impulses. It cannot comprehend that one has intercourse with another only because there is an opportunity for it, for example being in one and the same room with a person of the other sex. The armored character, by contrast, cannot envision an orderly life without strict moralistic rules against rape and lust murder.

—Wilhelm Reich, *Äther, Gott und Teufel* (1983), p. 76  
(Translation mine).

Our society is turning life upside-down when affirming that man is a violent animal and needs to experience rape or child rape as a matter of 'natural urges;' no, natural sexuality is not violent, but consenting, not an urge to be acted out aggressively and to the detriment of the mate, whatever the age of that mate. But look at the facts, for if this is really so, why have we got sex laws?

It's because we have strayed from the natural path long ago, as a society, not just certain individuals labeled pedophiles, predators, or otherwise. In one of his latest books, *Children of the Future: On the Prevention of Sexual Pathology* (1950/1983), Wilhelm Reich who long before Masters & Johnson researched the human pleasure function, condenses many of his fundamental insights in the natural unbent and unarmored human nature. From this base paradigm of *emotional sanity and sexual health*, then, Reich formulated a sound catalog of ideas about how to set a future educational system that would insure that children's emotions and sexuality are not thwarted into denial, violence, perversion and sadism.

We are no more than transmission belts from an evil past to an eventually better future. We shall not be the ones to build this future. We have no right to tell our children how to build their future, since we have proved unfit to build our own present. (...) We cannot possibly preach cultural adaptation for our children when this very same culture has been disintegrating under our feet for more than thirty-five years. Should our children adapt to this age of war, mass killing, tyranny, and moral deterioration? (Id., p. 6)

In my entire life I rarely encountered such honest a statement on the state of the world and what we have done about it—facing the unfulfilled needs of our children. When Reich wrote this, in the 1950s, the

world was not yet as catastrophic, and ecologically devastated as it is by now, and the whole of the Western world was not as negative toward children's erotic interests than this is the case today. Hence, the actuality of Reich's book is even greater today.

Our pathologies, and here especially our sexual pathologies have not seen an end in these fifty years of ongoing madness, and our legislators have not done one single move in the right direction to end the sexual misery of the youth—in the contrary, all has only worsened. Reich's suggestions for avoiding sexual pathologies essentially claim *parental and educational non-interference* in children's emotional and sexual life. Fortunately today this view is shared by progressive child psychologists, psychoanalysts, and social workers, and yet it is not for this reason a mainstream view, and has not gained access to our government agencies that go on to mold children after certain standards, certain values, certain ideologies, certain religions, certain racial or otherwise partial views, certain fashions and certain traditions.

The view that children should be left to grow in basic freedom is today in 2018 as marginal as it was in the 1950s. Reich explains that there are essentially two fundamental wrongdoings in our child-rearing prac-

tices that contribute to thwart and distort the originally sane psychosomatic setup of the child. Here they are in his own words:

(1) The natural bioenergetic principle in the newborn baby is systematically smothered and ruined by the armored parent and educator, who in turn are supported in their ignorance by powerful social institutions which thrive on the armoring of the human animal.

(2) A simple but tenacious misinterpretation of nature governs all education and cultural philosophy. It is the idea that nature and culture are incompatible. In accordance with this cultural ideology, psychoanalysts have failed to distinguish between primary natural and secondary perverse, cruel drives, and they are continuously killing nature in the newborn while they try to extinguish the brutish little animal. They are completely ignorant of the fact that it is exactly this killing of the natural principle which creates the secondary perverse and cruel nature, human nature so called, and that these artificial cultural creations / in turn make compulsive moralism and brutal laws necessary. (Id., pp. 17-18)

Reich vehemently contradicted the mechanistic approach of most Western physicians and pediatricians, which was one of the reasons he did not gain social acceptance throughout his life. Reich writes:

If no severe damage has already been inflicted on it in the womb, the newborn infant brings with it all the richness of natural plasticity and development. This infant is not, as so many erroneously believe, an

empty sack or a chemical machine into which everybody and anybody can pour his or her special ideas of what a human being ought to be. It brings with it an enormously productive and adaptive energy system which, out of its own resources, will make contact with its environment and begin to shape that environment according to its needs. (Id., p. 20)

It is obvious for those informed about the way of living and the child-rearing practices of native cultures that natural sexual pleasure is soft and yielding, manifesting as hot and melting energy which streams through the organism, vitalizing all tissues, organs and fibers, rendering the skin smooth, the hair abundant and shining, the eyes pristine and vibrant and thoughts clear and focused. It is also obvious that sexual communication is essentially healthy and fosters natural growth and rejuvenation in people of all ages. Reich writes:

Satisfying intercourse is also important for the body as a whole, because the vigorous circulation of blood through all the tissues promotes metabolic activity. This explains the fresh, robust appearance of the person who is sexually satisfied, compared with the usually pale, pasty appearance of the abstinent person. (Id., p. 178)

Most importantly, for assessing the nature of undistorted sexuality, we have to inquire into the sexual habits of natives who lead peaceful lives and foster

monogamous marriage, maintain stable and nurturant relations with their young, and abstain from sexual mutilations, violent initiation rites, torture, and ritual pederasty. Reich found in accordance with reputed anthropologists Bronislaw Malinowski and Margaret Mead that those natives lead peaceful lives who respect and intuitively foster *emotional flow* and all the other natural life functions in which sexuality is integrated as a growth and rejuvenation factor. Wilhelm Reich observes:

Among those primitive peoples who lead satisfactory, unimpaired sexual lives, there is no sexual crime, nor sexual perversion, no sexual brutality between man and woman; rape is unthinkable because it is unnecessary in their society. Their sexual activity flows in normal, well-ordered channels which would fill any cleric with indignation and fear, because the pale, ascetic youth and the gossiping, child-beating woman do / not exist in these primitive societies. They love the human body and take pleasure in their sexuality. They do not understand why young men and women should not enjoy their sexuality. But when their lives are invaded by the ascetic, hypocritical morass and by the Church, which bring them 'culture' along with exploitation, alcohol, and syphilis, they begin to suffer the same wretchedness as ourselves. They begin to lead 'moral' lives, i.e., to suppress their sexuality, and from then on they decline more and more into a state of sexual distress, which is the result of sexual suppression. At the same time, they become sexually dangerous; murders of

spouses, sexual diseases, and crimes all start to appear. (Id., pp. 192-193)

The present mainstream value system reflects a real reversal of natural functions when taking into account these bioenergetic facts, which in the meantime have been corroborated by the sex research of Masters & Johnson, the Kinsey Report, the work of Alexander Lowen as well as by psychoanalysis and child psychology.

—See Alayne Yates, *Sex Without Shame* (1978), Stevi Jackson, *Childhood and Sexuality* (1982) and Mary Fortune, *Sexual Violence* (1994), with further references.

It is exactly the *repression of natural sexual gratification* that leads to crime, and not, as it is believed by most of our governments, sexual freedom and permissive education.

Wilhelm Reich states this fact, referring Malinowski's field research as evidence to the bioenergetic truth of sexual nonviolence being the rule, and civilization's exorbitant sexual crime rate as a result of straying away from natural biogenic self-regulation.

The etiology of homosexuality finds its clear explanation here; however, the fact that homosexuality is a sexual dysfunction is of course not a reason to be prejudiced about it or to socially stigmatize it:

It is a fact that only the person who is incapable of gratification, the person whose sexual life is impeded and disturbed and who is contaminated by moral inhibitions, becomes sexually dangerous, while the sexually gratified and healthy person, no matter how many and what relationships he has, poses no risk to social coexistence. (Id., p. 193)

According to the findings of Malinowski, an English ethnologist, homosexuality starts to appear among primitive peoples at the same rate that missionaries import Christian morality into these people's natural sex lives and separate the sexes from each other. This is also confirmed by the fact, which we observe over and over again, that wherever normal sexual relations between men and women or girls and boys are prohibited or hampered (e.g. in boarding schools, in the army or navy, etc.), homosexuality develops in proportion to the degree of sexual suppression. (Id., p. 201)

It would be totally wrong, however, to conclude from these facts that homosexuals should be despised or made the object of anti-homosexual campaigns. (Id.)

The dualistic concept of love that came over to us from Aristotle in the Church's moral codex is schizoid in that it splits the wholeness and unity of love off in *dysfunctional concepts* that are not only meaningless but when taken as guide posts for behavior lead to social and individual schizophrenia. Reich comments:

The splitting of sexuality into debased sensuality and transfigured love, which generates entire systems of philosophy on the problem of 'sexuality' and 'eroti-



cism' is nothing more than an expression of the dominant position of the man and, in addition, a consequence of the efforts of distinguished hypocrites to set themselves apart from the masses by adopting a special morality. (Id., p. 204)

The often-voiced call for more *sexual responsibility*, as we know it for example from the feminism agenda, is a tautology because naturally, and as long as we let nature regulate our sexual lives, we are sexually responsible, and this responsibility begins to be severely eroded exactly with allowing *moralistic* pseudo-responsibility to set in. Reich writes:

Sexual responsibility is automatically present in a healthy, satisfying sexual life. (Id., p. 208)

## THE MYTH OF PEDOPHILE PREDATOR SEXUALITY

After this clarification on the nature of undistorted sexuality, which is the human expression of the pleasure function, let us now look at unrepressed and undistorted *pedophile sexuality*. In what does pedophile sexuality differ from the mainstream sexual behavior pattern?

To answer this question I must first clarify what, if ever, can be taken as the majoritarian rule of sexual

attraction and conduct; it seems that when nature is not bent, we 'grow up' psychosexually in the sense that as children we are erotically attracted to children of about equal and slightly different age, when we grow into adolescence, we choose adolescent and adult partners, *while some adolescents prefer children*, and when we grow adult, we again change our sexual appetite in desiring, at least most of the time, adult sexual mates.

As you see, I drafted this statement rather carefully, for there are so many exceptions to the rule that the rule itself is difficult to define. In fact, as early as in the 1920s, sexologists such as Richard Krafft-Ebing, Wilhelm Stekel or Havelock Ellis affirmed as a general tenor of their research that in human sexual behavior a *normalcy standard* is difficult to make out as *the variety of human sexual conduct tends to be greater than its uniformity*.

Current society, while it has come to be convinced that homosexuality does no harm per se, still remains widely (and wildly) hostile toward pedophilia. The monolithic myth that was being built over the last years and decades against adult-child erotic relations can handily be coined *The Myth of Pedophile Predator Sexuality*. It is argued by circles of society that are in

one way or the other involved with the worldwide mega-business of *child protection*, and also by many psychologists that all pedophile sexuality was per se of a predator nature, the adult typically acting out an aggressive urge for sexual satisfaction by bullying the child into coercive and painful forms of oral, anal and vaginal intercourse, virtually mutilating the child's spiritual integrity on all levels, physically, mentally and emotionally. There is a whole web of myths woven in this media fabric, and those myths serve propagandistic purposes. To sort out the mess, I have to go step by step, carefully putting things straight that are distorted, and facts apart that are entangled in a mythic cinematographic picture of gigantic dimensions from which emerges the youth-focused lover as the proverbial sexual street monster and predator animal.

What I am talking about when I say 'mainstream' sexual conduct is but a rule of thumb. Now, when the mainstream sexual conduct is that people are erotically interested more or less in mates of about same or slightly different age, with pedophile attraction, the only difference, really, is that here significantly younger partners are preferred.

There is no other difference. As with all *undistorted* sexual attraction and mating, pedophile emotional at-

traction and sexuality is tender, harmless, loving, caring and nurturant, and as generally with sexuality, when it is repressed, it begins to exhibit violent and harmful traits.

The predator myth cheats about these facts, signing the mythic pedophile up as a scapegoat for acts that are for the most part perpetrated by heterosexual predators, and also for the minority of pedophile predators whose existence I do not deny, but who are, like heterosexual predators, sexual 'pathologies' because they have repressed their original longings, which is why they became sexual sadists.

Pedophile sadism is certainly an undesirable and socially harmful vintage of sexual pathology. The sad outcome of such violent urges make the headlines of our daily morning and evening papers. However, what the media do not tell is that these cases are but a tiny percentage of general violent crime, and an even tinier percentage of the total pedophilia related criminality.

All research on adult-child sexual attraction corroborated my early intuition that pedophile erotic attraction and behavior is as nonviolent and tender as mainstream sexual behavior provided it is left unregulated and thus functions in a self-regulated manner.

Our international media distort these facts more or less deliberately because ‘fighting perversity’ is today used as a major Trojan horse for populating the neo-fascist agenda of total control and tight regulation of the citizen. That most people are hardly if ever aware of this fact is deplorable enough, was it not just another piece of evidence for the distortion the consumerist worldview brings up with its general hostility to all sexuality; in fact, sexual citizens are bad consumers. This is a simple psychological and economic fact that was mentioned in the works not only of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, but that was even more broadly elucidated in the 6-volume masterpiece *The History of Sexuality*, by the French philosopher Michel Foucault.

—Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality* Volume 1: *The Will to Knowledge* (1976/1998), Volume 2: *The Use of Pleasure* (1984/1998), Volume 3: *The Care of Self* (1984/1998). The theme was elaborated even more in detail by other French philosophers, among them Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari. See *L'Anti-Oedipe: Capitalisme et Schizophrénie* (1973).



# CHAPTER THREE

---

## THE DEMONIZATION OF ADULT-CHILD EROTIC LOVE

### INTRODUCTION

In the present chapter, I am going to elucidate some of the main reasons for the present cultural demonization of adult-child erotic love. We are going to see why the modern paradigm of *child protection* doesn't ensure valid protection of the child against various forms of violence, educational, sexual or other, both within and outside of the family. Actually our daily news report that children in our culture are highly vulnerable to being hurt, and highly unsafe, and that the worst of the worst can happen to them virtually every day.

Missing children, abducted children, raped children, children as assault receivers in divorce trials, not to talk about children raped to their blood in all our wars and civil wars around the world, all this shows with blatant evidence that children are *not protected*

*through our modern child protection*, whereas in former epochs of humanity, children enjoyed a much more effective protection—while one would never have talked about it in that paradigmatic manner that is today's media tone.

And myself living since more than twenty years in Asia, I have seen here children being much more protected, while much more exposed to potential dangers, on their daily way to school, walking, or biking alone, sometimes miles to and from school.

While children are early initiated in the work process, and not relegated to 'eternal play' as in Western countries, children in Asia enjoy a higher sphere of personal freedom and yet are not to that point assaulted and humiliated as it is the case in all and every Western society! This is, frankly, a shame for a culture that arrogates itself to be the most child-centered and child-protective in the world.

It has to be seen that child protection came up, not as a coincidence, with the *Industrial Revolution*, and was a byproduct of the industrial exploitation of the child, and later, the discovery and recognition of children as prime consumers. Hence, the true reason for the present demonization of adult-child sexual relations is a cultural fear that is actively fueled by the



corporate world in its eternal collusion with governments around the world. The fear is that the child as a consumer may disappear one day because of consciousness development and the real, not fake realization of children's emotional and erotic freedom. That would possibly be the end of consumer culture in its present form.

This is thus a legitimate fear, and from this perspective, all the strangeness in the present child protective paradigm can be understood—while I am probably the first researcher after French philosophers Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari to have discovered and unveiled these hidden connections in my books.

—See Gilles Deleuze & Felix Guattari, *L'Anti-Oedipe: Capitalisme et Schizophrénie* (1973).

Next, I am going to elucidate in this chapter what the expression 'sex offender' known from criminal jurisprudence, actually means. It is quite obvious, I think, that this expression denotes something like 'sexual heresy,' just as it was in the times when the Church ordained what was permitted as wholesome intercourse and what was 'intercourse with the devil.' For example, under the Church's doctrine, even within a couple in a valid marriage, anal copulation was judged as a 'devilish' form of intercourse. By the way, this archaic view is

still valid today in Islam, and can be found explicated in the Koran.

I also show in this chapter that the one-sided focus upon the victim, while denoting the abuser as a criminal, without giving thought to the *root relationship* that was established *prior to the abuse*, is not conducive to elucidating the truth in relationships that at one point turn south through one party abusing the power he or she has over the other party. This is so because from a scientific point of view, we need to know the *whole of the story*, not just the part that led to the decay, and even the destruction of the relation, or the fact it ended up in court. The present abuse paradigm renders it extremely unlikely that researchers even bother to know the whole truth, because partial truth, which is called ‘scientific bias’ is virtually planned into this paradigm. And with that, sorry, I cannot live as a lawyer and researcher; this is something that has to be attacked, in my view, until the Supreme Court renders a decision about it, and such a decision could trigger a change in the whole of the *oppressive and unconstitutional system* that the abuse culture has established in our originally democratic culture that considers *human intimacy as protected by constitutional guarantees!*

## WHAT IS CHILD PROTECTION?

The *child protection movement* is a social, political and economic union of politically conservative and spiritually orthodox circles of modern society that have achieved to receive high government and industry funding for running national and international campaigns for the so-called protection of children. Some authors also speak, in this context, of the ‘child protection industry’ since the financial power and sociopolitical influence of this movement is growing fast. While this movement does not shy away from interfering in other countries’ internal matters, it has so far not contributed to lower the enormous child-related crime rate in modern society; this fact contributes to the suspicion that child protection is rather an *ideology*, or a new worldwide business that plays on the irrational registers of the human mind, rather than on factual knowledge.

Modern educators like Maria Montessori came up with the idea to tailor the child’s living environment according to the child’s age and size, thus segregating adults and children into worlds apart.

Regarding the child’s natural need of a variety of contacts to grow into a sociable and kind person, it is

argued by child protectors that such contacts may endanger the child's health, physical safety or emotional balance. However, statistics of child-related crime show that in countries that are lesser safe and technologically not very advanced, the number of child rape assault, violent murder, lust murder or kidnapping of children is minimal compared to the statistics for these crimes in Western industrial nations.

Western crime experts, justifying the Western child protection paradigm, tend to argue that these statistics could not be relied upon since the most part of child abuse went unreported in those cultures.

So far so good. Let us look then how it developed in our own culture because here, we have more reliable data. The first idea to protect children came up at about the middle of the 17<sup>th</sup> century. Before that time, the idea of children enjoying a special status or being another vintage of humans who need special care was unknown.

Hence, when we talk about child protection, we talk about a modern paradigm, a concept that was mainly developed in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, while the idea was present already in early Christianity. As Susanne Cho demonstrated in her doctoral thesis at Zurich University, Switzerland, the idea of child protection

seems to be unthinkable before about the second half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century.

—Susanne Cho, *Kindheit und Sexualität im Wandel der Kulturgeschichte: Eine Studie zur Bedeutung der kindlichen Sexualität unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des 17. und 20. Jahrhunderts*, Zürich, 1983 (Doctoral thesis).

This is so because it was at that moment in human history that, for the first time, it was defined what a *child* is; in fact, before the onset of the *Industrial Revolution*, children were not considered as a separate race that obeys to different laws.

It does not surprise in fact that it was exactly with the starting point of consumerist thinking that the idea came up that children had to be regulated and held tight. The underlying promise was that children represented tremendously important consumers. Hence, the idea of protection, which finds its parallel in slave holding, which was on the rise from exactly the same point in history. Slaves, too, had to be protected—mainly from running away!

When you consider this fundamental shift in perspective regarding children, that is after all a modern-day phenomenon, you may grasp the idea that all child protection in reality is a form of customer care, and a means to grow obedient consumers. The direct conse-

quence of this reality are our *age of consent laws*, which are based exactly upon that fictional definition of the consumer robot ‘child.’

Without a person being considered a child, age of consent laws do not apply. ‘Child’ is thus a legal criterion. This is of tremendous importance for the understanding of how our child protection laws work.

So I need to dig a little deeper and find out what a ‘child’ is under the definition of the law. And when I look through existing age of consent laws I may be surprised to find one single criterion: the *age* of the child. No mention of maturity, no mention of knowledge about life or former experience, no mention of IQ, no mention of the will of the child.

All this is considered irrelevant by modern child protection laws. A child is a person below the age of consent. The age of consent is so and so many years. And how many years it is, actually depends on time and place, and on the cultural setting. Thus, we can conclude at this point that the ultimate purpose of our age of consent laws is to protect a certain age-group of people from experiencing sex or body pleasure.

The rationale of age of consent laws, and ultimately of child protection, may not be clear. It has to be elu-

culated. The answers we get from our lawmakers and from our child-protection experts are clear-cut. Sex is something for adults, we hear. Sex is damaging the child, we hear. Children are sexually innocent, we hear, and have to be protected from abuse. This is the official rhetoric.

I wonder if we are not all *innocent about driving cars* until we get our driver's license? I once dated a student girl who was sexually innocent at age twenty-one. Does that mean that at age twenty-one, she was still a child?

According to the laws of consent, she was an adult. Yet she was a virgin and said she had suffered from the fact that all through her childhood her mother had forbidden her to touch herself. Her mother in fact had regularly followed her up to the toilet to make sure that she was 'not touching herself.'

This girl was an incarnation of guilt and shame, and she said she felt attracted only to old men, to men who physically looked like her father. Upon my inquiry why she did not find men of her age attractive, she replied that she found young men 'brutal and insensitive'.

This young woman may be an exception or she may have suffered from a particularly harsh and life-denying education, but cases like hers let us question the rationale of morality.

It is often argued in conservative circles of society that children should by no means be sexually awakened as this would impair their sense of morality. Now, then, let us inquire into this argument. First of all, *which* morality is meant? Is it the morality of good behavior, of decency, of moral conduct, of respecting others?

Does that mean so far that the child has to abstain from sex so as to learn to respect other people, so as to keep a good conduct and learn a decent behavior?

Indeed, it is argued in conservative circles that children had to pass a certain time for learning, and not just for enjoying life, and that too much of body pleasure and enjoyment was detrimental to their sense of morality; that children had to encounter hardship and learn to deprive themselves of certain things that they could enjoy *later on* in life.

Does that mean the child must abstain from sex *for the common good*, for the sake of morality? Or for their own good? If the first is true, we are not talking about



child protection, but about morality protection, or the protection of that strange thing that in legal textbooks is called ‘public morals.’ If the second is true, we are dealing with a paradigm of child protection that applies restrictions to the child’s life for the best of the child.

The present book will try to elucidate what the current state of the law is in matters of child protection and how age of consent laws have grown historically, what their rationale is, and how, or not, they serve the child’s welfare. I will also comment on some of the rather folkloristic and irrational aspects of the present public child abuse debate and the character structure of people who stress child protection with particular emphasis, exhibiting an almost obsessed focus on the *protective* stance in education.

This is to say that in such an intensely controversial debate, to abstain from any judgment and pretending to deliver an ‘objective’ assessment of the topics at stake would be an illusory and perhaps dishonest endeavor. I want to see the person who can react cold-bloodedly to such a hot matter. Children’s fate *does* trigger deep emotions, and for good reason.

Yet, not only because I am a lawyer and therefore perhaps more detached when looking at things that

shock most people, I would like to invite the reader to try hard to steer in between the extreme positions of the child protectors, on one hand, and the self-declared pedophiles, on the other. Probably on neither of these sides, truth resides, because the positions are extreme by themselves. And they have probably become even more extreme over the last few decades because of an evident lack of dialogue, let alone good-willed and constructive interaction, between these groups of people. This is why I would like to expose in this book some of the absurdities that are to be found in the rhetoric of both the child protectors and the declared and organized pedophiles on the matter of loving children.

And by the way, what about listening to the children themselves? I have done so and my inquiry led to some fundamental insights that are not brought forth by both the child protectors and the organized pedophiles. In addition I would like to come up with some perhaps original ideas about how children could be protected in a way that leaves their emotional integrity as untouched as possible. I call this idea the *principle of non-intervention* and it's not a new idea, but a recurrent argument in the writings of alternative child psychologists such as the late French child ther-

apist Françoise Dolto (1908-1988) or the American child psychologist Alayne Yates. Besides, some women rights activists such as Stevi Jackson have taken a strong stance on freeing the child's sex life from an overhead of paternalistic control and regulation.

## CONSUMER PROTECTION?

The media, especially television and cinema play a major role in forging behavior by spreading the consumer value system worldwide, a value system that by suppressing and criminalizing the most tender forms of sexual interaction between generations breeds violence, hatred and hyper-aggressiveness mixed with sentimentality and an attitude twisted toward suspicion, mistrust, defensiveness and insolence.

The behavior of not only a large majority of Western children, but more or less a majoritarian part of all children in technologically advanced societies shows, as a result of emotional, tactile and sexual deprivation in childhood, the following patterns:

- ▶ Lack of kindness and lack of empathy with others;

- ▶ Lack of autonomy, self-determination and responsibility;
- ▶ Clinging behavior (symbiotic attachments);
- ▶ Strong egotism and difficult attitude;
- ▶ Frequent anxiety, insomnia or nightmares;
- ▶ Strong materialistic focus, dependence on labels;
- ▶ Standardized behavior patterns and role models;
- ▶ School violence such as bullying smaller ones, etc.;
- ▶ Laziness, lack of attention, sometimes analphabetism;
- ▶ Depressions, tendency toward drugs, and sexual dysfunctions.

There are no quick fixes to heal those symptoms and, if there are, they precisely cure the symptoms, but not the disease at its origin. The disease is a cultural, psychological and ideological pattern; it's a puritanical mindset that punishes pleasure and belittles violence, that roots out any spontaneous and creative behavior in favor of behavior characterized by the imitation of idealized model leaders, materialism and focus upon possessions, a trend for proselytism, sadism and edu-

cational violence against children, the justification of slavery, civil war and structural violence, a revenge-oriented criminal justice and violent prison system, religion characterized by a jealous, vindictive and violent god, strong prohibition of pre-marital sex, the dominance of patriarchal values, and generally a higher esteem for males and an open or hidden discrimination of females and female children.

Modern citizens tend to believe our democratic Western nations were among all countries the most liberal and free societies, blaming the Taliban and other tiny extremist minorities for acting-out the shadow that they deny to admit. Or they even project their undesired split-selves on a whole religion such as Islam or *Islamic Fundamentalism* while in American history, *Christian Fundamentalism* truly was leading all over the place, and for centuries without end, without any effective control of its outright fascist, persecutory, irrational, undemocratic and anti-constitutional attitude.

With regard to children, their rhetoric is suspiciously similar to the way the former apartheid regime in South-Africa talked about the black slaves and their social status. All children's rights for a free, uninhibited and non-manipulated emotional and sexual life during

childhood and youth are countered with arguments that deny to children basic human rights such as:

- ▶ The ability to determine themselves;
- ▶ The ability to make responsible choices;
- ▶ The ability to identify what could possibly harm them;
- ▶ The ability to develop autonomy;
- ▶ The ability to make friends;
- ▶ The ability to assert oneself;
- ▶ The ability to consent to sexual relations.

## FROM PROTECTING CHILDREN TO SERVING CHILDREN

Some more interesting parallel comes up when we look at another of those false realities, the notion of a *protectorate* in international law. In this term we encounter protection thinking, and here, too, it has been in human diplomatic history a pretext for the colonial occupation of a foreign territory, and thus against international law. This term equally reveals that pre-empting to protect another is often, even in the law of nations, a rape-like act targeting at violating the other and depriving them of autonomy and self-determination.

I believe that true democracy can exist everywhere, no matter what regime a culture or nation subscribes to, as long as it has a cultural and spiritual foundation that respect human values and human life. Once we free ourselves from black-and-white judgments that divide the world in East and West, high and low, male and female, good and bad, and so on, we can gain a new and fresh regard on educating our children that acknowledges that, all over the world, education needs wisdom and patience.

However, it is not given to everyone to be wistful and patient, which is the reason why, in Antiquity,

teaching was in the resort of philosophers and men of high personal culture, virtue and integrity.

The problem of child safety is complex in our culture because our nation is relatively rich, relatively secure, relative comfortable, and relatively democratic, and yet, strangely enough, practices a are lesser secure, lesser comfortable, and lesser democratic regime for its own children!

To put the problem of children being potentially unsafe in most Western nations on the back of strangers, criminals, predators or a scapegoat group called *Pedophiles* does apparently not bring viable solutions, except longer prison miles, as the reality of erotic attraction toward children is much more complex than this simplistic scheme suggests.

Fact is that postmodern consumer culture is lesser safe for children than most native and tribal societies and developing countries.

We can also highlight the problem from another angle. Where people need a captain, they are unable to steer themselves. Where they need child protectors, they are unable to protect their children, as mothers and fathers, as teachers and caretakers. And if we inquire why this is so, we get some keys regarding the



nature of childhood in our Western cultures. In my opinion, the reasons are:

- ▶ a genuine disinterest of many Westerners in children;
- ▶ a lack of care present adults suffered in their childhood;
- ▶ transfer of tutelary power from the family to the state;
- ▶ lack of knowledge about what children really need;
- ▶ hypocrite attitude regarding the facts of life;
- ▶ lack of caring touch between older and younger people;
- ▶ lack of trust through disruption of the extended family;
- ▶ lack of freedom for alternative forms of togetherness;
- ▶ aggressiveness/egotism valued higher than tenderness/care;
- ▶ defensive emotional behavior because of lacking trust;
- ▶ neglect of children's emotional needs;

► and so on.

This list is not exhaustive. It shows only the peak of the iceberg. If there is one area in modern society that is really neglected, it is *education*. The problem is that education is not human anymore and it does not seem to be destined for humans, but for robots. This is so because it has been considered to be commercial, just as everything else in consumer culture, which means it has been *standardized*.

The problem is that humans are not material goods, which is why education is per se something volatile, that needs intelligence, intuition, and virtue to be done in a way that really brings out the best of each and every child. Child protection veils this fact in that it creates huge profits from the child as a victim, the child as a helpless dependent creature and not the child as a self-reliant entity or the child as a person-in-growth.

That is exactly why child protection needs the child to remain a victim and be victimized and abused, so as to realize its business expectations.

And, *quid est demonstrandum*, that is exactly why the child abuse industry will never want to heal abuse, but in the contrary finance a social machinery that

contributes to *more abuse* in society and the world at large.

Seeing this means to see that child protection *really* is a fake cause.

## SEX OFFENDER

The expression *sex offender* associates a kind of sexual heresy. Offending—what or whom? When I have offended a person sexually I am still not a sex offender and remain a person offender. I cannot offend sexuality, can I? Can you offend the sun?

The expression targets at persons who actually offend the reigning paradigm of sexuality which is exactly the Church's traditional view of heresy. The Church, in its hubristic arrogance to define what is life and what is not, said there is good sex and bad sex. It more precisely said that all sex is bad but granted a tight exception for procreation.

To regulate man's pleasures was a powerful and tyrannical means to subdue the population under the Church's exclusive power. Nothing is more effective for manipulating and dominating humans than prohibiting pleasure and desire and then judge and segregate

those who cannot and will not comply. This is the key of how it could happen that people lost their individuality and became robotized—long before the beginning of the computer age.

The monastery schools and forced alphabetization did their part in the brutal mind-washing process that deprived masses of people of their identity during the last millennium. The very notion of *offending* of course comes from witch hunt times and it is no wonder that those masses of neo witch hunters today use it again. Abusers and abused are sitting in the same boat and they are caught in the same trap. That is why healing for both groups is very similar in that it must deal with the same scars. These scars are neither physical, nor sexual, nor emotional in the first place. They are related to the problem of accepting self and the sometimes karmic inability to live one's power and natural aggressiveness in a way that is positive and integrative.

To love the abused and hate the abuser is a common dichotomy that originates in a *lack of understanding of the complexities of love and abuse*; it's a sign of helplessness and a sentimental cover-up of the true roots of abuse.

The present situation breeds frigid powerless women from the cradle since no father can enter any-

more freely in a natural erotic exchange with his daughter to mirror her the thrill of her early womanhood. What moralistic child-rearing brings about is death, not life, cripples, not powerful humans and ill-responsive citizens instead of sanely and sexually responsive ones.

The present abuse paradigm and the masses of people it attracts as its believers and worshippers is the most deplorable, the most powerless, infantile and self-alienated form of human togetherness that I have ever seen in human social interaction. It is the prolonged kindergarten of the worst sort, the *good boy, good girl paradigm extended into adulthood*, the paradigm that paradoxically, by its very perversity, has contributed to bring about abuse in the first place.

The core message I get from most people who publicly spread their abuse story is not very different from what was formerly called *confessions*, with the difference only that the *priest* has been replaced by the *psychiatrist* and the expression *sin* by the expression *abuse*.

The Church punished the victim for having let it happen, the modern culture punishes the victim for not being aggressive enough to defend herself. The Church admonished sinners to comply with Church morals and thus to repress sexuality; modern culture

admonishes victims to get into therapy to boost up their aggressiveness to comply to modern society's paradigm of *violence is better than sex*. Thus, essentially, nothing has changed. It is often the punishment or the therapy more than the initial abuse that produces the guilt that erodes self-esteem.

However, society's hypocrisy and the pinkish foam of sentimentality as well as the black mask of panic and mass hysteria that surrounds this whole subject renders it almost impossible to leave what happened how it happened—without making it up, sensationalizing it and thereby distorting and even falsifying it in the most absurd way.

It's shame and taboo, restrictions of speech and dishonesty among close relatives that prepare the ground for abuse, not openness, honesty and outspoken needs and desires. It is a fact that if a father is socially or morally prohibited from expressing his incestuous needs verbally that prepares for acting out incest. The secret of harmony is naturalness and communication.

If you want to perpetuate war and destruction and the sentimentality that covers up the vital facts about the true reasons of abuse, do exactly that: prevent children from fulfilling their emotional needs, and pre-

vent both parents and children from what the late child therapist Françoise Dolto called *parler désir* (talk desire).

Truth is dynamite in a truthless culture where the mute, blind and deaf are both the leaders and the followers, characterized by their abhorrent ignorance of life and essential life functions.

Victimization as a social paradigm was established as a money-making machine in today's postmodern international consumer culture because it was institutionalized, organized, and socially structured. One chaotic soul will not do much harm with their agenda, but when a whole society, by its commercial setup, sets in place huge funding for creating an abuse-centered industry, then we are facing a paradigm shift for the worse. Then we are facing a return of tyranny, of persecution, and of mass indoctrination we thought we could bury in our history books.

The hero culture asks for a high price. The gods of patriarchy are blood-thirstier than their matriarchal predecessors, they are highly judgmental, revengeful and fanatic, and they hate one thing more than all, *permissiveness*. That is why the child, and childhood are in their constant focus. For it's a deadly sin in their eyes to raise children permissively, and that is why, in

turn, why they need abuse to happen. Abuse is exactly the price we pay when we deny to be permissive, and when we arrogate ourselves to be righteous demi-gods.

Patriarchy is set in a way that abuse will almost invariably happen, and that is why it creates victims, as a matter of cultural logic. The double-tongued hydra face of the league of child protectors becomes intelligible even for those who are in favor of child protection when it goes to label and denunciate children and adolescents as *sex offenders*, thereby registering them on lifelong databases that might destroy their later careers. These cases, that are not quite the clear-cut vintage that is often displayed in the media, are revolting, to say the least.

What happens here in the long run is to systematically destroy child sexuality, and this is really what it is: a *scary fascist agenda of hitherto unknown dimensions*.



# CHAPTER FOUR

---

## DOES PEDOPHILE LOVE EQUATE ABUSE?

### INTRODUCTION

In the present chapter I am asking if pedophile love, as it is most often argued in our culture, equates abuse? Well, I would like to wrap the question up differently, asking you if love, for you, equates abuse?

Don't laugh, for I seriously believe this society automatically assumes that *all love is abuse*. It's just as in modern medicine where everybody assumes that all life, one day, ends up in sickness.

It is common knowledge that in high civilizations of the past, the exact opposite regard was prevailing, namely that all life, if lived correctly, is producing *health, and more health*, not an automated pattern that leads to major sickness. This is perhaps simply a matter of self-fulfilling prophecies. While in the old traditions, people were thinking on the lines of 'life keeps

itself healthy,' today, because of various reasons, people rather argue in the opposite way, affirming that 'sickness is inherent in all life.'

If this is so, the question if *pedophile love per se equals abuse*, while it sounded so 'regular' first, assumes another taste, another fragrance, and another color; it assumes a flair of perversity, not to say that *the question in itself is perverse*. It is perverse because it is suggestive, manipulative.

The answer is clear and simple. Of course not. Pedophile love is *love* in the first place, as any other love is *love* in the first place, and not abuse. To repeat it, when a child chooses an adult over a peer, this decision must be respected if one day we at all grant children free choice relations; as a result, we cannot honestly assume a *qualitative difference* between the relation child-child, on one hand, and the relation child-adult, on the other, that can possibly emerge from this freedom of choice.

Hence, the dichotomy of *child-child sex vs. child-adult sex*, so common in our present media debate is a fake equation because on a normative level, there can't be a difference in these relations; if the child's free choice is the decisive element that triggers either of these relations, they have to be treated equally, both on

a social and a legal level, and within the framework of permissive education.

My historical survey has implicitly shown that adult-child loving relations were always part of the love game in our culture, if not worldwide, and the accounts we have, which are predominantly negative, and which are the only proof that historians present to us, cannot be taken for the whole truth. They are accounts of *accidental relationships*, accounts of hurt, that report abusive customs and relationships, and perhaps even, an abusive mindset regarding children. But they cannot be taken for the whole of the story, for the whole of adult-child erotic interactions over time.

—See Peter Fritz Walter, *Minotaur Unveiled: The Truncated Account of Adult-Child Erotic Attraction (Essays on Law, Policy and Psychiatry, Vol. 5, 2018)*.

In such a situation, where evidence is lacking, or the evidence present in court is biased, as a law practitioner, you are not supposed to take any definite conclusions; in such a case, the court will either ask for more evidence, or dismiss the case because ‘doubt is in favor of the accused.’

I use this as a metaphor, of course, because we are not evaluating legal evidence here, but historical evidence. What I am saying is that historians, and psy-

chohistorians, should be subscribed to a professional ethics; when I apply the *ethical rules of the law profession* to historical research, I must conclude that in the present case, no definite answer can be given and we have to say, sorry, we can't get to know the whole truth because of lacking evidence, and the evidence we do have is one-sided and biased.

As a result, we cannot go as far as Lloyd DeMause, Florence Rush or Alice Miller and conclude that all through human history, children were invariably abused, raped, tortured and infanticided, or used as amuse-jesters and night-pillows. And a step ahead, this means we can't conclude that history 'has proven that pedophilia is damaging for children,' which is the usual conclusion taken from such historical research.

Here, what we are facing is not scientific conclusions but *demagogy*, not search for truth, but *propaganda* that serves the system in which children have to shut up and keep their emotions in check so that they do not disturb ordained *consumption without reflection*. My argument is corroborated by the fact that etiologies of *pedophilia* and of *child rape* are clearly distinct. Our media refuse to make that distinction and thereby breed *more confusion than clarity* about the true nature of pedophilia.

## CHILD-ADULT SEX VS. CHILD-CHILD SEX

The pedophile movement argues that children, in the typical case, desire sex with adults as a natural and intuitive choice. Well, after studying native cultures, and among them especially the Trobriand culture that was subject to important field studies of both Bronislaw Malinowski and Margaret Mead, I question the truth of this argument. When looking at these natural tribes, it seems that children relate first of all to peers for experiencing their first steps into body pleasure and sexual curiosity.

The parents, in these cultures, are practicing an active form of non-intervention in their children's love life. Interestingly enough, homosexuality and pedophilia are practically non-existent among these natives, and sex crimes are virtually unknown. Also the low divorce rate of only 4% simply is astounding.

What also astonishes about Trobriand culture is the fact that they are much tougher than our culture for *safeguarding the incest taboo*. In fact, children live from age three in special dormitories in which where parents are not supposed to go at night, as we know this from Israeli kibbutzim.

—I heard about these Kibbutzim night rules in a documentary on German television on Israeli Kibbutzim years ago. That particular Kibbutzim practiced what they called the common standard of modern child rearing in Israel, and it was clearly stated that from the age of three, children sleep in dorms supervised by trained psychologists, and not by parents, and that parents have no access to their children at night. The why and how of this rule was justified, *inter alia*, with preventing incest. An exception was made only, it was stated, when the child was sick and insomniac, and would then be allowed to sleep with their parents for the time of their sickness.

As with the Trobriand natives, the parent-child separation is put up as a precaution against incest; in the kibbutzim, children, from age three, sleep separated from their parents in dormitories that parents are forbidden to enter at night, and where specially trained caretakers look after the safety of the children.

The question that comes up is if child abuse and pedophilia are perhaps the result of *repressing children's erotic peer relations* while at the same time overdoing the emotional closeness between parents and children in the nuclear family setting? My research on child abuse indeed is conclusive to the hypothesis that it's the lacking development of autonomy in modern child-rearing and resulting *parent-child codependence* within the nuclear family that is the root cause of child abuse and pedophilia.

The present split in the discussion of the subjects of so-called *childlove* and *child abuse* results from the fact that in our society, it is not scientific research that forges public opinion, but the necessarily partial views of the most powerful interest group.

Yet it appears that truth cannot be found on the basis of group interests and group perspectives since they are always partial. They represent keyholes. Only an approach that enables the reader to form their opinion in a state of quiet intuitive insight, without being influenced or manipulated by pro-and-con propaganda will eventually lead to a better understanding of the complexity of sexual desire in general, and desire for the young, in particular.

A few years ago, sending some mail to a group of boylovers that exposed their ideas on the World Wide Web and presenting in that mail my project for this book, they replied they could not understand any sexual attraction for little girls since they considered boylove being a form of *role modeling*; such role modeling is in their view impossible to occur in a relationship between a man and a little girl.

Besides the fact that I question why men should only be role models for boys and not for girls, there are recurrent arguments in the rhetoric of both pedophile

and homosexual interest groups. Their principle argument appears to be that their sexual orientation is in-born and cannot be changed.

I question this and believe there is no either-or in emotional and sexual attraction. If a person says that he or she can never and in no circumstance be attracted to a person of either sex, the person is either dishonest, ignorant about the pleasure function, naive or emotionally blocked, which means *neurotic*.

The nature of pleasure, in general, and of sexual desire, in particular, is *not* such that it creates exclusivity in partner choice. To believe it is infantile despite the fact that it is one of the strongest polemic arguments of the homosexuals. They have used this argument in order to gain a residual form of societal acceptance. However, in my exchanges with homosexuals, I found that this argument is but a rhetoric. Most of them admitted that exceptionally, they could sleep with a girl if only the girl was 'beautiful and responsive enough.' And in their life stories it was obvious that they had *just not found that kind of girl*, and one day stopped searching. And as a result of stopping the search for a viable mate of the other sex, their sexual energy retrograded and inverted.

—See Havelock Ellis, *Sexual Inversion* (1897/2001).



You may argue that among heterosexuals the same should then apply since love proceeds always in trial and error and that for that reason, many heterosexuals would have had to turn into homosexuals because of the frustration experienced in the fulfillment of heterosexual love.

The answer is that because our sexuality is not instinctive, the mating game is actually a matter of *taking chances and voting for options*. In a situation where I feel rejected, living through a depression that was brought about by a frustration of my sexual desire going along with a momentary hurt of my self-image, I may naturally react in reasoning out options. This may not be mental. It may be subconscious or it may be on a feeling level. I may decide to give it another try, or I may dare into getting ahead sexually with the other sex or another age group.

My point is that, in doing so, one by no means becomes homosexual, pedophile or gerontophile.

The fact to get stuck in some sexual orientation or the other has emotional reasons and reasons related to personal power. It is not primarily a question of sexual orientation, and still less of any pretended initial sexual orientation of the kind 'I'm born a homosexual.'

There is abundant sex research showing that homosexuality is well-established among mammals, but only under certain conditions, the primary being a lack of females in the group. It is also known that among primates, sodomy is practiced on young animals from the part of older and much stronger ones. Thus to cite nature for forwarding a mechanistic view of sexuality of the kind 'male jumps female of same kind, same age and same size,' as this is very common with ignorant and fundamentalist people is an ambiguous way of arguing. This is so because there is a lot of variety in nature regarding the mating game, much more than those simplistic thinkers, who typically deny erotic complexity, want to believe and accept. After all, some ants, after copulating, eat their husbands ...

Naturally in all matters of pleasure we try to compensate for pleasure we fail to get after repeated trials. We then look for a temporary surrogate pleasure, an *ersatz*. We do this because of the fear that our original sexual longing may be socially rejected.

Fear of living our genuine sexual longings impairs the high potential of creativity that is inherent in sexuality. It means to be afraid of the moving nature of life itself and its constant change. Sexual anxiety and all inhibitions that flow from it are manifestations of a

general *fear of life* that, as Alexander Lowen showed in many of his books, is firmly rooted in the Judeo-Christian cultural base setup, and of course equally established in orthodox Islam and Hinduism.

—See only Alexander Lowen, *Fear of Life* (2003).

Krishnamurti said that sexuality is creativity. However, he added that for most people in our non-creative culture, sexuality has become the only form of creativity; and that this caused a lot of strife and obsession. In *Education and the Significance of Life* (1978), Krishnamurti writes:

The intellect, the mind as such, can only repeat, recollect, it is constantly spinning new words and rearranges old ones; and as most of us feel and experience only through the brain, we live exclusively on words and mechanical repetitions. This is obviously not creation; and since we are uncreative, the only means of creativeness left to us is sex. Sex is of the mind, and that which is of the mind must fulfill itself or there is frustration. Our thoughts, our lives are narrow, arid, hollow, empty; emotionally we are starved, religiously and intellectually we are repetitive, dull; socially, politically and economically we are regimented, controlled. We are not happy people, we are not vital, joyous; at home, in business, at church, at school, we never experience a creative state of being, there is no deep release in our daily thought and action. Caught and held from all sides, naturally sex becomes our only outlet, an experience to be sought again and again because it momentarily offers that

state of happiness which comes when there is absence of self. It is not sex that constitutes a problem, but the desire to recapture the state of happiness, to gain and maintain pleasure, whether sexual or any other. (Id., p. 118)

People who experience high artistic, scientific or intellectual pleasure find it less of a problem to sublimate sexual feelings than those who lack out on deriving pleasure from those pursuits. It's a fact that when sexual fulfillment is temporarily not available, art, science, design or any other intellectual pursuit can become a temporary investment for sexual energy. In that sense, sex could be called a residual form of creativeness, one that steps in when all other outlets have become dysfunctional.

With child-focused sexual desires it is no different than with desire projected upon adult mates, as from a *functional view of sexuality*, the mate one chooses is not 'defining' one's sexual apparatus; the latter, namely, is setup by nature. The streaming of the sexual energy is not different when desire is projected upon children, infants, peers or elders.

This is an important observation to be done in addition to current sex research. So far, sex research was not able to really elucidate the true reasons and motivations behind the loving erotic attraction to children.

Research on love may be difficult in general as love cannot really be defined. We have to see also that research never helped us to love more, to be more tolerant and more understanding for the variety of the human experience which also always is an *emotional experience* and therefore, by its very nature, difficult to measure in the laboratory. People do not change their beliefs because of scientific research, because beliefs are not rational. Ivory tower studies serve those who sit in the tower, not those who live outside of it. The latter, and that is all of us, must *feel things emotionally*; that is however only possible if we take down our shields, our armors, our set opinions, our defensive assumptions, and open our heart to the streaming of emotions, and the wisdom of intuition.

While science only can touch our intellect, art inspires and transforms our whole being. Truth then, has to be searched for holistically, in an experience that combines the emotional and the intellectual sides of our nature, which connects both hemispheres of the brain, so that, according to the Renaissance ideal, art and science, in a synchronistic kind of movement become *philosophy*.

If we want to know and understand love, we must get away from the rigid assumptions and prejudiced

opinions of the mass media and formulate our own individual quest for truth.

I can be argued that poetry, literature, music and art represent more reliable sources of the multi-faceted reality of childhood over time than any scientific study on the matter. A scene drawn on a Greek vase that depicts a Greek warrior playing with the penis of a boy while both he and the boy look each other straight in the eyes says more about the possibility of loving adult-child sexual contact in that culture than any so-called historical case report.

I go beyond history as a garbage science. I say that we have to begin *hic et nunc*. If we want to know if children experience sex as positive and joyful or as negative and humiliating, we have to *ask them*. And since we cannot ask the children of the past, we have to begin asking the children that surround us here and now. Depending on the cultural conditioning they are submitted to, they will either say the truth, or lie, or keep silent. In my experience, the reactions of children are quite predictable.

- ▶ Children from sexually repressive, punitive and highly religiously doctrinaire cultures will keep silent or lie. They are not likely to tell the truth about their feelings or they have repressed them to such an extent that they do not even know

what they feel. These are the children who fake to consent, out of fear or false respect and sometimes later betray their lovers or just keep silent until they are grown up;

- ▶ Children from non-repressive yet patriarchal cultures tend to make up stories about early sex, especially boys. They tend to make believe to have had all the girls or even boys in their neighborhood which may be true to the extent that heterosexual and homosexual play is frequent among children in those cultures although it is hidden to the foreign observer;
- ▶ Children from non-repressive and semi-patriarchal or postmodern semi-matriarchal societies are likely to tell the truth, in a straightforward, unashamed manner, even if they hurt the feelings of an adult who tries to please them in order to get their consent to sexual play. Thus, they can say no. When they mean no. And, by the same token, they can say yes when they mean yes.

This is only a general structure, of course, and there are a number of variations within one cultural model or another, depending on a variety of factors, such as religious belonging of the family or father, provincial setting or metropolis, low-class environment or middle or upper class setting. The reason why we research on childhood is that we want to know what children need so that we, as a society, can more effectively meet that need. When we agree about this objec-

tive, we have as yet to define which tools we are going to use. If history, for the above-mentioned reasons, is a rather untrustworthy source of knowledge and thus a bad tool, we have to look for better sources of information.

Let us thus first inquire into the quality and trustworthiness of information we get from historical and psychohistorical sources; let us then evaluate if this information is really useful for answering the following questions: ‘What can we know about the quality of adult-child sexual contacts in the course of human history? Is there any prevalence contained in this information for childhood sexual experience to be predominantly negative, predominantly positive, or negative and positive at the same time, depending on other factors?’

This is a possible theoretical and pragmatic framework for research on the topic of the *History of Childhood*.

Research we have collected so far on this broad topic is far from being impartial, if it is not bluntly negative in its general outlook.

—See Peter Fritz Walter, *Minotaur Unveiled: The Truncated Account of Adult-Child Erotic Attraction* (Essays on Law, Policy and Psychiatry, Vol. 5, 2018).



At present, we are in a phase of collective awareness building regarding the quality of childhood over time. It seems that modern civilization, perhaps because of now almost a hundred years of psychoanalytic enlightenment, is beginning to get sensitized for the true needs of children.

It is impossible to prove that really childhood has always been negative or abusive! To repeat it, I intuit the account of positive erotic child-adult love over time was *truncated* for reasons of political correctness, with the result that today the overwhelming part of the literature on childhood, as far as history is concerned, traces a hopelessly negative picture.

However, if we add to these sources personal biographies and autobiographies, novels, poetry and the creations of our great painters, this picture becomes more diversified and more positive. And as a matter of fact, not everybody has got a bad or abusive childhood—fortunately so. There is always the danger to generalize one's own personal experience, and even the most objective of historians or psychohistorians is not free from this tendency. It is a fact that generally people take the pen to write their story because they suffer from high inner tension as a consequence of problems or of abuse suffered, not because they feel great. When

we feel great, we tend to expand more on the outside level, take action, get things done, make money, make love, engage in sport or travel around the world.

Many poets admit that it is rather in a state of melancholy, confusion or depression that they feel inspired for great poems, and not in the other case that they feel good and sober. From my own experience as a writer I know that this is true. Most of the time when I sat down to get my soul out on the paper, it was because I suffered so much and the inner tension resulting from all the hurts and humiliations I went through became just unbearable!

As a matter of fact, the years in which I wrote poems were by far the most difficult ones I had to cope with in my entire life, and writing poems helped me tremendously to clear out this inner confusion and tension. This is the principal reason why world literature and art treat the unwelcome and hurting aspects of life rather than the welcome and pleasurable ones. And if this is true in general, it is so much the more true for childhood stories.

This simple truth may be the reason why we find by far more negative childhood descriptions than positive ones in world literature. Besides that, my intuition tells me that people who always see the bad and nega-

tive in life and who have an over-protective attitude toward children have a *high anxiety level* and are generally blocked against acknowledging complexity. They are locked up in a fascist mindset that comes up with simplistic answers about all and everything, and that, worse, *pretends to know everything*. These parents tend to tell their children ‘Shut up, what do you know about life?’ So the child very early, and very consistently, learns that listening to one’s inner wisdom is a sin, because it equals being disobedient to one’s holy father or mother who, pretendedly so, know everything or for the least knows better than stupid little child.

When people see life as static, instead of perceiving it as a total and intrinsically dynamic experience, they tend to focus on the ugly and hurtful aspects of life. Thus, from their biased approach to the dark and light sides of life results a very fundamental and fundamentalist kind of prejudice: they emphasize the dark side of life while not giving enough attention to its light and joyful side. On the other hand, children do not have this kind of bias and that is why they tend to see sexual pleasure as something enjoyable that is related to a *deeper experience of love*, provided they are allowed to experiencing love at all.

To find a way between the extreme positions of child protectors, on one hand, and pedophiles, on the other, it is useful to look at the spectrum of the whole of society regarding this controversial topic. It then namely appears that the answers are not that clear-cut and that there are not just two opposite positions, but at least six *different overall perspectives*.

And these six types of reactions are mainly conditioned by experience and the result of *early emotional impregnation*, rather than distinctly rational points of view—while most people tend to deny the impact of their emotions and pretend having carefully reasoned positions.

The events that form people's basic mindset regarding issues of life and death, or sexuality, often occur as early as in childhood at a time and in circumstances that later are blinded out from memory by *amnesia*. Amnesia namely happens when the experience was such that the child's conscious mind was not able to assimilate it in any way with previous events or if the experience was humiliating, hurting or sad, or else if the experience was against the child's basic code.

Regarding the last alternative, the psychoanalytic and pedagogical literature is controversial. This is, among other parameters, the main reason for the irra-

tionality of the response that most people display regarding subjects such as child sexuality, sexual freedom for children and adult-child sexual relations.

What I'd like to do is to examine the most frequently encountered answers given, but solely for their irrational, emotional content. I won't inquire into what would possibly be the most rational answers, for that's not the point. The idea is to have a deeper look at the emotional quality, the *emotional dimension* of the answers, because after all, we are dealing here with an emotionally charged topic. The majority of publications, especially those under the header of *sexology*, until this day have not taken this look. They have in the contrary brushed off any obviously irrational answers, saying that people were misinformed, anxious or misguided—and it's here where I see the Socratic error. Researchers have namely missed to see the key to understanding this very irrationality, this very emotionality of people's reactions to the fact of sexual love between children and adults. This key is of paramount importance because it can help building a bridge between the extreme positions of pedophiles, on one hand, and mainstream society, on the other.

My guess is that this bridge is built with emotions as the building stones and that therefore the relation-

ship childlovers can have with the meta group either becomes positively emotional, or else the status quo will be maintained, which means no relationship.

Research papers, how well written and intended they may be, are not going to change this fact. And you may well reflect about the utter failure of the undoubtedly highly intellectual pedophile movement.

The six overall reactions to childlove can be summarized as follows:

- ▶ (A) Love with children, and sex, possible, I don't know.  
*Emotional attitude: Positively indifferent*
- ▶ (B) I don't care, I'm not aroused by small stuff.  
*Emotional attitude: Negatively indifferent*
- ▶ (C) I liked it as a child. It enriched me emotionally and sexually.  
*Emotional attitude: Positively subjective*
- ▶ (D) I had such experience. I felt like a stone, victimized, abused.  
*Emotional attitude: Negatively subjective*
- ▶ (E) I abhor it. People who do that have to be killed.  
*Emotional attitude: Moralistic, judgmental, projective, defensive, idealistic, pseudo-objective, negative, generalizing*

- ▶ (F) I think we have to distinguish violence and love.  
*Emotional attitude: Positively affirmative, objective, scientific, conscious*

What difference is there between an emotional and a non-emotional response? Or, to put it differently, who has the greater understanding of the matter, the one who reacts emotionally or the one who reacts defensively, guarding off his or her emotions and hiding behind judgments and projections? Let us have a look at each response and get a feel what people really want to convey.

#### A) POSITIVELY INDIFFERENT

‘Love with children, and sex, possible, I don’t know.’

The emotional content of this answer is one of *laissez faire, laissez vivre*, an old rule for love in, for example, the older French culture. More importantly, love and sex with children is seen to form a part of the general experience of love, including physical love. This is said implicitly, non-verbally. But then it was added that it could not be said if this was to be judged as good or bad, positive or ugly, honestly admitting ignorance of the matter.

#### **Historical example**

In France, under the regime of Napoleon III, street prostitution flourished in Paris to an enormous extent and most of the prostitutes were young girls from eight to fifteen years of age. They were a lot

cheaper to have than older ones because they were street girls, while controlled prostitutes were relegated to brothels, and therefore more expensive.

### B) NEGATIVELY INDIFFERENT

'I don't care; I'm not aroused by small stuff.'

The emotional content of this response is similar to the first example in that the person does not care, meaning would not attack or persecute others for their sexual behavior. The person then justifies their lack of concern by the fact that he or she did never experience a sexual response to children. Apart from the fact that sexuality can be exclusively focused on adults, in my observation, the answer displays personal or emotional non-involvement.

#### **Historical example**

Casanova is to be seen, from the content of his diaries, as an obsessed women lover or *Don Juan* figure who was not interested in young girls. The typical women's attributes such as a relatively pronounced bottom, large nipples, long legs, abundant pubic hair and sexual maturity were a precondition for his arousal. He would have refused, contrary to Marquis de Sade, a pre-menstrual flat girl with a bald sexual organ.

### C) POSITIVELY SUBJECTIVE

'I liked it as a child. It enriched me emotionally and sexually.'

Here, we have a personal involvement in the matter and thus an informed statement. The answer is emotional in that it does not attempt to rationalize or to



justify anything. It relates a personal experience that was felt to be positive and gives a value judgment that the experience has enriched the person erotically.

#### D) NEGATIVELY SUBJECTIVE

'I had such an experience. I felt like a stone, victimized, abused.'

This statement relates a negative experience for the child concerned. However, the person does not give a value judgment generally about pedophilia. The boy who made this statement only said that his experience of sex with a grown-up man was ugly and that he himself felt victimized and abused.

In my talks with school children who have given statements like the present one, I have found that the experiences were invariably of a kind that not only the child concerned but a majority of people, including most pedophiles, would judge the behavior of the adult involved reprehensible.

#### **Real-Life Example**

The little six-year old boy had just entered primary school and had to traverse a large public park on his way home. During noon time, and in summer, he said, the park was usually quite abandoned since it was too hot to sit out there. When the boy was passing the park, a man jumped out from a nearby bush and quickly grabbed him from behind, putting one hand firmly on his mouth which almost suffocated the child. Immediately, the man opened the boy's trousers and fondled his penis with the other hand. Then the man took the hand from the boy's mouth, turned him around and French-kissed him. Whereupon the man said if the boy told anything about the experience, he would kill him. Then the man ran

away. The boy reported he felt like he was dreaming, and then went home. Upon my question if he ever told his parents or anybody else about the experience, he shook his head and affirmed that I was the first person he related this experience to. When I insisted why he had not told his parents, he said 'They would not have believed me.' Asked about his feelings after the experience he said that he had felt very angry at the man because he had almost suffocated him and forced him to be kissed 'inside of his mouth.'

E) MORALISTIC, JUDGMENTAL,  
PROJECTIVE, DEFENSIVE

'That's abject behavior. People who do that have to be killed.'

This is the usual moralistic, judgmental and hypocrite smear of people close to churches or other sex-denying ideologies. What these people have in common is their total ignorance on the subject of pedophilia. Typically, this vintage of people judge 'from a green desk,' having read numbers of reports written by system-conform scientists, newspaper clippings, and perhaps also looked into forensic studies, psychological evaluations and litigations. They regularly refuse to talk with children directly, and hardly ever look at matters from a non-judgmental perspective. Thus, they have actually no idea about how children think about sex in general, and sex with adults in particular, how they react to such experiences, and how they later on may think about these experiences, once they're grown up. I guess that these people's rigid attitude has its real origin in the fact that they themselves have no satisfying sex life or else lead a complicated, disturbed or negative sex life.

These people are thus unable to provide any balanced evaluation of the question of children and sex. Personally, when I saw this kind of attitude in mothers, I could often discover in further talk that the woman has been raped at one specific moment in her life, either by her father, a boyfriend or, much more seldom, a stranger.

Many of those activist women who today work in child protection organizations or are members of feminist organizations, openly declare themselves as being abuse victims or incest survivors. Thus, bluntly stated, people with a damaged sexuality and a damaged psyche go around telling other people and the media what healthy sexuality is supposed to be about—and what not. I do not lose a word here. As a lawyer, a witness suffering from such kind of hangup is easy to dismiss, as their statement is biased and has little or no ontological value.

### **Examples**

Any daily newspaper clipping, television report or magazine where adult-child sexual relations are demonized and indiscriminately mixed up with child abduction, child murder, child trade or the illegal production of child pornography.

#### **F) POSITIVELY AFFIRMATIVE, SUBJECTIVE, CONSCIOUS**

‘I think we have to distinguish between violence and love.’

This statement first of all surprises by its honesty and its personal touch. The interviewed person shows a conscious attitude toward the values involved in the game. The person is vehemently against violence and thinks it is possible to distinguish more or less clearly

between sexual assault that is violent and sex play that is not. The person then points out criteria she thinks are decisive for sex play not being violent which are enumerated as—

- child and adult close to each other;
- presence of mutual bonding;
- presence of care and trust;
- absence of enticement and/or manipulation;
- considerable time of knowing each other;
- clear affirmative response given by the child.

This statement is particularly valuable in that it very clearly states the different criteria the person thinks are important for judging a sex relation with a child a truly pedophile relation. Considering the general confusion and media hysteria about the topic, statements like the present one generally require a long and intensive inner work.

To summarize, we can see that there is something like a an array of possible reactions to adult-child sexual interaction, and that reactions are far from being uniform. In fact, it seems that there is quite a variety of opinions among people, and this despite the fact that the mass media try to make believe that everybody thinks on the same lines, that there is *one monolithic opinion* and that there is something like a general consensus about it in our society. This is quite irresponsible from a journalistic point of view because more

careful research indicates that such consensus is difficult if not impossible to make out. The truth is that opinions are divided on the question, and that there generally is a high level of ignorance about the details in play, so that most people's judgments are either biased or lacking essential information.

## POSSIBLE ETIOLOGIES OF PEDOPHILIA

It may be intriguing to look at the possible etiologies of pedophilia. Besides the clinical literature on the subject, there may be specific reasons in the form of *inner motivations* why adults, either from early in their lives, or later in life turn toward children for finding emotional and sexual gratification.

My research indicates that there are indeed reasons other than sexual for a man to identify himself or herself as a 'pedophile.' I call them psychological reasons. I do not believe in statements like 'Nature has made me so' or 'I've been born like that.' It is not very likely that loving children erotically is something we are born into or we have inherited or that is fallen upon us by a magic spell of destiny.

*There are no events in nature without specific reasons.*  
All and everything hangs together with other things

because our universe is multi-causal and multi-vectorial.

—See, for example, Donna Eden, & David Feinstein, *Energy Medicine* (1998), Amit Goswami, *The Self-Aware Universe: How Consciousness Creates the Material World* (1995) and Michael Talbot, *The Holographic Universe* (1992).

The fact that most people are too lazy for finding out about such reasons is not a justification for investing in their ignorant worldview. And it cannot impede those who want to know to get the answers they need to get, that is, *true answers*.

When I say that there are psychological reasons for childlove I mean that sensitive men opt for childlove in a rather conscious way, and that we have here a love choice that is not just conditioned by sexual training we have received early in life, but that is the result of a rather non-sexual choice. Humans are not primates and they do not act out ‘sexual programs.’

*Humans in fact constantly make love choices.* Our love life is volatile and dynamic and this dynamics is exactly the reason why it is healthy. Love is like life itself in that it dies when it becomes static; it stagnates if it resists change. The love choices I am talking about are not choices regarding the sexual mating game, but are

situated on the forefront of sexual mating, on a quite different plane. They are *emotional* choices.

To illustrate my point, let me cite here a statement from hundreds of its kind to be found on the Internet, where lovers, under the protection of anonymity, tell the story of how their love life took a decisive turn in changing its emotional quality:

ANONYMOUS PEDOPHILE

I fell in love with their innocence, their sincere love and caring, and all of the spontaneous and fearless things that little girls do but big girls don't. In other words, I was falling in love with their whole being instead of just with their bodies. I would not regard myself a pedophile at that time, it was just one aspect of my sexual feelings, but it was there. It was only one to one and a half years ago that I found that there was more. There wasn't just lust, there was love. I wasn't just sexually attracted to them, but emotionally too. And that was the time that I also came out to myself, and said 'Yes, I am a pedophile.'

The tenor of all these statements is that if a man or woman has only once in a while a sexual desire for a girl or boy below the age of consent, this is to be evaluated a special thrill of their sex life, a distraction of the senses, as it were, or some kind of sexual luxury. If, however, the person begins to feel emotionally attracted to children, and this emotional attraction has a dimension far greater than sexual attraction and becomes

a more and more stable feature in their daily life, the person is beginning to consider himself or herself as a pedophile, a ‘childlover’ in their own self-labeling terminology.

I was curious to find out to which extent these men or women were emotionally attracted to the children they met and had sex with. Once working in South-East Asia, I did not need to go far to meet street children and prostitute children. The streets were full of them in the warm evenings, and most of them were very friendly and funny little boys and girls.

Talking with them, I saw that these children subtly distinguished between certain types of customers—the ‘nice ones’ or friends, and the ‘not nice ones.’

The latter group, I could find out, were the ordinary tourists who profited from the occasion to have sex with a child once in a while or once in a lifetime, and those usually had adult local girlfriends.

These guys were described as ‘out for quick sex without fuss,’ and it was said they did not want to meet the children’s families and did hardly show any feelings. They were further described as ‘proud to have all they can get for money.’ My question if the children liked these men was answered in the negative and



there was often a little detail the children advanced, that was, interestingly enough, not related to the sexual encounter itself, but to some or the other detail one would call insignificant if it was not showing that they actually hated those men. I remember what one eight-year old street girl, that I will call *Sandra*, said about one of those guys:

He never took me home. He had a big car and coming from his hotel he was always busy to join his girlfriend in a particular bar that was quite far from my home. He always just left me at a corner of a cross-road from which I had to walk more than half an hour through the busy hot streets until I was home. Usually I was very tired then, and thirsty, while he was probably laughing about me with his girlfriend. One time, when I complained, he almost pushed me out of the car, getting angry that I dared to ask him for what he considered a long ride. This would cost him too much gas, he said, and I got out, very angry.

Curious, I wanted to know more about the second group, the ones they called *friends*, and how *they* behaved. Friends, I was told, were men that were special in some sort. First because they traveled alone, never in groups, never with friends and never with a wife. It was added that most of these men were not married. Secondly, these men typically invited the children for a meal or bought them gifts without asking something in

return. They were usually described as men who 'are good and care.'

Then, Sandra told me, the story would in most cases go on in the following way:

When I like him, I give him a bracelet for free, to tell him he's nice. Some of them are very funny and they like to listen to us. Often it happens that the man is interested just in one of us. This shows up quite early. It means that for example the man is more friend with me than the other girls or he gives me more attention after a while. Maybe he likes to take two of us, which I think is more fun! Then we go with him to his hotel or even stay with him a week or two, and when he comes back, he will search for us again. I had one from France who was so sweet, he was even writing me often and sometimes put some money in the letter.

Then, in most cases, the man is invited, one of the following days, to the house of the children. The children are ashamed to take their lover to their homes since they live in such primitive huts and are afraid their new big friends would despise them for the dirt around their home and the primitive lifestyle. But generally, those men are described as being rather indifferent to that or even spontaneously offer help, give some money to repair the roof or bring the baby to the doctor. Most of the time, I heard, the children who have a stable lover are suffering a lot of teasing from their lit-

tle friends in the street; obviously, they are envied because they are treated in a way that is considered as privileged.

Those men are said to be really special in that, once they have made a choice among the children, they stick to it and treat the love child or love children, even in public, in a way that others treat only their spouses or girlfriends.

From these talks it became quite clear to me that the second group to be described by the street children are the true pedophiles. My question if there were also women who could be 'friends' was answered positively. When the question was if there was some love or sex involved in the relation, the children said it was different regarding boys and girls. If the ladies desired boys, they wanted generally the bigger boys, those who got already a 'big thing.'

If however ladies had a liking for little girls, it was not so easy for them to get one because most girls were afraid they'd be called Lesbian afterwards by their peers. But since those ladies would give lots of money, they would always end up finding a willing girl.

This talk with the group took a funny turn, when the boys joined in and said they wanted to 'fuck the fat

white ladies,' but the girls were advancing the ladies wanted 'the big cock and not your tiny thing' which made the boys more or less violently hit back.

The prostitute boys among them were more macho in that they did not allow their love relations to be exposed in the way the girls did it. They said they like to just stay in the hotel with their friends and eat at snack bars or play video games at places where there are not many tourists around.

Sandra later invited me to visit her house and I met her smaller sister. As that girl behaved in strangely frightful ways, I was asking Sandra if that had always her way to relate to foreigners? Sandra, sadly, shook her head and added she had be raped by Jim, that man she had talked about in our first meeting, and that since that time she was very mistrusting toward all foreigners. Upon my question how that could happen, she said he had wanted to sleep with her and her sister in the hotel and in the night, he had done it with her, when Sandra herself was sleeping.

That man was later arrested by the police for having raped another little girl, and not surprisingly so, but not as a matter of truth, he was called, in the news, a sex-traveling pedophile. He clearly was not.

Sandra, whom I knew for about four years, later married, when she was around twelve, and first seemed to be happy with her local husband. She gave birth to a healthy girl when she was just twelve and a half and on the outside level all seemed fine for her. She had got a job as a hairdresser and did manicure and pedicure for female tourists and earned a relatively high salary. But asking her if she was happy, she said:

At that time, you remember, some years ago, when I was still small, and had many tourist friends, I was much more happy. Now, I think my life is boring and my husband is really not nice with me. I must give him all my money. He only rides around with the motorbike all day long, drinking with his friends, and at home he beats me. He has no interest at all in our child. And I cannot meet my old friends. When they write me, and he finds the letters, he tears them up. I feel my life is wasted now, and before I was sometimes so happy and really felt loved and cared for. Because my parents never cared, as you know.

I recount these stories here because they throw some light upon the psychological makeup of the pedophile, while showing the attitude of the heterosexual lover who is out for some additional erotic thrill.

It is important to realize that both groups very strongly differ in the way they presented themselves to the street children I interviewed. While I do think that we cannot simply transpose and generalize these expe-

riences, taken from a quite exotic culture, and superpose them upon any of our Western countries, there are some details that have a rather universal significance in that they show that a true love relation is typically characterized by values such as *care, affection, loyalty, generosity, understanding, patience, a sense for social relations, respect, discretion and tact*, characteristics that are the same in any socially accepted love relation anywhere in the world.

The children, not having been impregnated as yet by a life-denying religious paradigm, were judging the right or wrong of relationships with foreign tourists not invariably according to a material measure, but they were distinguishing relations along the *affection level* that was present in the relation.

That the children also got money or favors, in relations where affection primed did not keep them from judging those relations good and helpful to them and their families, while they found relations where they gave sex in exchange for money useful and necessary, but ‘not nice.’

They obviously had more pleasure in relations where there was affection, sharing, friendship and true love while sex was present in both kind of relations.

What I cannot judge and write about here, because of lacking information, is the interesting question if perhaps the *kind of sex* that was present in both kind of relationships was different as well? It would certainly be too generalizing to say that all heterosexual men who approach children for sex engage, like Jim, in sexually coercive ways with them, and all true pedophiles in mutually consenting ways. The picture is probably rather diverse. As I could not research the sexual details for that reason, I would like to focus more closely on the *psychological reasons* why adults may love children and want to be around children.

It may sound somewhat artificial to distinguish between *sexual* and *psychological* reasons for love, since in daily life things are not that clear-cut, but it is a hint that may help us to get a felt sense for what really primes in pedophile relations.

In my opinion, corroborated by the views of those children, who, after all, had a lot of factual life and love experience, what primes seems to be affection and care, not sex. In coming-out reports, one finds invariably long descriptions about the sexual changes and new feelings and only one or two little key sentences that point to the dramatic change in the *emotional setup* of the person. I think that this has to do with a general

tendency in our Western culture to be more focused upon sex than upon emotions. The truth is that changes in our sexual behavior are preceded by changes in our affective setup, in the way we experience relationships *emotionally*. And for this reason, a researcher must focus more on the emotional reasons for love than on the merely sexual ones.

## POSSIBLE ETIOLOGIES OF CHILD RAPE

On the other hand, this insight could also give us some hints to explain violent sexual behavior. My hypothesis is that violent behavior is a consequence of the *absence of affection*; it may be that affection is blocked or otherwise repressed as something that contradicts the person's self-image.

Typically, in those relations the adult does not identify himself as pedophile, but uses one or the other *macho stereotype* to explain his somewhat unusual sexual hunger. The process starts with sex fantasies involving children that mentally stage forbidden sexual behavior and that the person subsequently represses under guilt and shame.

These fantasies, then, are acted out in a compulsory movement and often after the consciousness barrier



has been lowered by alcohol, consciousness altering drugs or other external stimuli. The problem in child rape is *abuse of power* which is not primarily a sexual problem or a question of sex relations, but a question about how a particular person is able or not able to handle frustration and depression in their lives.

While it has been proven already by researchers like Nicholas Groth that, in general, most rape cases are either anger rape or power rape cases, these insights are so much the more valid for child rape in that the child, because of their weaker, smaller and more innocent appearance, is an almost ideal projection object for those repressed and retrograde love energies.

—Nicholas A. Groth, *Men Who Rape: The Psychology of the Offender* (1980).

However, we should bear in mind that in order to understand *child love* it's awkward to find out about it by researching on *child rape*. While this exactly is the strange turn that Western science has taken regarding childlove, it is absurd when you look at it. This namely means that we try to define health from what we have seen is sickness. However, to know what sickness is does by far not mean we know what health is, simply because *health is much more than the absence of sickness*. To say, childlove is much more than the absence of

child rape. If a heterosexual lover affirmed loving women was good just because it is characterized by not raping women, he would certainly be contradicted in public with the argument that love is much more than the absence of rape!

## PEDOEMOTIONS ARE UNIVERSAL

### Pedoemotions (Definition)

Pedoemotions are temporary, transient, recurring or exclusive emosexual desires and fantasies involving children.

While pedoemotions are not primarily sexual, they focus our emotional attention upon children in a way that children become more important, more attractive, more interesting to be with, more captivating and more seducing than they are for a control person with a lesser degree of pedoemotions.

Pedoemotions are present in both men and women and their love objects can be either male or female children or in a bisexual form both boys and girls.

The path for the future, in my view, is to foster and encourage sane emotional relationships with children *within a social framework of accepted pedoemotions*, so that adult-child erotic relations can be lived in constructive and non-harmful ways. Only if we get at coding pedophilia as an essentially *social behavior*, we can say that we eventually take the responsibility we have

as a society for saving all the children still to be raped, tortured and killed if we deny action now and remain with the ineffective and socially destructive paradigm of a total child sex taboo.

One of the biggest problems in pedophilia is the shared responsibility between lover and love child, which in many cases may turn out to be a heavy burden for the child, especially when the parents of the child are ignorant and supposedly or outspokenly against the love relation.

From this burden of secrecy, depressions, insomnia and other psychological problems may result. It is for this reason not astonishing that one of the most extensive studies, that of the Dutch psychologist Theo Sandfort from Utrecht University in the Netherlands, examining twenty-five boy lovers and boys, came to the result that *psychological problems were present* in the cases only where the parents were ignorant or against the man-boy relation, and that they were totally absent in the relationships where the parents of the boy fully consented to the relation—which was the case in about one third of the samples.

—Theo Sandfort, *The Sexual Aspect of Pedophile Relations: The Experience of Twenty-five Boys* (1982).

However, even in the relations where such burden existed because the couple had to hide their love, the exams showed that neither of the boys had any serious or acute psychological problems or hangups. This is astonishing news for traditional child psychology since it proves that the psychological make-up of a child is much more robust than Western child psychology tends to admit.

## AESTHETIC AND POETIC LOVE OF CHILDREN

Today, it is to hope that despite draconian punishments and general child abuse hysteria, poetic and non-sexual love of children has still its privileged and discrete corners in the holy or not so holy family of our times. The wholeness of the family is exactly demonstrated by the fact that it can tolerate and assimilate adults who give the children that form of *erotized affection* that is typically not acted out upon through actual sex, but that the parents often neglect because they confuse nutritive tactile care with erotic love.

When I met the French psychotherapist Dr. Françoise Dolto (1908-1988) in her Paris apartment in

1986, she told me in that interview that she was supportive of eroticized adult-child relations outside the family since it was a way to lower the incest problems within our *highly incestuous* nuclear urban family structure. This was so, she explained, because the child, especially during the *Oedipus Complex* and later in adolescence, could project their incestuous desires upon loving adults other than their parents.

This view that was shared, at that time and even more so before (during the 60s and 70s), by many psychologists and psychoanalysts, now belongs to the intellectual dynamite mainstream society tries to conceal by all means. It has to be seen that Françoise Dolto, when talking about *eroticized* relations did by no means imply relations where intercourse is taking place. Hence, we have to be attentive to this subtle yet distinct difference.

To respond erotically to a child is according to Dolto a sane reaction; to pursue that erotic interest up until actual sex play or even intercourse with the child is *not*, according to Dolto, a sane reaction.

Today however, the child abuse paranoia resulted in a much less distinctive regard. Research has been suppressed, funding taken away or has been directed

into other channels, for example those of the child protection industry.

It sounds somewhat out of the air when child protectors claim the *sexual innocence* of the child or similar hypotheses that were shown to be myths already at the beginning of the last century when Sigmund Freud discovered the sexual nature of the child.

But anyway, this debate is not of much relevance for the poetic lover of children because he or she abstains from approaching the child sexually. Loving children poetically, without acting out on erotic feelings, was not at any time in human history regarded as a dangerous behavior, until child protectors declared that even mere erotic feelings for children were a potential abuse case. To show how biased this view is, a general study or monograph about the aesthetic value of childlove needs to be written.

Presently photographers seem to be more active than writers to invoke, through associations and a very sensitive way to exhibit children, a foretaste of what I would call the aesthetic value of adult-child erotic attraction. I primarily think of Jan Saudek.

Saudek is special in that his message is clear, yet subtle and non-obtrusive, and therefore acceptable also

for non-pedophiles. The message is honest in that it does not fake to show an objectivized child or a post-modern version of Rousseau's *Émile*, but a decorated child that is voluntarily and humbly seen as a projection container. In fact, it is illusory and moralistic to judge depraved our need for the child to being a fetish and receptacle for our dreams, our *Sehnsucht* for a better world, our poetic fantasies of a *lucid tenderness* that is not male or female, nor otherwise fragmented, but *androgynous*, whole and truly innocent, divine and eternally lovely.

—See, for example, June Singer, *Androgyny* (1976).

Poetic love for children is unlimited in its dream-like dimension, in its poetics. It is somehow associated with the belief in fairies, in supernatural powers, in animated nature, and a *God Pan*—that had his place in the Greek pantheon, and that wishes to be respected by humans for his conquests of innocent little girls.

—Pan is the Greek god who watches over shepherds and their flocks. He has the hindquarters, legs, and horns of a goat, in the same manner as a satyr or pane. The parentage of Pan is unclear; in some myths he is the son of Zeus, though generally he is the son of Hermes. His mother is said to be a nymph. In universal mythology Pan is associated with the male sexual drive, and sometimes with sexual desire for young girls.

There are many poetic writings that are the result of love for children, such as the *Peter Pan* story or *Kim*, by Rudyard Kipling which describes a wonderful love relation between a magician and a little British boy in India, the *Petit Prince* by Saint-Exupéry and many others, but they leave open the question of a possible sexual relation, or leave it over to the reader's fantasy. The whole of modern child art production including Walt Disney is the result of loving feelings for children, yet of a love perhaps voluntarily restrained to its poetic and platonic dimension.

One may argue in the fore-field that these productions may not comply with my rather exact definition of childlove as an erotic form of love. However, I argue that *erotic intelligence* is not per se to be acted out sexually, through sexual behavior of any kind, but can remain a world of fantasy, and live its erotic dimension in the poetic domain. It therefore also did not define poetic love for children as 'childlove' because it is not sexualized, but has sublimated any associated sexual feelings.

To begin with, I find our society's definition of sexuality a joke, if not an aberration. We are sexual in a much larger dimension than monkeys mounting each other as a game of instincts. We humans are not in-



stinctual, but consciousness impacts on our very genes as has been shown by both quantum physics and psychoneuroimmunology.

—See, for example, Candace B. Pert, *Molecules of Emotion: The Science Behind Mind-Body Medicine* (2003), Richard Gerber, *Vibrational Medicine: Energy Healing and Spiritual Transformation* (2002), Donna Eden, & David Feinstein, *Energy Medicine* (1998), Amit Goswami, *The Self-Aware Universe* (1995), Michael Talbot, *The Holographic Universe* (1992).

There are to be found less friendly testimonials as well, often by anonymous authors, such as the *Diary of a Gentleman*, which I mentioned earlier on and which was one of the Victorian bestsellers. However, the cynical sadism typical for this kind of productions cannot really find an audience among non-sadistic pedophiles.

The author, a noble living during the industrial revolution in England, and frequenting young prostitute girls from the poor worker milieu in London, exhibits a strange form of pride in raping these girls literally to their blood, deriving from his conquests a deep manly satiation that almost totally misses out elements of empathy, compassion and shared pleasure. My heart was bleeding when I read his accounts that were republished in Florence Rush's book about the sexual abuse of children.

My reaction to that stuff was *visceral and immediate*, and not the result of reflection. It was as if my whole body and soul revolted.

Yet in modern culture sadism is so deeply ingrained in general morality, which is only logical because *morality is sadism*, that people tend to take such sordid adventures for granted and argue ‘Well, that’s exactly what pedophilia is about and that’s why it’s abject.’

And here’s the error. There are also heterosexual lovers who have not made the transition from the *mute sex communication called rape* to explicit sex communication that manifests through shared intercourse. Rape simply is a form of silent masturbation, where the partner is not present in her total reality, but only on the fantasy level of the lover.

I am not for that matter spreading illusions; pedophile desire strives for fulfillment as any other form of sexual desire, but orgasm and fulfillment can be achieved in many other ways than by penetration. I do not deny that penetration gives an additional thrill, whatever a man’s sexual preference be, but a caring pedophile will know to avoid harming the child. Research statistics have shown with an astonishing constancy over the years that most pedophiles do not attempt to penetrate a child against their will, nor in the

case when a child is well willing to be penetrated, but because of inexperience doesn't really understand what this implies. In such a case, when proceeding to penetration would obviously be painful for the child, caring pedophiles would abstain, and achieve fulfillment in non-harmful ways.

This is actually a matter of common sense, and there is no reason to believe that pedophiles have lesser common sense than other people. Besides, it's also a matter of sexual experience. It has been shown in clinical reports that most of the men who do harm to children by penetration or in other ways during the sexual encounter, are *either sexual virgins or have had very little sexual experience with children*.

In most cases, and where sadism is not part of the game, the man will try to find viable compromises between his desire for fulfillment and the child's interest to being hurt as little as possible. There are many ways to achieve orgasm in tender ways, without any penetration needed, for example, between the child's legs, or through masturbation while caressing the child's naked body. Most children are more readily available for such kind of activity than for example doing fellatio or kissing; most small children do not like to kiss, while there are exceptions.

I have seen parents from Spain and Belgium french-kissing their children, while I do not have reason to assume that they were in any way sexual with their offspring. On the other hand, it cannot be denied that french-kissing does trigger sexual arousal, generally, and in this case, probably both in the parents and the child.

However, it has to be noted that erotic attraction between parents and children is, without actual sexual follow-up is not felt as illicit in many cultures of the world, Spanish and Belgian cultures among them, while the same activity would be felt as almost criminal in British and American culture.

In my experience as a babysitter, babies really like to french-kiss with parents and caretakers but most parents and nursery teachers teach babies that such behavior is *indecent*. This early wet-kiss taboo is probably the reason why many children are apathetic to mouth-to-mouth kisses. Some children are even really allergic against it, and lovers have to understand this, and much more, if they want their love children remember intimate communication and embrace as a positive, empowering and enriching experience.

After these explanations, it may hopefully not come over as a propagandist statement when I argue that the

before-mentioned pamphlet of a Victorian gentleman anonymous is by no means to be taken as a representative pedophile publication. In fact, much of the material commonly cited in bibliographies and link lists about pedophilia is of that kind and has thus little value for research on erotic love for children, the *loving, empathic and emotionally balanced, and not chaotic or sadistic erotic attraction for children.*

To find cultures that bestowed on erotic childlove an aesthetic value, we have to go way back before Christian times. Christianity never made an attempt to understand adult-child erotic attraction, even though the Vatican Library is reported to contain abundant material depicting and reporting sex stories between priests and minister children. Depending on who was the person in charge or the Pope, these cases were persecuted with more or less rigor, or perhaps not persecuted at all during some times.

There were minority voices that stated pederasty between priests and young boys to be beneficial for both the priest and the boy. It was argued *inter alia* that a priest was committing a lesser sin by having sex with a child than with a woman.

I do not know what the opinion was regarding small girls but I tend to think that the taboo on homo-

sexuality within the Christian belief system is *stricter* than illicit sex with a virgin since in the latter case it is believed, according to the Genesis, that the woman, though small, is always the beginner.

On the aesthetic level, the Church has definitely not contributed to integrate pedophilia in its paradigm. Its position is similarly defensive as the official positions of Islam or Buddhism while, here as well, sex relations between religious officials and children are reported in the literature.

While those events are simply taken as abuse or, in a less aggressive way, as ‘weakness of the flesh,’ I could so far not see an effort within organized religions to come to at least an *open discussion*, a paper, a research or otherwise a creative way to deal with the fact that children have a sexual side, and that it’s okay, and a plus for them, when they are sexually attractive for adults. In ancient times, that was rather different.

In the meantime, almost everybody knows that pederasty was practiced with the Greeks and the Romans, but few people looked deeper, to see that in those cultures, pederasty was already on the decline and had taken low and abusive forms.

Where we see adult-child sexual love blossoming without such abuses, and without the sadistic component, is in still older cultures such as for example Minoan Civilization, pre-pharaonic Egypt, ancient Persia and Turkey until, still farther back in time, the Sumer civilization. The abuses came about through slavery, later on, and were not originally contained in the custom of loving children erotically.

*First of all, lovers are not per se abusers.* This is so for all love, not only for the erotic love of children. Lovers are those who live their love *conscious* of all its implications. Abusers are those who repress their love or are *unconscious* about a drive they do not understand and not really try to handle. This is true for both adults and children, for children can be lovers, too. They have been pushed in our culture into the role of the passive ‘sufferer’ in the love relation which is an ignorant reduction of their total ability for love, and sexual love.

In ancient cultures, children were not yet seen as beings of a second class, but as adults’ possible love partners. Sexual relations with children were widespread and they were socially regulated. Ancient societies, unlike our present postmodern industrial cultures, were aware of the *immanent sexual attractiveness* of children—while incest was effectively prohibited,

and much more effectively than today, because every father could easily hold his fingers off his own offspring by finding willing similar-aged children in temple prostitution and brothels.

That is why it was easy for parents to comply with the incest taboo; they could effectively restrain from seeking sexual favors from family members. This may have been one of the reasons why ancient society regulated pedophilia; religion, at that time, was a foremost social regulator and was able to provide the social institutions for that purpose. One of the main outlets was *temple prostitution*. Temple prostitutes were young boys and girls, and in a great variety, so that every lover could find what he needed for his individual taste.

I do not know exactly from which age the children went there, but I suppose it was from the usual age of consent at that time that was 7 years with the Hebrews and the Egyptians, probably much lower in Sumer—supposedly *three years and one day*, if we are to follow the information on ancient clay tablets, as reported by Florence Rush in her book .

The erotic love of children had an aesthetic value at that time and was on the same level as religious service, while men who frequented temple prostitutes



were not marginalized in any way; in fact, most of these men were married and had a family. The children did the work as a religious service as it was believed that intercourse they granted to men who desired them sexually was actually intercourse with the *Goddess of Love*, Aphrodite or a similar goddess according to their tribe or society.

Ancient cultures bestowed to temple prostitution an aesthetic, artistic value. Poets chanted the erotic love of children, and what we still have in Plato's *Banquet* or similar writings can be considered a tiny left-over of the original abundance of this kind of creations that we lost over time through the ruthless art vandalism rampant in later moralistic epochs, and especially the Barbarian attitudes against erotic art that orthodox Christianity and Islam practiced over many centuries.

The youthful energy of Hermes, God of the Merchants and Thieves was that of young boys around puberty, who irradiate a *youthful bliss* that is able to charm the hardest male into complacent friendship and love.

The myth is probably much older and the archetype of the eternal youth, a never-aging adolescent, is one of the oldest myths of humanity, represented, for example, in the astrological sign of *Gemini* or the *Peter Pan* story. Its female counterpart is Aphrodite, the

Goddess of Love, for in ancient representations she is not depicted as an adult woman but as a young girl, driving men to the worst of love crimes with the sweet passion she inflicts upon them.

## AFFECTIONATE VS. SADISTIC PEDOPHILIA

It appears that with one group of men sex fantasies involving children tend to be *affectionate*, and with another group of men fantasies take on *violent and sadistic* forms. It has been found that sex fantasies are important for integrating our desires, especially when their fulfillment meets societal disapproval.

Until now it could not be demonstrated by research if erotic fantasies initiate sexual acting out or rather avoid it through a non-targeted energetic release of the fantasized-upon content in masturbation. The literature on the subject is hopelessly controversial. The only thing that experts appear to be agreeing upon is the *universal existence of sex fantasies* within every human being, child or adult. The crucial question, it seems, is how we cope with such fantasies, while the question much more interesting for the psychologist is why we have such fantasies at all and what their function is in our psyche?

First of all, I think erotic fantasies or, more generally put, love fantasies are an involuntary production of our psyche and a form of creativity that is induced by the loving current or psychic energy that we constantly exchange with others. The fantasies could represent ways how we respond to loving energies received from others and they could be ways to mirror this love transfer back to the person that emitted it. The particular characteristic of love fantasies is that they are thought forms that contain love wishes, specific ways we wish our love and desire to be fulfilled physically and, often, sexually, with the other person as a mate and partner. I want to focus here only on sexual fantasies while there certainly are also many non-sexual love fantasies.

Sexual fantasies can be classified into *affectionate* and *sadistic*. While in affectionate sex fantasies, sex is fantasized upon as a form of loving sexual exchange, involving or not penetration or intercourse, sadistic sex fantasies contain elements not contained in the merely affectionate sex fantasy. These fantasies regarding the sexual mate are characterized by the mate being tricked or dragged into the relation, fooled, corrupted, degraded, perverted, entrained, kidnapped, beaten, spoiled, hurt, damaged, victimized, overwhelmed,

raped, gang raped, assaulted and to the very extreme, tortured and killed. While in the affectionate sex fantasy, the love game is an exchange with the sexual mate, in the sadistic fantasy there is typically a *one-sided debasing action* that is inflicted upon the mate. In the first case we encounter empathy, in the second, hostility.

How can sex be linked, then, to positive, affective feelings, on one hand, or to negative, hostile, degrading and even hateful feelings, on the other? The secret is that sexual urges can get linked to every possible feeling because it's not sexual urges that decide about how those urges are lived out, but *non-sexual emotions* and, first of all, the way we handle personal power. When personal power has been smashed early in life and the person has an *overwhelming power need*, there is a tendency toward compensating for this lacking power by abusing of power over others.

If, by contrast, a person has been able to built an adequate level of *primary power, self-power* or *soul power* early in life and did not feel smashed or crippled in the realization of their ambitions, power typically is lived positively and not as a vacuum to be filled. In most sexual problems, especially in cases where sex becomes a weapon to subdue and humiliate others, the true problem is not sex, but a *power hangup that triggers a*

*destructive hunger for power, and more power.* These are very strong urges.

Sex, then, becomes the specific pathway or tool this power hunger is going to be satisfied on the expense of another and at the cost of his or her discomfort. In sadistic pedophilia, this pathological thirst for power is particularly harmful wherefrom result the violent social reactions against such crimes. The whole pedophilia discussion is actually overshadowed by this single very important but rather marginal aspect of pedophilia.

Of course, no cause and no endeavor is pure. There is always a perverted form of it to be found on the human agenda, but the manipulation and the social hate campaigns are to be explained by the fact that the few marginal cases where pathological power thirst becomes linked to child-focused sexual longing are taken for the 'normal' picture of pedophile love. The fact that every kind of love can be lived both constructively and destructively does surely not mean that humans should restrain from loving. This, however, is in last resort what the nonsensical argument of the majority and the media in matters of pedophile love boils down to! Seen from this angle, its absurdity is more shocking than the absurdity of abuse. For if abuse is a perver-

sion of desire, the allegation that certain forms of love were nothing but abuse is a perversion of life!

Sadistic childlove, on a fantasy level, is a *necessary counterpart* of affectionate childlove. Fantasies are not actions; fiction is not reality. That sadistic fantasies get acted out is because social norms and attitudes do not provide an outlet or sufficient outlets for constructive affectionate childlove. Sadism is a denial reaction of the bioenergetic system; its root cause is the pent-up sexual energy and emotional stuckness, and not the natural and flowing sexual tension. It originates in love denial and is a direct consequence of moralism and collective love prohibition.

Research with heterosexual men has shown that even among socially well-adjusted subjects *once in a while sadistic sex fantasies* involving women are experienced. More detailed research has shown that, typically, sadistic fantasies come up if either the sexual object is not available or that she refused to be a sexual mate, or that generally jealousy or anger is part of the experience.

Every porn sex site on the Internet or, in general, heterosexual pornography proves this fact as the overwhelming tenor in heterosexual porno is that the female is shown as an object, and that rape-like acts by

far dominate the scene. Thus, sadistic fantasies can be said to be socially accepted when they are situated within heterosexual love.

This research also showed that in the great majority of cases, sadistic fantasies are *discharged by masturbation* and are not resulting in sexual assaults against the women that were the subjects of the fantasies, or other women. I cannot see why, when such phantasms involve children instead of adults as sexual objects, they should be considered differently!?

My hypothesis is that sadistic fantasies involving children come up primarily because of a *lack of tangible love possibilities* and the more or less prolonged sexual frustration. However, the present public discussion suggests that sadistic sex fantasies serve no purpose or are an indicator for the perversity of the desire itself. As shown above, fantasies also exist with heterosexual lovers who have no homosexual or pedophile interests. In addition, to respond to this argument, we should begin to see clearly what *perversion* is and what it is not.

Perversion appears to be produced by fear. And it is equally true that psychological fear is perversion, an up-side down of the *élan vital*, a retrogradation of the love energies, an obstruction of the life force.

The most important thing to know about perverse desires is that they come up through the *repression of original desires*; thus, the perverse desire kind of replaces the original desire and compensates for its lack. In other words, the perverse desire has two functions, a *replacement function* and a *compensation function*.

Perversion, we could attempt to define, then, is a strongly distorted form of sexual love, a sexual desire that is mutilated in a way to result in its very contrary. Instead of love and life, what comes out in perversion is hate and death. In the Freudian terminology, we would say that perversity is not a manifestation of *libido* but a variant of the *death instinct*.

One may argue that rape is a perversion from natural mutually consenting love, and I think much speaks for that view, but it does not help us any further in our regard on pedophilia.

## DOES PEDOPHILIA EQUAL CHILD RAPE?

Instead, the question stands in the room if pedophilia equals child rape? To repeat it, one may consider rape as an act so hostile and so far removed from normal love that it has to be considered a perversion;



but we have to see also that this is by no means a criteria to be applied only for pedophilia.

Surely, some pedophiles rape, but also some heterosexuals rape, and some homosexuals rape. Rape has reasons that are not related to one's sexual orientation. It has primarily power reasons.

—This is the tenor of a widely published and influential rape researcher, Nicholas Groth, in his book *Men Who Rape: The Psychology of the Offender* (1980).

Rape is a form of compensation for feeling powerless that uses sexuality as a weapon against another rather than a loving exchange as it is in natural sexuality. I think once we seriously consider these implications, we can learn a lesson about human love considering its very contrary.

Krishnamurti often said in his talks that we cannot define love while we can define and look at all what is *not* love. Looking this way at perversion, we can see that *in all perverse behavior is to be found a residual form of thwarted love* that, if it was not so tragic, would certainly be considered as clownish in some way, or scurrilous. When we look even deeper, we encounter fear, much fear. We can then see that it is fear, and nothing but fear that originally distorts love into perversion.

In love there is no fear; love is carefree, love is abundant and it is giving. Perversion is paranoid, it is avaricious and heavily focused on an exorbitant need for self-gratification; in its inability to yield, and to give, it is utterly narcissistic. Love is sharing, and shared pleasure, while perversity is egotistic and lonely enjoyment at the cost of another, even at the cost of his or her life. Thus, while in love there is always natural care, perversity typically is little or not caring about the mate. What are fears that distort natural love into perversity?

A generalized answer does not exist. There are complex reasons, individual and collective. I always found our culture unnatural and perverse in its very roots. To prohibit the child to live their natural emotions and sexuality is perverse. There is no argument to be brought up against that. This millenary practice in itself is a flagrant violation of nature in its most tender origins.

## FREE CHOICE RELATIONS FOR CHILDREN?

I contend that child sexuality is such a controversial issue only for one single reason: people intuit that

allowing the child to be emotional and randomly sexual will deprive them of a powerful tool to control children.

Sexually enlightened and experienced children have little in common with the dull and insensitive consumer rats brought up in our repressive modern culture; and they are not easily blindfolded. They will not throw themselves onto every new merchandise because they have a naturally gratifying relation with their bodies.

In addition, people intuit that they would not be able to maintain their violent and projective attitudes toward pedophiles, simply because a number of children would demand emotional and sexual relations with adults who feel randomly or exclusively attracted to children. Thus, they fear to lose even more control over their offspring.

It would namely become obvious that the plea of child protection is a no-namer, if not an utter fake; the protection of children deprives them of their right for *free choice relations and erotic self-determination*.

In one word, such a campaign or the very thought of it reveals that the true reason for the pedophilia

taboo is the enslavement of the consumer child, and no other reason.

## LOVER VS. OFFENDER

The media discriminate very little between the one who is in for love, and one who is in for offending society. Not only is there no discrimination, but the media even suggest that there is *only* the latter type of person, extrapolating this character and by implication saying that this is what is called ‘the typical pedophile.’ The media suggest that these men who clearly are a minority—

- ▶ are perverse in their sexual setup;
- ▶ are representing the majority of pedophiles;
- ▶ are organized in worldwide rings;
- ▶ are speaking in public pro domo the childlove cause;
- ▶ are justifying violence, abduction, and penetration of the child.

The two types or characters are easily recognized. The *obsessed schizophrenic and chaotic type*, that by far

dominates most of the media reports, has a facial expression that is mask-like and lacks expression of emotions and of empathy. These men appear to have done a deal with society, a devil's deal one may say: they have taken the revenge position, the position that says, *I'll take revenge at society by using that child as an assault-receiver.*

Here, the child becomes some kind of sacrificial object for the chaotic unconscious of the perpetrator-rapist. These men are regularly very little educated and have a definite macho-mindset, typically unaware of their feminine side, their *anima*, which makes that they usually are *rough if not brutal* with the little mates they tend to abduct from home or school.

The detail of abducting the child is an archetypal element that is really important. Without the fact of abduction, these offenders would probably not find the thrill they need, because then the collective 'revenge' aspect of the assault is not strongly enough expressed.

Some of these offenders have a political agenda in the sense that they use the child as a sacrificial goat and poison container for actually assaulting society at large. In this sense, they do not really belong to the group of sex offenders, but the group of what is nowa-

days called *terrorists* and that was earlier in history called *anarchists*.

Cases of this kind have in common that offenders do seldom display signs of empathy or emotion, and that they are outspoken and sometimes bluntly honest. Some even seem to derive pleasure from the fact to be hyper-explicit and shocking, accusatory, instead of being *defensive and vulnerable*.

This type of offenders appear to actually retaliate at society for being marginalized with their love, and this may explain why they turned violent. These offenders are not the ones who commit passion crimes but they are among those who do reflect upon what they do, and who have a philosophy behind their crime, or the crime even is used as a *strategic tool* for political reasons in their hidden agenda.

In such kind of cases I cannot speak of love because the character of the deed is intently to hurt society by hurting a child; thus, what appears to be the case here is a sort of 'sexual terrorism,' targeted at violating the emotions of many people who really suffer from the idea that a helpless child is brutally raped; by deeply penetrating in children's bodies and souls, these offenders inflict hurt on a collective scale.

Masaru Emoto's water research has shown to what extent vibrations can affect our thoughts, bodies and emotions, so perhaps it's not too far-fetched to say that those crimes can act like *real bombs*, which is why I use the analogy of terrorism to describe these cases.

I think if the general public or at least journalists were really crystal-clear about this, they would not as easily put these cases in one pot with cases where adults are in for having had sex with a child within a love relation.

So, analyzing this carefully, it appears that these people are not lovers of children because their primary intent is not love, but various non-sexual motives that have to do with hurt, with being hurt themselves when they were children and with taking revenge at society at large, using the victim as a sacrificial goat.

Unfortunately so, the very zeal of the child protectors for 'fighting perversity' is what drives these people so deadly furious in counter-attacking society, virtually sacrificing children for their abysmal cause of hatred and revenge.

It is significant here to point out that in these cases, both society and these sadistic child abusers are de-

fending an ideological cause. It's a vicious circle altogether. Here we speak about ideologies, not about love.

Not only from my own research, but as a conclusion of the abundant forensic, clinical and psychiatric material I perused over the years, I found that those who label themselves childlovers or pedophiles tend to have a different set of character altogether.

First of all they are *emotional*, which can be seen on their faces. While sadistic, chaotic and schizophrenic offenders tend to have mask-like faces where emotions are banned from getting at the surface of the personality. Consciously pedophile men and women tend to have faces where emotionality and empathy are present; while some of them may suffer from a narcissistic hangup, they generally seem to be more vulnerable as a group than sadists and suffer more from enforcement procedures taking against them compared to the often astounding stoicism of the sadistic or schizophrenic type.

In fact, they are able to cry which is something surely defended by the character set of the hard-core violent abuser types. What we face here simply are different kinds of people, while law enforcement treats them as one group of people.



# CHAPTER FIVE

---

## LOVERS OR ABUSERS?

### INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, I am going to ask if pedophilia, as it is often argued, is per se a perversion?

I have reported already earlier on in this study that according to psychiatry, all sexual paraphilias are no more considered by psychiatry as a sexual perversion.

However, in the popular media, and in political debates, the theme is recurring to equate pedophilia with perversion. It's almost daily talk in our television reports and talk shows, and yet it's factually incorrect.

The assessment of the DSM is interesting in that the only difference between the paraphilias and 'normal' sexual behavior is the 'intensity' of the fantasies. It is asserted by researchers that non-clinical studies of individuals with unusual sexual interests demonstrate

that these individuals are indistinguishable from those with ‘normophilic’ (conventional) sexual interests.

That means in clear text that the DSM argues in a *circular manner* and is ultimately simply an ordeal of normative values that are thrown over the head of the patient, and sold as ‘diagnosis.’

Well, sorry, this is what in all gulags was and is done to intellectual and political dissidents, and thus, we are not dealing here with an instrument to be applied in a democracy, but with a toolset of fascist control.

There is an interesting side-remark to be made about the psychiatric assessment of paraphilias effected by Dr. Charles Moser that I am going to review further down, on the question if the paraphilias are mental disorders, or if their inclusion in the DSM was based on normative rather than factual considerations?

Now, regarding pedophilia, while the authors argue for removal of all paraphilias, they assert at the end of their paper, pedophilia was a ‘special case,’ in that pedophiles occupied ‘a particularly odious position’ in our society. Hence the authors argue that the removal of pedophilia from the DSM did ‘not bring any advantage to pedophile offenders, in the contrary.’

The authors state that the removal of pedophilia from the DSM would ‘focus attention on the criminal aspect of those acts, and not allow the perpetrators to claim mental illness as a defense or use it to mitigate responsibility for their crimes.’

—Dr. Charles Moser & Peggy J. Kleinplatz, DSM-IV-TR & The Paraphilias: An Argument for Removal, *Journal of Psychology and Human Sexuality*, 17 (3/4), 91-109 (2005), p. 11, ‘The Special Case of Pedophilia.’

Well, this comes as a surprise for it’s not logically cognizable why pedophilia should make a categorical exception among the paraphilias, to get a ‘special treatment?’ What the authors do here is actually taking with one hand what they have given with the other; in other words, is is a circular argument. The social situation of pedophiles is not the cause but the *consequence* of the arbitrary laws on the matter and the normative nonsense that is codified by the DSM— as the authors themselves criticized it. So this appears to be a tautological and illogical conclusion.

Their argument is bluntly and clearly *normative*; how can these people come up with believing they were *empirically oriented* psychiatrists whose diagnoses would need to be based on facts, not unverifiable diagnostic dogma? With that turn at the end of the paper, the authors show that they are as dogmatic as the

early sexologists were, and that their whole rhetoric is but a *paper claim* without being carried by an intention to really bring about a reform in our sexological landscape.

## WHAT ARE SEXUAL PARAPHILIAS?

While for most people today in modern societies and in the urban environment, heterosexuality may go beyond intercourse male-female within a valid marriage, and may encompass promiscuous sex, premarital sex and even group sex, and while homosexuality equally is recognized socially since about twenty years, this is not so far the case for the so-called *sexual paraphilias*, as for example pedophilia, gerontophilia, nepiophilia or zoophilia.

—Please note that this statement may not be true for certain countries where religion is still more or less compulsive or even coercive, and it may not be true even for very liberal countries, when you go to a rural, provincial environment, and a population that is older than average. All these factors need to be considered. When I express myself generally here, it always means in a modern secular society and an urban setting, and in addition, a certain education level of those who are dealing with the information.

Let us look a moment at this rather unusual term, first from a dictionary point of view, then from a psychiatric perspective.

The dictionary application for Apple Mac OS X defines a *paraphilia* rather normatively as ‘a condition characterized by abnormal sexual desires, typically involving extreme or dangerous activities.’ Merriam Webster’s dictionary seems to see it in more modern terms, defining paraphilia as ‘a pattern of recurring sexually arousing mental imagery or behavior that involves unusual and especially socially unacceptable sexual practices (as sadism or pedophilia).’ Healthline (healthline.com) contains very useful information that I will quote:

#### DEFINITION

Paraphilias are sexual feelings or behaviors that may involve sexual partners that are not human, not consenting, or that involve suffering by one or both partners.

#### DESCRIPTION

According to the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (known as the DSM) fourth edition text revised (DSM-IV-TR), the manual used by mental health professionals to diagnose mental disorders, it is not uncommon for an individual to have more than one paraphilia. The DSM-IV-TR lists the following paraphilias: exhibitionism, fetishism, frotteurism, pedophilia, sexual masochism, sexual sadism, trans-

vestic fetishism, and voyeurism. The DSM-IV-TR also includes a category for paraphilia not otherwise specified, which is the category for the less common paraphilias, including necrophilia, zoophilia, and others.

## PEDOPHILIA

Pedophilia involves sexual activity with a child, generally under age 13. The DSM-IV-TR describes a criterion that the individual with pedophilia be over 16 years of age and be at least five years older than the child. Individuals with this disorder may be attracted to either males or females or both, although incidents of pedophilic activity are almost twice as likely to be repeated by those individuals attracted to males. Individuals with this disorder develop procedures and strategies for gaining access to and trust of children.

Now, the question is if pedophilia really is a ‘disorder’ in the sense of the DSM. I will discuss this question in the next sub-chapter. Here, I would like to make it very clear to the reader what a *paraphilia* actually is.

Please be aware that there are two levels of discussion, the level of our popular media and of the populace at large, and the level of sexology, the level of actual sex research, as well as the psychology of sexual behavior. While you may argue that this is always the case, with whatever subject we are talking about, the distortion, if not aberration of truth that has taken place in the discussion of sexual behavior in our cul-

ture has long roots. It has to do with our anti-sexual ecclesiastical dogmatism that reigned for at least one thousand years in Europe and that has left deep scars in our collective unconscious. In a way all matters sex are subjected to shame and guilt, and there are few people who can even discuss them in a democratic, and somewhat rational manner.

And if this is true generally for sex, it is so much the more true for adult-child sexual interaction, and pedophile attraction. This is why even randomly objective observation can't be found, other than in dusty libraries, but surely not online, on the Internet. All that had a resemblance of truth was removed by police and security forces since about twenty years now, and during that time, not surprisingly so, the turn to populist, that is, fascist opinions on the matter became all too marked.

This is why, as a general information, it has to be seen and understood that the argument 'If this was true, I would since long have seen it on television or on the Web' is a cognitive misevaluation. It's a pitfall of perception. This domain is taboo in our society and that means not just the behavior itself is penalized and demonized but talking about it as well; hence, free speech in these matters has been severely restricted, to

a point that a *monolithic politically correct image* on the question was distilled and that is what is served from all the servers around the world, as the ‘truth’ about pedophilia.

I can only say, as I said it as a child already, when I looked through the veil, that this is the way stupidity is duplicated and eternalized, but not the way the human being is going to evolve in consciousness.

Sexuality is the number one complexity issue we have about the human, and if this complexity is denied, we are going to get where we got in 1933, the straight haven of fascism. That’s why I argue that our position regarding pedophilia, or the paraphilias, is paramount for either safeguarding democracy, or leading us into the abyss of further holocausts and crystal nights. This is how matters are, and this explosiveness of the topic is certainly not to be put on the back of pedophiles themselves, but on the back on a society that is only through a slow and gradual ascension ready to get eventually, after 5000 years of patriarchal madness, to a point where it begins to understand life systemically, and intelligently.

In addition, in matters of pedophilia, the academic level is not much more enlightened than the popular level, as there are myths that are sold for truth—just as



the fact that in the DSM, the *homosexual* pedophile is taken as more dangerous than the *heterosexual* pedophile.

I know that there is no conclusive research that could back such a claim, and yet it was put in the definition, simply because the psychiatric establishment wanted it to be there, in the first place.

In the abstract to the article *The DSM & Paraphilias*, submitted in 2003 to the *American Psychiatric Association (APA)* by Dr. Charles Moser, Ph.D. M.D., a practicing physician, psychotherapist and professor of sexuality at the *Institute for Advanced Study of Human Sexuality* in San Francisco, it is stated:

The DSM-IV-TR (2000) sets its own standards for inclusion of diagnoses and for changes in its text. The Paraphilia section is analyzed from the perspective of how well the DSM meets those standards. The concept of Paraphilias as psychopathology was analyzed and assessed critically to determine if it meets the definition of a mental disorder presented in the DSM; it does not. The Paraphilia diagnostic category was critiqued for logic, consistency, clarity, and whether it constitutes a distinct mental disorder. The DSM presents 'facts' to substantiate various points made in the text. The veracity of these 'facts' was scrutinized. Little evidence was found in their support. Problems with the tradition of equating particular sexual interests with psychopathology were highlighted. It was

concluded that the Paraphilia section is so severely flawed that its removal from the DSM is advocated.

—Dr. Charles Moser & Peggy J. Kleinplatz, DSM-IV-TR & The Paraphilias: An Argument for Removal, *Journal of Psychology and Human Sexuality*, 17 (3/4), 91-109 (2005).

It is enlightening to have a look at the evolution of the DSM regarding the paraphilias, and also to look at the history of sexuality.

In our culture, there is really no intelligent approach to be found for understanding the diversity of human erotic attraction, and as a result there was and is very little tolerance for sexual minorities.

This was and is, contrary to what Moser writes in his paper, not universally so. Not ‘historically and cross-culturally’ as he asserts, was there accusation, death, and imprisonment for any interest in specific sexual practices, but well in our root cultures that are coming from Judeo-Christian patriarchy.

The pattern of *emosexual life denial* is typical of patriarchy and was the most ruthlessly practiced in the few cultures that today are the high-tech countries, and the richest countries, around the world.

Guess why they are rich and high-tech? Through their extreme sexual intolerance, they have driven

people virtually ‘out of their bodies’ and ‘into their brains,’ by a hypertrophy of the left brain and the neglect of, and disregard for, the qualities of the right brain.

That is why we are leading split existences today, and one of the reasons of the paraphilia complex is exactly a lacking integration of mind and body because of the *cultural dressage* early in childhood.

That is also why we have cancer and immune deficiency syndrome, and a range of other ‘lifestyle diseases’ that would better be called ‘anti-lifestyle diseases.’

It’s a form of neurosis that is culturally sanctified, justified and legalized in all possible ways. This *schizoid split*, as I call it, is programmed into our very genes, as members of this cultural tradition—while I deny that this is universally so.

Western researchers have always had this bias to declare as universal what really is limited to our own cultural perversity. This was already the case with Freud, and with Moser it’s not lesser the case. And while this paper surely has its merit, it is flawed in this point, and would have had to be much more radical, if

this important cultural perspective had been seen, and validated.

In old India, China, Japan, Persia, Turkey, Egypt, and most tribal cultures, sexual preferences could vary much more than in any of our violent patriarchies, and this has been assessed by a number of researchers, among them Riane Eisler.

—See Riane Eisler, *Sacred Pleasure* (1996).

It is true that all but procreative sex was traditionally considered in our culture as sexual perversion, and later on, as mental disorders. The authors of the DSM research paper admit that ‘[i]t is exceedingly difficult to eliminate historical and cultural factors from the assessment of unusual sexual interests.’ (Id., p. 2) They go as far as affirming that ‘equating of unusual sexual interests with psychiatric diagnoses has been used to justify the oppression of sexual minorities and to serve political agendas. (Id.)

There was an important change in the DSM-III (1980) where for the first time, it was intended ‘to be neutral with respect to theories of etiology;’ at the same time the nomenclature of the paraphilias changed from ‘sexual deviation’ to ‘paraphilia,’ a descriptor that the

authors call 'supposedly atheoretical and non-pejorative.'

## IS PEDOPHILIA 'SICKO' BEHAVIOR?

In the populace, especially among the low-class and uneducated, but also with a certain number of people who received higher education, there is a long-standing belief that pedophilia, or generally, the erotic attraction for children was 'sicko' behavior, a form of mental derangement or psychic insanity.

Apart from the fact that the same was believed in the past regarding homosexuality, there is per se nothing that indicates why a person should be 'mentally deranged' only because their sexual energy manifests in a slightly different way than that of the majority. All in this field is simply so messed up by prejudice and life denial, and the terrible scars done to real knowledge by the ecclesiastical dogmatism that is a fact of our collective past; so one must not wonder to see people entangled and torn up with such pitifully ignorant views.

And as today a propaganda of the same sort, only under a different header, and with a different target intention is the order of the day, we are not really a step

ahead in our evolution to an intelligent race that understands that human sexual behavior is not animal-like, not based upon instinct, but entirely upon learning, that is, *sociocultural conditioning*. As Riane Eisler writes in *Sacred Pleasure* (1996), p. 22:

RIANE EISLER

In short, sex does not, as a once-popular song had it, 'just come naturally.' Rather, as illustrated by the jarring differences in the prehistoric and contemporary sexual symbols and images we have been comparing, sex is to a very large degree socially constructed.

When the DSM changed from 'sexual deviation' to 'paraphilia,' that means something. It means that from a mental health perspective, childlove is no more considered as 'sicko' behavior. And here we are not even talking about Dr. Moser's proposition. Just with the turn to DSM III (1980), we already see that the normative stigma upon pedophilia and the other paraphilias was alleviated, and a more functional regard began to make its way through psychiatry.

This functional regard is where we are today, and it's the regard I apply in all of my books.

Now, let's see how things were developing. Already back in 2000, the APA, based upon the latest edition of the DSM, asserted that a literature review was required

to update the DSM, and that any further development of the DSM should henceforth be ‘supported by an extensive empirical foundation.’

—Dr. Charles Moser & Peggy J. Kleinplatz, DSM-IV-TR & The Paraphilias: An Argument for Removal, *Journal of Psychology and Human Sexuality*, 17 (3/4), 91-109 (2005), p. 3.

Now, what the authors write is that their own extensive literature review ‘found no literature to support most of the assertions made in the paraphilia section of the DSM and several studies were found to contradict the text.’ The authors conclude that objective data to support the classification of the paraphilias as mental disorders is lacking.

As I pointed out already earlier in this chapter, the comparison with homosexuality is interesting; the authors state that about 30 years ago, it was expected that the other paraphilias were going to be removed from the DSM together with homosexuality, but this was not the case. Now, the interesting question is, why was homosexuality removed, then?

The authors write that objective data were lacking for supporting its inclusion; research confirmed that homosexuals did not fit in specific psychiatric categories. The authors suppose that the removal of homo-

sexuality from the DSM had *political reasons*, and that the situation, right now, for the other paraphilias was practically the same as before with homosexuality. Only a political decision, the authors say, could lead to the removal of the paraphilias, or some of them, from the DSM.

This is of course explosive information when you hear that said from the pulpit of psychiatrists judging their own diagnostic manual. For if it's political reasons only that were at the basis of the removal of homosexuality, and if it's political reasons that the paraphilias were *not* removed, then sorry, I am right when I say in this book and other books of mine that the fact that pedophilia is considered mental derangement, rape and chaotic behavior has *political reasons*, and is not for that matter corroborated by any facts or any research.

The following part of the article discusses if the paraphilias are mental disorders, or not, and the authors plead they are not.

What is interesting here, is that my own historical view of the development of sexual paraphilias is shared by other researchers. The authors, quoting Bullough & Bullough, *Sin, Sickness and Sanity* (1977), confirm my view that what today is called paraphilia, was called *sin* by the Church, and what was called crime now is



called *pathology* or, in popular language, ‘sicko’ behavior.

The authors retrace how ‘sexual sin’ became ‘sexual pathology;’ they mention Krafft-Ebing’s *Psychopathia Sexualis* (1886/1965) as being a classical case. I have since long been disturbed by the incredible arrogance and arbitrary judgmentality of those early sexologists, including Stekel and Moll, German, all of them, who were not far, in their general worldview, from the Nazi ideal of ‘racial and genetic purity,’ and whose views must scandalize any serious sex researcher in our days.

But it was these people that were quoted as the early ‘authorities’ in matters of sexual behavior, also in legal textbooks; their treatises on sexual pathology stand for the ‘normative’ approach to sexology that preceded the present ‘functional’ and ‘empirical’ approach in sex research that was mainly founded by people like Brough, Rubin, Moser, Green, and others.

I have recently shown there is equally a normative approach in psychoanalysis that parallels and duplicates this blindfolding tradition later on with the psychoanalytic establishment.

—See Peter Fritz Walter, *Normative Psychoanalysis: How the Oedipal Dogma Shapes Consumer Culture* (Scholarly Articles, Vol. 14, 2015/2017).

Hence, no rational law making is to be found at the basis of the demonization and criminalization of pedophilia; it is what it was, *arbitrary church laws turned into modern penal law* without any thought given to it by the modern lawmaker. It's a shame for any of our large democracies to have such laws in place, and in addition, what is even worse, they are unconstitutional altogether.

## AN ETIOLOGY OF BOYLOVE

Boylove, in the sense I use this term, is the exclusive sexual attraction for, and love with pubescent boys.

The typical characteristic of the boylover is that, contrary to the homosexual, he does not principally reject the female as a sexual partner, but focuses emotionally on boys.

Physiologically, he can thus well have intercourse with women, but he prefers boys for reasons of *emotional predilection*. Different from the girllover, the boylover does not engage in erotic love relations with little girls. He may well like little girls as friends, but he is not emotionally attracted and as a result not sexually interested in love relations with them.

On the other hand, while there are boylovers who like love and sex with pre-pubescent boys, the typical boylover is an *ephebophile* who likes boys that have developed into puberty or are at least on the verge to enter puberty. Most boylovers enjoy discovering the first signs of puberty with their love boys and derive considerable emotional satisfaction in assisting their loved boy in passing the border to adolescence with the least possible hurt or strife. In fact, there is a strong *educational logos* in pederasty which, it seems, is recognized in many native cultures since times immemorial.

Since there are also childlovers who are not boylovers, but interested in small boys, a distinction is needed here. What is the difference emotionally between a man loving a boy and a boylover loving a boy?

Typically, the pedophile loves the boy from a heterosexual pleasure expectation while the boylover or pederast loves boys from a homosexual pleasure expectation. I know this sounds kind of construed or unnatural but there is some rationale in it. Small boys have many attributes females typically have, such as lack of pubic hair, fragility, small size, playfulness, smooth skin, childish behavior, high-pitched voice, docility, innocence—and they are sexually rather passive. What, by contrast, excites the boylover in a boy

are quite opposite characteristics, such as a masculine and healthily aggressive attitude, independence, sexual activeness and some sprouts of pubic hair. But there must be some reminiscences of the child or of childhood because otherwise we'd have to talk about a homosexual attraction.

The high excitement and emotional gratification of the boylover in his relations with preferred boys most often comes from the special mix between childlike and male attributes in one and the same boy and the resulting oscillation or *androgynous* attitude such an adolescent typically displays during the difficult transition from childhood into adulthood. What is shared between man and boy are in most cases emotional values rather than sexual experiences.

The adolescent boy is particularly sensitive to male warmth, attention, affection and care. This is so much more the case in a culture where most adolescents are emotionally neglected by their overworked or absent fathers and by the fact that society strangely assumes that a child that transits into puberty did not need any more physical affection.

The truth is that most adolescents in our culture are emotionally starving and craving for closeness and emotional warmth, if they are not outright sexually

starved. Thus, there is quickly a common denominator between men and adolescent boys that is not primarily, as most people think, sexually motivated, but plays on all registers of the affectionate, emotional level.

My hypothesis for the etiology of boylove is more complicated than the etiology of girllove. While there is, fortunately, a natural pederastic *erós* in every male adult because otherwise we would not have teachers for adolescent boys or all teachers for boys would have to be boylovers, the boylover is exclusive in that he typically does not have a taste for small boys, small girls and grown-up girls as well as adult women as sexual partners. Hence, the partner choice of the boylover is rather limited.

Many boylovers summarize their predilection in a definition of *The Boy* they find to be 'the ideal one,' and while this definition varies from man to man, there is an astonishing similarity in all those individual descriptions.

Now, to be more precise regarding the etiology of boylove, I think there must have been an event very early in life which led to a reject of the female later on.

It is possible that this detail is similar in the etiology of homosexuality. Psychoanalysis sees the etiology

of homosexuality in a cold or unacceptable mother or a mother that rejects the boy's maleness, giving only *conditioned* love. The condition namely is that the boy continues to behave, act, talk, eat and think like a baby.

This explanation however does not contribute to elucidating why one group of men only feel erotically attracted to adult males while the other prefers males that are on the border to adulthood. That is why we cannot simply put the two groups of people in one pot. This seems obvious to me after all the research that has been done. Also, when you hear talking a boylover and homosexual about their erotic preferences, you get two quite distinct pictures.

A boylover will not sleep with an adult male, or only in very exceptional circumstances, while a homosexual will not be aroused by a small boy who has not pronounced male characteristics. Little pubic hair and a slim androgynous air that would make appear the boy ideal to the boylover would lead the homosexual to almost certainly reject him as a sexual partner.

What is it then that, in the etiology, is different in homosexuality and boylove? *After all, the difference seems to be rather volatile.*

I have not extensively researched the etiology of homosexuality, and my insights here may not reach an expert level, but regarding boylove I found there is very often a love story in the lover's childhood that reminds the girllove etiology. This can be a love story with a girl that turned into a deception, or a love story with a younger boy.

More specifically, from what I have learnt through personal reports and autobiographies, boylove develops when a love story with a girl, in childhood or early adolescence, was deceived or corrupted by the intervention of the mother of the lover or of another female who had tutelary status over him at that time.

The *monster parent*, in the early etiology of girllove, on the other hand, is probably the father or another tutelary male, while in the stories of boylovers, it is a female.

On a psychological level, the result is quite complex. While the mother or any female is hated as a love-destroying Kali, the boy will develop strong guilt feelings since his relation with the girl let him enter his *Oedipus Complex*. Thus, through the deception, the mother gained both the son's hatred and his increased incestuous love. This mix of hate and repressed incestuous feelings is exactly the reason why later the lover

is blocked almost entirely against sexual relations with females.

This etiology would at least be valid in case the event occurred within the Oedipal phase, and thus between the 5<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> year of the boy. If the love deception occurred before or after that time, pederasty could still develop but to a lesser extent and the exclusion of females from the circle of potential sex partners will probably be less dramatic; as a result heterosexual periods or casual encounters with females are more likely to occur.

In fact, there are quite a number of boylovers who live double lives, are married and still maintain occasional or regular pederastic love affairs with pubescent boys. Others, without being married, occasionally engage in loving boys, for example when they are unsatisfied with their girlfriends or appalled by the materialistic attitude of prostitutes or mistresses, and in search for emotional gratification.

From individual reports, I know there are also boylovers who marry only for the purpose of gaining access to a divorced or widowed woman's boy(s). In those cases, the astonishing fact is that over a certain time or even over the whole time of the mixed relation, the lover maintains heterosexual intercourse with the



mother while living his pederastic love and sex relations with her boys.

While we know from Nabokov's novel *Lolita* that triangular relations are not uncommon for childlovers, and while they appear more logical among girllovers, in pederasty such relations appear to be irrational in some way. In both forms, the incestuous tint of such relations cannot be overlooked. It is a difference if I engage in a love relation with a child outside my family setting or if I approach the boy sexually in my quality as his foster father or tutelary authority.

Even though I do question that incest is per se in all cases traumatizing, for the unconscious a relation that is non-incestuous and one that is incestuous is clearly different. While this kind of relations bring up many controversial questions, the only topic that is of interest for the present study is why the lover needs to re-enact a childhood constellation that was incestuous, in order to achieve emotional and sexual gratification?

I admit that the answer to this question is not crucial for the understanding of boylove in general because not every pederastic relationship is per se incestuous or pseudo-incestuous. However, it would be interesting to know where the borders exactly are be-

tween non-incestuous pedophilia, on one hand, and incestuous pedophilia, on the other.

I have found in the literature that others have asked that question but so far I haven't found a conclusive answer to it. I leave it open here for further research being done on this interesting topic.

## AN ETIOLOGY OF GIRLLOVE

Girllove, in the sense I use this term, is the erotic love with little girls. Little girls, in this definition, are pre-pubescent girls, girls who have not yet reached puberty and not yet developed the typical body characteristics of a grown-up woman.

I am not sure if pubescent girls should be encompassed by this definition since they are not really little girls but are commonly called 'young girls.' I also think that lovers who like pubescent girls as well as adult women are usually heterosexuals, and not girllovers.

The girllover typically is attracted by the absence, and not the presence of, for example, pubic hair, nipples, and a full female bottom. They typically like what is *girlish*, not what is *womanish*, such as a slim, agile body with a flat chest or tiny nipples, a bald slit and a

small round bottom; often girllovers are erotically attracted by the *small feet* of their mates. While there are distinct age group preferences, there are roughly three main groups—

- ▶ those who like little girls around five to eleven;
- ▶ those who like baby girls around two to five;
- ▶ those who like both groups of girls.

However, these groups are not really distinct from each other and the borders are largely overlapping. Some sexologists qualify the group who like toddlers not as pedophiles, but as *nepiophiles*, a term that originates from old Greek *nepios*, baby, toddler, or as *infantophiles* or *babelovers* which are synonymous terms. It is obvious that the second group is more attracted by *babyish features* of little girls, such as a seemingly inflated vaginal lips, flat chest, short limbs, a high, squeaky voice, and a roundish body, while the first group likes slightly thinner and taller bodies, and a less babyish appearance of the love girl.

Obviously, lovers of pubescent girls like, in addition, the existence of at least rudimentary nipples and a genital development ready, or almost, for intercourse. In addition, for love with little girls to be defined as

girllove, this love must be an *exclusive* attraction which means that the lover is not only exceptionally or occasionally interested in love and sex with little girls. For this to happen consistently, the lover's *pedoemotions* typically have crystallized to an extent that there is a more or less complete emotional focus upon little girls, whatever age group it is that he or she prefers.

By contrast, if a man loves girls and women without distinction, being erotically attracted to 'females from 0 to 100' (Picasso), the lover is to be qualified as heterosexual, even if he had extensive sexual encounters with young girls—as it was reportedly the case with Picasso, when, as a young painter, he was living in the poor quarters of Paris, where street prostitution of young girls was a fact of life.

As to the etiology of girllove, the hypothesis that I present is rather different from what has been submitted so far. The results of thirty years of research I have done in this field indicate that girllove is not the mere consequence of an infantile incestuous fixation or unresolved *Oedipus Complex* (psychoanalysis) nor hereditary (early psychiatry), nor cowardice to approach older females (Freud), nor psychosexual infantilism (Stekel).

What I found is that male girllovers had been girllovers already when they were children. They have been in love already with exactly the age group they later on still prefer.

What I also found is that the unconscious or conscious decision to *not* grow up in the choice of mates is the result of a an *early love deception* that had a traumatic consequence for the lover during his young age. Typically, what happened is that the lover has been in love, as a child, with a little girl to a point to see in her the girl of his life and that this relation was brutally or otherwise forcibly destroyed or denied. This deep and traumatic wound is carried into adulthood and the only way it can be healed is by re-enacting the event that caused it, and thus through repeated positive love relations with little girls that remind of the little star that the lover still loves deep in his heart.

By the way, it is not uncommon that among children exclusive love choices are made. People who are frequently around small children know that not seldom children who fall in love to each other say 'This is my wife' or 'This is my husband' or they say that they are married, or peers may point to the child couple as being married. Adults laugh about these matters, but this attitude often hides a *serious lack of respect* for the

child's emotional life. Love is always, for adults and children alike, a serious matter.

Doing this research was no easy task. In the beginning, I had only myself and my own story to begin with. Not that my story has particular importance or because it is particularly sad, but rather as a point of departure I would like to recount it here. Interestingly, I did myself not bestow too much interest on my story and it was not my own experience that let me discover the etiology of girllove. But at least, my story brought me to ask the question how a man who loved women until his thirties, eventually discovers that he's a girllover?

The insights about girllove I have today came to me gradually as a result of asking further questions. This is how I could develop a perhaps different approach to the etiology of girllove and formulate it as a theory. This, then, is my story:

#### THE STORY OF URSULA P.

When I was seven years old I fell in love with a girl named Ursula who was of the same age as myself. This was, by the way, a very sad time in my life. I had to spend the week in a home where I was beaten and sadistically mistreated in many ways by the female owners of the home, while the weekends and holidays I had to spend with my mother who was divorced. So much the more was the love I felt for Ur-

sula a heavenly blessing, an escape into a new and hitherto unknown dimension. Love! Life had been such for me that the notion of love never had existed, never had entered my mind let alone my blood. There was only constraint, a thousand limitations and exhortations, violence and this perverse mix of over-protectiveness and negligence that is so typical for our hypocrite modern culture where children are possessions of their parents or other adults or the state. In my feelings, I overcame all these limitations in my love for Ursula and, for the first time in my life, I felt deeply in my heart and my brain this horrid injustice that denies love and friendship to children. Ursula's father was a policeman. He was an arrogant, violent guy who was riding high on a horse and who worked in the former French military base near our street. Most of the time, Ursula was forbidden to me. When I came to pick her up, her mother would tell me that the girl had some work to do in the house, proposing me to ride the bike with either her little sister Barbara or her older sister Monika (who both liked me very much). I was not interested in both of them but sometimes sadly accepted the bad deal which only enhanced my frustration. One day I heard a girl crying in the house and insisted asking little Barbara who was crying? She told me that it was Ursula. That she had disobeyed the father who had beaten her up with the horse whip. I remember very well that I got so mad in that moment that I was ready to kill the man. As in that moment the girls' big brother, a boy of around sixteen, left the house, I attacked him and was going to beat him if he had not, laughing at me, held my arms tight. When he heard what I was so mad for, he even tried to console me, but for no avail. I was afflicted for days. Around one week later, I had a dream. In that dream, I felt my love so strongly to Ursula that until now, forty years

later, I have not forgotten it. And in that dream Ursula kissed me innocently on my cheek which was pure heaven to me. A moment later, her little sister who was jealous and angry said that Ursula was going to be whipped by her father for that kiss. The dream left me dumbfounded and some weeks later, the family changed residence and I did not see Ursula any more. Only years later, when I was already married for five years, I had related the story to my wife who turned out to know Ursula well. She said Ursula had worked a short time with her in the garment factory and that she knew her present residence. I was excited! I wanted to see her again and we met in a little bistro downtown. When I saw her, I was shocked. She looked very ugly, depressed, pale and I immediately saw that she did not love herself and suffered from some kind of abuse. I was not wrong since after some formal exchange and two glasses of wine, she boasted into tears and said she had been raped, shortly before, by her former husband who revealed to be an exact copy of her father. He had not respected their divorce, broke in the house one night and bluntly raped her after beating her up because she tried to defend herself. She was dependent on drugs and already in psychological treatment since quite some time but without any positive result. I felt so sorry for her! The only thing that was similar between the little girl she had been and the woman she was now was her slim body. But with seven she had been a beauty while now she was a wreck. And, sadly, the tragic story of being abused by a brutal possessive father-lover was repeating over and over in her life, as in the lives of so many women I have known or heard about.

I think that the *general condition* in which the love deception occurred is of importance.



It is particularly significant to determine if the traumatic event occurred *within a highly restrictive authoritarian environment* where other love choices were barred, or in a free and democratic environment where the deception can be superseded by new and exciting love opportunities.

In my case it was obviously the first alternative. There was actually no other girl I really got to love during my whole childhood and adolescence.

In the stories of male girllovers, I have seen over and over a pattern indicating they were girllovers already when being boys, with the difference however that during childhood they had no power to gain access to the girl or girls they loved or they have been severely punished for having lived their love. Just as in my own case, their love choice was shunned by their environment and, often, their particular love relations actually were smashed. Stories abound in autobiographies of long descriptions of punishments and brutalities committed by parents and educators as a consequence of finding out about a love and sex affair of the little boy with a little girl.

Another important point to consider regarding the etiology of girllove is the fact that in the Trobriand culture where children's love life is widely respected by

adults, children grow into *really heterosexual* adults who have no hangups, neither for childlove nor for homosexuality nor even for sexual promiscuity. *They really stay with one partner for life and are happy.* This is astonishing because it is unknown in any of our larger civilizations.

This fact brought me to build the hypothesis that it is the destruction of children's natural love life that causes the rupture, the split, the inner crack that is at the origin not only of pedophilia, but also of homosexuality and all other emotional derivations from the natural mating between an adult male and an adult female.

## CHILDLOVE VS. PERVERSION

The persistent denial of mainstream international culture to *socially code pedoemotions within a framework of acceptable erotic behavior* is a fatal lack of responsibility with disastrous consequences all over the globe. In order to work out a draft for such a positively coded behavior pattern, we need to have a closer and deeper look at what pedophilia really is, and why in fact adults turn toward children for emotionally intelligent reasons.

What is it, after all, that is so erotically attractive in children? Or is it something that can only be perceived by people sensitive for it because of their own hangup or erotic specialness?

While it is obvious that without the love for children, the human race would since long have disappeared from the globe, it is still a matter of confusion what the place of *erotic attraction* is within the greater framework of loving children. I do not need to cite psychologists for stating that love and erotic attraction is not necessarily the same, while they go together on most occasions.

A closer look at language patterns seems to suggest that *there is an erotic element even in the natural desire or wish that a couple has for procreating a child*. The French language is particularly transparent here. The expression for a couple to desire a child is *désirer un enfant* while the exact same expression, used in another context, would mean to sexually desire a child, because, for example, *désirer une femme* means in French the wish to have intercourse with a woman.

The whole psychiatric construct of the *Oedipus Complex* is based upon the assumption that the child sexually desires the parent of the opposite sex while being caught in a pattern of homosexual identification

with the parent of the same sex. Without the underlying assumption that parents and their children desire each other sexually in some way, the psychoanalytic theory would never have come to exist; psychoanalysts tend to argue in addition that the *Oedipus Complex* was a universal phenomenon, to be observed in all cultural settings, while this assumption has been clearly invalidated by anthropological and ethnological research.

In the interview with Françoise Dolto in Paris that I mentioned earlier, the famous child psychoanalyst affirmed the importance of what she called *parler désir* (*talking desire*) as an educational activity so as to create a *verbal coding for child-adult sexual relations* in the child's psyche.

It has to be seen however that Dr. Dolto did *not* advocate the acting out of pedophile desires in the form of real-life sex within an educational relationship and even more so vehemently rejected as wrong and abusive such acting out in a therapeutic relationship with a child. However, regarding all other non-educational and non-therapeutic relationships between children and adults outside their family, she held society should code this form of sexual behavior that was in her view a normal part of intergenerational human relations since times immemorial.

It is indeed irresponsible to leave the public discussion over to interest groups, pressured politicians, fearful religious leaders and a hypocrite and misinformed mob that feeds upon the stingy and the perverse in order to keep alive with a basically negative worldview, a worldview that is deeply schizophrenic. It is quite obvious to observe, in such a situation, how non-sexual emotions such as *repressed anger, frustration, depression* and *schizophrenic splits* occur, and why the desire tends to be lived out perversely through abduction, sexual assault and murder.

These negative results are not an outflow of erotic love, but are created by non-sexual phenomena when the natural discharge of the sexual impulse is impaired by social stigma and denial.

Society so far does not contribute to understanding pedophilia and thus contributes to the rise of more or less perverse forms of it. By the same token, a misinformed and irrationally minded public acts here as a *group victim of irresponsible propaganda*, instilled or tolerated by corrupt politicians and political or religious leaders who believe in an archaic eye-for-eye, a witch-hunt paradigm or in what I call 'the impossible human.'

The persistent denial of mainstream international culture to socially code *pedoemotions* in a framework of acceptable erotic behavior represents a fatal lack of responsibility with disastrous consequences all over the globe.

Where democracy shows that it is but a hidden form of terror or the oligarchic tyranny of a group of elite neo-fascists, it has lost its right to be qualified as a democratic form of government, and it has to be taken into reform by responsible citizens.

While I do not think that violent forms of political conduct can bring any good, for what they bring is still more violence, I request a deeper understanding, a stronger commitment to truth and a better communication between all parties involved in the public discussion. I honestly believe we should open up to a debate that is public not only on paper, but public in the old Roman sense of the word, as a matter of the *res publica*, of public concern. And it is with empathy and concern, not frivolity and certainly not aggression and violence that such a public discussion has to happen if it is at all to bring anything positive.

The present discussion reminds me of how Freud characterized, at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the situation he faced when he first began to apply psy-

choanalysis in the treatment of neuroses. For what Freud pointed out at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century is still valid at the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup>; what dominates the situation is a double standard, falseness, cowardice and a collective shut-your-mouth-attitude over issues that are considered social dynamite.

Actually, the issues have barely changed. At Freud's time, it was neurosis that plagued our culture, today it is paranoia, and schizophrenia.

Even though many people may have a vague idea of what pedophilia really means emotionally for both the lover and the love child, the implications of loving a child erotically must be looked at with more accuracy.

To begin with, let us evaluate child-child erotic contacts. Peer relations, strangely enough, are often overseen in the recent heated debate on child-adult sex.

The first to desire small children as sexual partners are adolescents! This is no secret for psychologists, educators and all who are close to adolescents and know about their bubbling sexuality. Yet, in recent years a really shocking amount of criminal sentences have been pronounced against adolescents who had sex

with younger child mates. Only then, it seems, the mass public noticed the age-old fact of life that adolescents are sexual, and perhaps more sexual than the rest of us. However, seen from the perspective of how children are living together and considering the practices in tribal cultures, love relations between adolescents and smaller children are completely natural and healthy. Of course, I do not include here adolescents who have *exorbitant power needs* because something went wrong in their upbringing. Because in these particular cases I agree with the judges that the smaller child may easily be victimized.

Originally however and in a sane environment, adolescents' desire for smaller children is rather *tender and romantic* while it certainly includes sexual arousal; the sane adolescent will not overpower a younger child just because he's stronger but he will try to impress the child with his greater knowledge, force or social influence. It's a love game, then, and not a rape game. And it will take considerable time until an ado will begin to act out his sexual desire with the child. He namely fears reject more than all in life. He therefore prefers to wait longer and have a longer-lasting friendship with the little boy or girl than to proceed ruthlessly and experience a setback.



Adolescents are very sensitive, even those who come over as brute or coarse. That's often a façade or shield they are using to hide their deeper feelings, for fear of being ridiculed.

What actually happens in sane adolescent-child relations is that the adolescent is *protective* regarding the smaller child, sometimes as protective or even more protective than a parent. This protectiveness includes tenderness and natural care. Most adolescents, female or male, adore to babysit and they are deeply hurt when parents are mistrusting and reject their advances to babysit a small child. They may even grow a hidden form of hatred toward all adults if this happens to them repeatedly, especially when their fears to be rejected are not rationalized and communicated. As a result of the present pedophilia hysteria and child protection paranoia, I picked up from the literature and the Internet that male adolescents are no more given public trust as eligible babysitters, a phenomenon that *can have disastrous consequences for their psychic and emotional wellbeing later in life.*

Love relations between adolescents and children are very lively, full of energy, full of joy, full of sexual tension, too. In Africa, Southern Europe, the American Hispanic culture or in Cuba and, of course, in Middle

and South America, they are widely common, being a part of the daily folklore. Also in the Arabic, and other Middle Eastern cultures, they have a well established place within a greater set of social rules that put the older brother on a particular position, a position close to the father. From that position is derived the power of the first-born or second-born son over smaller siblings within the extended family structure, and accordingly, the range of possible abuse of that privileged position.

It's only a step to the next age group, also very strongly represented in pedophile relations, the age-group twenty to about thirty-five. It is interesting to observe that the nature of these relations is quite different from adolescent-child relations. There is less physical play, fewer outdoor activities, more fondling, more closeness, more tenderness, more social activities, too. A pedophile of more than thirty years of age for the most part lives a rather lonely life, different from a group-oriented adolescent.

The experience of his loved ones will be influenced by this loneliness even if most pedophiles can change their lifestyle quite flexibly once they get in touch. But what I have observed is that some pedophiles tend to reject youngsters and also young girls who do not want

to comply, at least for a minimum of time, to *contemplative moments of shared tenderness*.

Tenderness is perhaps the key word in loving children as it is the key word in love in general, but certainly not in what today is practiced as heterosexuality and marriage. The obvious lack of tenderness in fashionable love affairs and in many marriages strongly indicates that these relations are not love, but forms of socially approved rape, a way of maintaining archaic forms of mating that may ideally suit monkeys but not humans.

Human love is spontaneous and tender, but public discussion tends to focus on where things have got out of hand and where relations turned south or have turned abusive. *As if real love could not exist in adult-child erotic relations!* And yet every loving act defies the perverted standards of life haters and persecutors. Every bit of courage of a father to sleep with his naked children for giving them warmth, trust, loving care and body energy defies the system. Every kiss and warm embrace bestowed upon the boys or girls in a class by a male educator defies and challenges the system. Every time an early child care worker takes a bath with a baby, defying the perverse rules in day care centers all over the Anglo-Saxon world, destroys a bit of a sys-

tem that creates *robots, perverted humans and schizophrenics*, and not sane adults.

# CHAPTER SIX

---

## FREE CHOICE RELATIONS FOR CHILDREN?

### INTRODUCTION

#### THE PSYCHOLOGICAL ASPECTS

In this chapter, I am going to ask if children should be granted the right to have free choice relations?

As I mentioned it already, the question is discussed not only by paraphilia researchers, not only by criminologists, but also by violence researchers, by feminists and by those who ask for a bill of rights for children.

In addition, the point was on the agenda of various alternative political parties, such as the *Green Party* in Germany who argue, if children should be more respected in the future, this respect would ask to grant them free choice relations without supervision of their realm of intimacy.

I said that whatever one may think about such an idea, and much speaks for its implementation as a matter of greater democracy for all, it is a fact of life that even though adult-child erotic relations are penalized, many children share in a secret when they engage in any such relations.

Clinical and forensic reports have shown that, astonishingly enough, children are *not per se traumatized by the burden that such a responsibility brings for them.*

In view of the high fines for pedophile offenders, it is actually quite a burden for children to carry, and here I see an argument against pedophilia under the present legal situation.

For this very reason, the burden may really be *too high for a child to carry*, as the consequences when things go south are so drastic, that mental and emotional scars can hardly be avoided.

This is actually an appeal to pedophiles to avoid any kind of sexual relations with children, and rather keep their relations platonic, namely for avoiding the very danger that could lead to a brutal disruption of the relation with all the nasty consequences that this brings for all people involved. An ethical demand may here well be placed upon the pedophile to avoid this

potential harm done to the love child and their family, and this is for me actually *the strongest argument against pedophilia*.

I am responding in this chapter also to the often-asked question if pedophilia was a ‘metaphorical form of incest’?

This argument that was perhaps first made by the late American psychohistory founder and psychoanalyst Lloyd DeMause, cannot stand trial as the incest taboo finds rationale because of the special power relations within the family, and cannot be extrapolated to the realm outside of the family.

I understand this argument as an allegory; it may be that DeMause meant that in the relationship adult-child, the adult assumes a power position similar to the father to his own child. This is an argument that has been brought forward of course very often in the whole of the pedophilia debate, and it was answered in many different ways. We do not need to make an analogy with incest, to answer the question if there is a specific power difference in the adult-child relationship. The answer depends on many factors. In the teacher-student relationship, for example, this special power difference was always affirmed, and is affirmed almost universally around the world, which is why

those relations are often *carefully monitored*, as sexual relations in that kind of relations is universally considered as especially harmful for the child.

In the general case, things depend very much on set and setting and also on the fact how the child has been raised with regard to authority.

The danger of power abuse is of course much lower if the child was allowed to grow into a high level of autonomy and can defend himself or herself against potentially abusive behavior from the side of an adult.

The child however is much more vulnerable in such kind of relations that has been treated as the proverbial vassal, and has simply ‘nothing to say’ in the family, and is therefore rather passive in their overall behavior pattern. Such a child may namely not voice dissent when an adult begins caressing, or invites for sexual play, and may silently participate, *while being revolted inside*, without giving any expression to this revolt. These cases are then not surprisingly those that go to court, and where things go south because the child will later complain about the ‘attack suffered’ while having let it happen. In one word, a general answer for all possible cases cannot be given, which is why the question cannot be answered in its generality. Case categories have to be defined and partial answers



must be given that are covering specific settings, and psychological circumstances.

### THE LEGAL ASPECTS

Now, *to switch from the psychological to the legal aspects of such relationships*, we have to realize that from the moment we liberalize sexuality from moralistic stigma that is a residue of inquisitory Church laws and therefore an anachronism in a modern legal system, we have no choice but to admit that *human sexuality cannot reasonably be subjected to governmental regulation and interference!* As a result, we must conclude that age-of-consent laws do not fit in a democratic society because they are not rationally verifiable and therefore represent a tool for paternalistic control and enslavement of the child's private life and desires. And in addition, they are completely ineffective to prevent the most chaotic and psychotic forms of sexual violence against children, including kidnapping and murder, which is a fact known from the daily news.

A new and democratic legal bill, if ever the criminal law system regulating human sexuality remains in place, must target upon violence and not sex, and incriminate both physical and sexual violence, not more and not less. Since in both physical and sexual assault,

violence is the determining factor of the offense, it is more effective to treat both kinds of offenses *in one and the same legal bill* and not, as it is now, in a range of largely diverse bodies of laws distinct from each other, and which present no congruent scheme and hardly any synergies.

As the word ‘violence’ has a rather ambiguous meaning, the draft bill uses the term ‘harm’ to precisely define what is the rationale of this bill. *Harm* is a term which is well-defined and it can be verified in each case, using empirical methods of scrutiny, if or not there was physical, mental, emotional or sexual harm done to a child.

The second point where the new legal bill should differ from previous legislation is that harm done against adults, be it physical or sexual harm, on one hand, and against children, on the other, should be treated *in one and the same bill*, and not in different and divergent laws.

The reasons for incriminating violence are exactly the same whether the violent assault is directed against an adult or against a child. Violence is violence, no matter against which members of the community it is released or inflicted.

On the other hand, there is no rationale to incriminate consenting love and sex between generations whatever the age of the partners may be. What we need is a *unified legal codification* that leaves sex up to private enjoyment and focuses upon violence and actual harm done, and that treats both physical and sexual violence in one and the same bill. So far, many legal experts agree.

But few of them will follow me when I do the next move that in my opinion is logical and that sets out to *decriminalize the whole of human behavior when human intimacy and sexuality are concerned*, and this independently of the age of the persons involved in such intimacy and sexuality.

As a consequence of thinking the matter through until the end, we should take intimacy out of the hands of all state authorities and give advisory functions, if ever it is justified, to legally empowered and trusted consulting agencies.

I can only throw a tiny spot on the immense jurisprudence dealing with the delicate topic of *legal corporal punishment versus illegal child battery*. For the purposes of this study, it will suffice to summarize the basic findings on both, to get at an integrative conclusion. Of course, the limitation on the Anglo-Saxon le-

gal system bears no preclusion, nor prejudice or value judgment with regard to an international perspective.

It is a matter of common knowledge that so-called physical or corporal punishment as well as sex laws regarding children vary from culture to culture. Cross-cultural studies on the practice of corporal punishment as James W. Prescott's paper *Body Pleasure and the Origins of Violence* (1975), have come to the result that it is the combination of patriarchal values, a monotheistic religion with one single male god, the early deprivation of tactile nutrition and the prohibition of premarital sex that leads to violence, and thus also to violence against children, especially in its socially sanctified form as corporal punishment which is structural violence at its best.

In fact, what we are facing here are customs, traditions and social mores that have become *legalized*, thus making for the strangest body of law in human history. Of course, because of the limited scope of my research, the legal rules presented and discussed here can only serve as examples. In the United States, like in many other countries, the corporal punishment of children is *generally accepted and more or less widely practiced*. I am of course aware of the fact that in countries like Denmark, Sweden or Norway, where corporal punishment

is legally prohibited, we are facing an entirely different situation.

But as the United States of America are very influential worldwide through their dominance of the international media, I have started my research with the American legal situation, and still today think that it was the right way to do so. For if some states of the USA change their criminal laws because of the insights provided in my books and proposals, the signal function is not to underestimate. In my view, such a scenario would trigger a global change of sex laws for more rationality, more equity and more real safety for our children worldwide!

As for the present legal situation in the United States, criminal justice assumes the task to define the limits where lawful corporal punishment exceeds into the huge grey zone of unlawful child battery. As the judge considers the *social rules and mores* in this field as a kind of guideline, and since these social rules change constantly over time, it is inevitable that the law in this matter is constantly shifting as well. Besides the time factor, there is also a *territorial factor*. A judge in a small town in Texas may rule in a different way than a judge in, say, Boston or New York, simply because social mores differ with regard to the limits of physical pun-

ishment and the values attributed to paternal correction. This is not a fault of the laws nor can it be held that the Texas judge is less qualified to rule about the matter. The fact simply is that the law in this field is not exact in the sense that criminal justice in this particular field reflects to a large extent *social and cultural considerations*, thereby granting a considerable discretion to the judge, the jury and the prosecution to incriminate certain behavior, or not incriminate it. As this leads to considerable legal insecurity, which is not desired in any jurisdiction, *a total abolishment of corporal punishment of children has been suggested.*

—See only Dean M. Herman, A Statutory Proposal to Prohibit the Infliction of Violence upon Children, 19 FAMILY LAW QUARTERLY, 1986, 1-52, with further references.

The general formula under the present state of the law is that corporal punishment of children by their parents or persons in loco parentis is not unlawful ‘if it is administered in good faith with parental affection, ... and not cruel or merciless.’

—Wharton’s Criminal Law (1979), §§ 99-282.

If this sounds reassuring, one might doubt when reading further in *Wharton’s Criminal Law* textbook:

According to some courts, the punishment is unlawful only if permanent injury results; a parent is not liable for excessive or even cruel punishment if he acted in good faith. (Id., p. 310)

This law is criminal indeed since it says 'Thou shalt not beat them to lifelong cripples; but as long as the damage you do to them or the torture you inflict upon them can be repaired, you can impudently massacre them.' And what does the chewing-gum clause 'in good faith' do here? In the precedent *People v. Green* (1909), the offender was charged with assault and battery of his adopted child Mabel, a twelve-year old girl. In the following case report, the offender is called respondent, and the girl complaining witness:

On the day in question, . . . , respondent missed a 50-cent piece, and charged the complaining witness with its theft. She, however, denied having taken the money, whereupon the girl was disrobed, partially by Mrs. Green and partially by herself, and when she was naked and alone with the respondent was whipped by the respondent with a small riding whip. The respondent then tied her hands behind her back, having placed her nightgown on her, and left her. She was kept so tied from Friday afternoon until Sunday about noon, during which time the respondent fed her upon bread and water. On the Sunday morning following the whipping, the respondent and his wife left Mabel alone and went into the country. During Sunday forenoon she made some outcry and attracted the attention of Mrs. Jennie Wilton, who lived in the house adjoining respondent's. Mrs. Wilton noti-

fied some firemen in the engine house nearby, and the girl was taken naked and with her hands still tied from the room through the upstairs window of respondent's residence into the home of Mrs. Wilton. From there she was taken to the police headquarters and placed in the charge of Mrs. Francis Stoddard, the matron. Her condition is described by the matron as follows: 'From here to the bend of the knee (illustrating) was so thick with marks, and underneath the marks the flesh was dark blue, green, curdled, and over that was the lashes, every one as large as my little finger, that was raised on her body. Across the abdomen, the lower limbs, was six marks, cut, where the blood oozed out and scabbed over. Seventy marks across here (indicating) that was not cut, but these six were cut. Had broken the skin and also across the lower limbs here, until the blood had oozed out, and scabbed over, and when I bathed the little thing with witch-hazel and water she cried, and I could not bathe them any more.' (119 NW 1087, 1087-1088)

It should be noted that in this case the *Supreme Court of Michigan* ruled that the limits of lawful corporal punishment were indeed exceeded, and that the respondent was liable of child battery. But it is noteworthy to see for *what reasons* the court came to this conclusion. Contrary to what one may think, it was namely not the fact that the girl had been maltreated in a severe way by her foster father, but *the fact only that she had been naked during the assault*. It was not the lashes big as a little finger, it was not the pain inflicted on her, it was not the fact that her skin was broke and



the blood oozed out at various spots, it was not the cruel imprisoning of the child during a whole weekend, it was not the fact that she had been tied up and put on a hunger diet. It was the fact that she had been stripped before she was violently assaulted:

We think one of the most serious elements of the respondent's offense is the conceded fact that he compelled the complaining witness, a female between 12 and 13 years of age, to stand before him nude and receive the castigation. This act is tended to shock her modesty, to break down her sense of decency and the inviolability of her person, which is the most valuable possession of a young girl. (Id., p. 1090).

This clearly means that if she had been assaulted with her nightgown on, all would have been okay. No word about the serious wounds and all the horrible suffering the girl was subjected to. *It was the extravagant component of her nakedness, a subtly sexual connotation, that was decisive for the judges to hold that she was mistreated, not the excessive degree of violence, not the sadistic brutality and merciless treatment she was subjected to by her adoptive father.* How could the authoritarian paternalistic attitude of the judges be better expressed than in the words they used, 'modesty,' 'sense of decency'?

It is obvious that for these judges, the slightest sexual tenderness between the girl and her adoptive father

would have been held ten times as harmful as the brutal assault and the impudent violation of her corporal integrity. This is even more apparent, although in some hidden way, in the final statement of the court:

It is not the intention of the court to in any way weaken parental authority. On the contrary, we hold that it is the unquestionable right of parents and those in loco parentis to administer such reasonable and timely punishment as may be necessary to correct growing fruits in young children; but this right can never be used as a cloak for the exercise of malevolence or the exhibition of unbridled passion on the part of a parent. (Id.)

In another precedent, *State v. McDonie* (1924), the *West Virginia Supreme Court of Appeals* had to deal with an action against the mother of a six-year old boy who was cruelly mistreated by his stepfather. (96 WVa 219, 123 SE 405, 37 ALR 699).

The mother not only tolerated the brutal assault on the little boy, but it was proved that—

... she fully and freely acquiesced in the cruel punishment inflicted on her son by the stepfather; that she brought the rods and switches used and stood by, not only without any attempt of interfere, but apparently aiding her husband in every way, as testified to by a witness present at the time. (37 ALR 699, 700).

Here is the case report:

It appears that on the evening before the particular occurrence which led to the arrest of the defendant and her husband, the boy had absented himself from home, and was found at the home of his grandfather, the father of Mrs. McDonie, and brought home sometime just after midnight by an uncle. Mrs. Cassler says that after the uncle had gone, Joe McDonie brought in a bundle of switches and handed them to the boy, who in turn gave them to her. She says there were ten of them, and the smallest was as large as her largest finger. That then McDonie began whipping the boy in the dining room, and slung him against the wall, while defendant sat there and witnessed the assault; that the child ran upstairs, followed by McDonie, and that she and defendant followed them up; that the husband ordered the boy to get into the bathtub and take his clothing off, which he did, and then turned the hot water on; that all the time the child was pleading with the mother to take him out, and tried to turn the water off himself, but the husband threw him back several times brutally against the side of the tub; that they tied the child's hands behind him, and McDonie whipped him while he was in the hot water and held his head under the water until he strangled and bubbles arose to the surface; that defendant appeared to be no more concerned than if it was whipping a dog, and she would smile at me; that the child continually appealed to his mother to take him out; and that the only time Mrs. McDonie was not present was when she went after more sticks. Witness says that she afterward talked to defendant about McDonie's treatment of the child, and that defendant said she loved Joe better than she did the child. This witness had been living in the house with the McDonies about two weeks and says that during that time Joe McDonie whipped the child

brutally almost daily; and that several times defendant asked him to whip it. (Id., p. 701)

There is hardly anything to comment on this concerted action of brutality from the part of the three adults, including the passive cold-blooded witness, against that poor little child. The witness speaks of the child as an 'it,' not a him or her, as if speaking about a thing and not about a person. *The Calvinist worldview of conceiving children as strange and somewhat devilish objects when disobeying becomes clear in this case.*

There is a pretty list of precedents cited in the case report after the following statement of the court:

Inasmuch as defendant was the parent of James M. Gibson, she had a right to punish him, so that even if malice is presumed, in order to justify the conviction, the statute requires that the acts must have been done not only maliciously and unlawfully, but with the intent existing at the time the punishment was inflicted, either to maim, disfigure, disable, or kill. (Id., p. 700)

These conditions evidently show that a parent's discretion for crippling and disfiguring a child for lifetime is virtually unlimited. For how can the intention to maim, disfigure, disable or kill ever been proved at evidence for a court since it is *a purely inner intention*? Another case, *State of Wyoming v. Spiegel (1928)* states the following point of departure: 'For a parent or one

standing in such place to strike a child in punishment for disobedience or other misconduct is not an assault and battery, but is the exercise of a legal right.’ (39 Wyo 309, 270 P 1064, 64 ALR 289)

One may think that, over time, the judicial and social standards for admitting battery have changed. However, the Anglo-American legal system with its principle of *stare decisis*, the rigid adherence to often age-old judicial precedents does not favor flexible adaptation of legal rules to factual changes in the value system. Only statutory legislation that expressly overrides judicial precedents can bring effective change! In addition we have to doubt if social standards regarding parental and educational violence against children have really changed in any significant way since the 1920s. The fact that these precedents with the cited commentaries are to be found in a 1979 treatise on criminal law does not encourage a positive answer to this question.

*Wharton’s Criminal Law* expressly states: ‘A parent has the right to administer proper and reasonable chastisement to his child without being guilty of a battery.’

—Wharton’s Criminal Law (1979), p. 309.

In good English, a parent has the legal right to inflict violence on a child, as far as this violence is ‘proper and reasonable.’ Proper violence, proper wars and proper bombs. Reasonable violence, reasonable casualties, reasonable weapons. The structural violence in this vocabulary speaks for itself, and I spare any further comment.

As to the United Kingdom, Cross and Jones’ *Introduction to Criminal Law* states that ‘the use of force does not constitute an assault or a battery if the accused is acting in the exercise of the right of corporal punishment.’

—Sir Rupert Cross, *Introduction to Criminal Law* (1984), p. 134.

The definition is similar to the one used by American courts and the precedents cited under this judgment date from 1860, 1869, 1873 and 1934. One is from 1973. Obviously, a hundred years did not alter very much in a value system that considers the child the devil in person!

After all, educational violence against children appears to be a rather stable institution in all civilizations that share a patriarchal past. With regard to the corporal chastisement of pupils by their school teachers, the general formula under common law was:

At common law, a schoolmaster or teacher possessed discretionary power to inflict punishment upon his pupils and was not liable for battery in so doing unless the punishment caused permanent injury, was inflicted arbitrarily and without proper cause or maliciously.

—Wharton's Criminal Law (1979), p. 311.

The more recent opinion of the *United States Supreme Court* in the case *Ingraham v. Wright* may reflect the present state of the law:

The use of corporal punishment in this country as a means of disciplining schoolchildren dates back to the colonial period. It has survived the transformation of primary and secondary education from the colonials' reliance on optional private arrangements to our present system of compulsory education and dependence on public schools. Despite the general abandonment of corporal punishment as a means of punishing criminal offenders, the practice continues to play a role in the public education of schoolchildren in most parts of the country. Professional and public opinion is sharply divided on the practice, and has been for more than a century. Yet we can discern no trend toward its elimination. At common law a single principle has governed the use of corporal punishment since before the American Revolution; teachers may impose reasonable but not excessive force to discipline a child. (...) Although the early cases viewed the authority of the teacher as deriving from the parents, the concept of parental delegation has been replaced by the view—more consonant with compulsory education laws—that the State itself may impose such corporal punishment as is reason-

ably necessary for the proper education of the child and for the maintenance of group discipline. (Id.)

What was abandoned as a humiliating practice against criminal offenders is still good enough for treating school children! If we only replace the word 'force' in the text of the judgment by the word 'violence,' one of its sentences reads as follows: 'Teachers may impose reasonable but not excessive violence to discipline a child...' Group discipline seems to have such a high importance that it justifies group violence.

Violence as a social sanction is thus, according to the *United States Supreme Court*, a proper means to regulate social relations. And a trend for elimination of group violence, and all violence, shall according to this judgment evidently not come from American jurisprudence!

## SHARING A SECRET

Most pedophile relations are secret from the start. Far from being sad or depressed about this fact, most children, engaging in a secret love that will not be approved by their parents, enjoy the freedom and the power of sharing a secret with an adult other than their



parents. This is clearly an *empowering experience* for a child, whatever society thinks about those relations.

In addition, from the perspective of the child, a secret shared with an adult is different from a secret shared with a child. While psychologists nowadays encourage parents to have their children keep their secrets in front of their parents, a secret shared with an adult has a specific thrill for a child. The child derives from this experience a particular boost in self-validation, pride, and affirmation of their self-power and capabilities.

I have seen this as an extruding fact in all forensic reports, even in rape stories, in the strange cases where children go to a sadist who derives a special power thrust from routinely sodomizing children.

These stories are particularly interesting since the children, when the case goes to court, tend to emphasize the fact that they 'got some money' every time they went to the man, and parents, judges, lawyers and the lay audience tend to be dumbfounded by the fact that the child repeatedly went there for being raped, for the same lump sum of money.

The question that is on the tongue of everyone is to know if the child *really* came back for the money, or for something else?

The hypothesis I advance for those cases is that it is less the money why they come back again and again, but the self-validation they receive from the fact that they are accomplices in a story they know would seem horrible to their parents and society. It is the sharing in a top secret that gives them the special thrill to walk on a path near an abyss. This is probably so because the sharing of a secret has for a child an initiatory character. Scout activities, by the way, are very similar only that they do not imply sex. We have only to listen carefully to the arguments that the scout movements advance for justifying their cause. I think there are not many people in our culture who really disagree with the scout cause because it serves a good goal in some way, and the impact it has on youth is important, and positive!

*Jürgen Bartsch* and his atrocities provide a striking example. What research overlooked were the rare, but well present tender aspects of some of the first encounters this sadistic child murderer had with little boys he found attractive.

The tragedy of this man was that he, as all of us, wanted to be loved but thought that nobody could ever love him. Already as an adolescent, he used to play violent power games with smaller boys. His problem was that he thoroughly believed it was impossible for anybody to love him.

Most of the boys he raped and killed came to him several times before the rape, tortures and death blow occurred. Why did they come back after the first time? What they got the first time was usually a harsh beating on their naked bottom as that was Bartsch's way to start his perverse mating game.

Why did the boys come back to this strange man after such a treatment? I think this intriguing and confusing question can get us to know the truth about these very revolting cases.

The only explanation I have for these little boys to come back to a man that mistreated them was sharing in a secret that validated them in their quality as trustworthy humans, and not just irresponsible children—as what they were treated at home. This man, as horrible as he was, trusted them not to betray him, not to tell their parents about him, not to tell police. And the miracle is they didn't. Not one of them.

This is what we have to retain from these stories and not the crude, ugly details of sadistic murder that, strangely enough, the masses like to watch and know about. If researchers had found the little details I mention here, we would have had much more insight in child abuse and murder cases and could have been much more effective in the prevention of these crimes.

That a *child needs to be validated in being trusted* by a monster proves that in our society the child is not for the least bit trusted by his own parents and educators, and this lacking trust is exactly the outcome of the child protection paradigm.

It is this very lack of trust and the ensuing lack of self-validation that drive children to unconsciously sacrifice themselves in the hands of sadistic murderers. And this is a very sad thing to happen and a thing that, if we really wanted, *we could avoid to happen in the future*, namely by changing our child protection paradigm, or modifying it for good.

When you observe the personality traits of children that usually are trapped by this kind of men, you see that they are very similar. These children tend to be passive, obedient, sexually repressed and uninformed, and at home have to constantly play the *good boy* or the *good girl* for their emotionally insecure parents. I

also found that they are often either neglected or over-protected, and keep on having childish or babyish characteristics even though they approach puberty because their parents do not want to see them grow into adulthood.

Every murder has an often hidden psychological reason and nothing is pure chance in this world. I do not go as far as pretending that these children are accomplices even in their own murder, even though some psychoanalysts are courageous enough to advance this view, but I do believe that *this type of children unconsciously attract their murderer* because they want to be validated in a way that sounds very strange to us but that logically is the *antithesis* to the total invalidation they experience with their parents or educators. Thus, prevention of those crimes has to go along with a change in educating children, for example by beginning to educate them *more honestly about the facts of life*, and by giving them more trust, initiative, freedom, power, responsibility and opportunities for building self-worth.

The more we affirm pleasure, the more we inhibit violence and this is what our focus should be: on pleasure and the good, positive side of life and love. And the world being a mirror of our way to view it, which

is not only a philosophical argument but has been corroborated by quantum physics, we actually *help the world develop more pleasure in focusing on pleasure*. This, then, will be the most effective remedy against violence in all its forms.

## PEDOPHILIA AND INCEST

There exists a devastating confusion, presently, not only in the public discussions regarding the borders between childlove and incest, but even among highly qualified researchers and therapists. For example, one of the more creative child protection researchers, Lloyd DeMause, writes in all his publications that pedophilia was a form of incest projected outside of the family, a view that clearly contradicts most of the psychoanalytic literature.

When sex is not between family members, how can it be classified as incestuous? To talk here about a *projection*, which is DeMause's argument, is not enough to make a case. So, what is the relationship between childlove and incest—or family sex? Well, in both cases there are adults and children in play, only that in the latter case the adult and the child are related in direct

or indirect line and that there is a tutelary relationship between them.

In the present heated public discussion, all is actually messed up by a big disgusting moralistic morass that is misleading for anyone interested in truth. What, then, is the truth? The truth is that we are not talking about sex, but about *power* when we talk about incest. It can be argued that the reason why incest is tabooed all over the world is that in a relation where the child is dependent on an adult to the point to owe him or her his life, the power of the adult over the child is so large and encompassing that sexual abuse would become the order of the day.

However, this argument does not make sense because under the patriarchal rule of *patria potestas*, the father has anyway the right to even kill his offspring if it displeases him. So why should he then be denied to have sex with his children, sex being just another outflow of his absolute god-like power as the creator of the family? While formerly I thought the argument of predominant male power in a family was a point to be made against incest, I now think it is turning out to be a fake argument. As traditional culture has never really given up the concept of the total power of the patriarch over his family, I wonder why it should want to

undermine his sexual power over his children? Here is a riddle that we have to solve in order to really understand the incest taboo. The only explanation I can find here is one that has nothing to do with the power of the father, but the power of the son against the father. Let me explain.

The only way that, in traditional patriarchal culture, one can reason out the incest taboo is the danger perceived by the father that his son may want to *overthrow him as the power leader of the family* by taking the mother as wife. The son is feared, not the father. The son is the potential culprit in traditional patriarchal culture, and the female that is, in their view, always prone to moral corruption.

And here we have the true reason of Freud's 'Oedipal' obsession, if I may say so. What Freud expressed as a moral rule of the subconscious was not a myth, but the insight in a *millenary defense mechanism of male patriarchy*: the fear of a male authority to be disempowered, emasculated and dethroned by his own son. The Torah, the Koran and the Bible abound of stories where exactly this happened: a son overthrew his father and, by force, attracted all the power that was not, or not yet, due to him.



It is not surprising that religious books do not mention the deeper *psychological, emotional and sexual implications* of this almost archetypal power conflict between father and son in patriarchal culture, but this does not surprise the modern researcher. For in ancient times language was different and not yet using terms that today we qualify as psychological and that reveal much more of our inner reality than outside feats and events.

We can translate these stories reported in our religious books into the modern psychological language of inner reality to eventually understand that the only incest that was meant to be strictly prohibited by the fathers of our culture was mother-son incest, *not* father-daughter incest.

From this insight, Freud's Oedipal theory becomes fully comprehensible. It makes sense in patriarchal culture—and *only* there. Since we are still living in this old patriarchal tradition even though the father's power is considerably lower in modern society, it is logical that incest is still a matter of strict taboo. On the other hand, it astonishes less, then, to learn that feminist organizations in Latin America report the father-daughter incest rate in some Latin American countries was as high as eighty percent of the population. It astonishes

less not because one may agree, but because one may understand that the forefathers of our patrilineal cultures were preoccupied only with the threat of the father being emasculated sexually by his son, and not with considerations that had to do with protecting the female or the female child from sexual harassment.

Only when we understand where we come from, we can make out where we are possibly going to. If today right-wing researchers and child protectors fight against incest and so-called pedophilia, they are probably not even conscious of the social paradigm at the basis of their private or public wars. The fact that the incest taboo *also encompasses relations between adults* that are part of the same family makes it obvious that this taboo does not focus on prohibiting pedosexual relations, but targets at prohibiting sexual relations that take place within the special unit called *family*.

Thus, seen from both a historical and psychological perspective, the rhetoric of the child protectors regarding incest is without a rational basis, being one more puzzle stone in their deceiving public wars that are making the world ready for the totally sexless child—and for huge revenues for themselves as a result.

In addition, incest is not really something natural. Incest can be said to be always a *compensation for real*

sex. Genetically, the human race is coded in a way that there are potentially millions of possible sex partners for one single human being that is prohibited. Strangely enough, when incest is chosen before nature, that one single inappropriate sex partner is chosen over several millions of appropriate ones. This simple play of numbers shows the absurdity of incest without adding any judgment.

But, let's be honest, this argumentation is quite a Darwinist one in that it argues from a certain paradigm that we have derived from a *natural science* that once was universally valid but that is now more and more questioned. From an emotional perspective, one could argue exactly the opposite:

—Why should I go and look out for other mates while I have a beautiful tender and sexy child here at my disposition every day, a child that is willing to be my *totally loving, discrete, trusting, giving, willing and devoted partner* and sexual mate?

That was the position that Freud took at the start of his work. He said that because incest is so natural a feeling in the human parent and, equally, in the child, that culture had to establish very tight rules to make sure the taboo is doing the job. It is difficult to say if psychoanalysis is right with all those damaging effects

it attributes to incest, for there are testimonies to the contrary.

The interesting thing is that the *psychic disturbances* seem to occur typically in cases where the incest is not acted out but where the incestuous desire was heated by some kind of seductive behavior of a parent or sibling so that the libido of the child concerned was at one moment overwhelmed by incestuous drives while at the same time the taboo strongly inhibited the acting-out of those desires.

And the results of that inhibition can range from a nervous breakdown until a grown-out schizophrenia.

On the other hand, there are adults who speak out about their incestuous relations with a parent. I have seen on German television honest accounts rendered by men who said, with the most candid attitude, they had complete sex relations with their mothers over years, during puberty and even before, and that they not only never suffered a disturbance, but experienced the best relations with women later on.

In addition, one of the men in the interview related he was happily married and thereby the 'umbilical cord with his mother was cut,' but the memories he still had were entirely positive. Another man who was

a quite successful fashion designer said he would never have got this close contact with his emotions and creativity had he not experienced full love relations with his mother (who was an artist) over several years.

These men clearly acted against the patriarchal incest taboo—and it seems they did well doing so! Another account was given by a woman who said she experienced tender sexual relations with her father over years during her childhood, and that her father had been the best lover of lovers for her, and that the relation had given to her the utmost what a young girl could get both in terms of affection and initiation into the thrill of sexuality. The relation had begun when the girl was six or seven and went up into adulthood, until the girl found her later husband, an elder man she then loved.

Similar as with the men's testimonies given in that reportage, the woman said she had always felt she loved older men and that she was completely happy with her much older husband who was on the best terms with her father. With her marriage, she said, the incestuous relation with her father had stopped naturally.

These personal accounts honestly left me dumbfounded and I am frank enough to admit that I do not

know how to conciliate them both with the framework of traditional psychoanalysis and the overwhelming majority of civilizations that strongly inhibit and taboo incest. What also was astonishing in these cases was that when the participants of the talk show were asked if they had never experienced problems with neighbors, social workers or police or if their fathers or mothers had ever be threatened to be jailed for the horrible crimes they had committed, all participants smiled and affirmed that there had never been a problem of the kind since all family members had known about the incest and had fully agreed with it, and particularly the spouses of the fathers and mothers concerned.

Toward the end of the film, the participants were asked if still today they thought that the incest experience was a positive and enriching one, and all of them, without exception, affirmed and said they did not want to live again through their childhood without the experience.

Until this day, I have not heard or seen any expert comments to those testimonies.

My only explanation is that those fathers and mothers were simply exceptional in that they did not for the slightest bit abuse of their parental power to

achieve sexual gratification with their children but that the relationship was a completely mutual and consenting one, and one that was actively sought after and desired by the child. I tend to think that these cases are *the exceptions that confirm the rule* and that perhaps there were karmic reasons why in these cases incest was okay. I think there is a certain probability that in former lives, these parent-child couples already repeatedly lived through incestuous cycles, perhaps with reversed roles, and that their greater self-chosen path was to *gain experience through actively experiencing tabooed incestuous love*. I found my view confirmed in quite a few books that report channeled messages.

—See, for example, Jane Roberts, *The Nature of Personal Reality* (1974/1994) and *The Nature of the Psyche* (1979/1996) as well as Sanaya Roman, *Opening to Channel* (1987).

These messages conclude in that love is universally free as long as the partner or mate is respected in their own will. I also remind the reader that in Old Egypt, incest and incestuous marriages were the rule within the Pharaonic aristocracy while incest was forbidden to ordinary people.

Another explanation why the usual negative psychic effects of incest did not occur with the children in these cases could focus upon the conditions under

which in these cases the love and sex relation was lived between parents and children. Obviously, following the testimonials, and quite opposite to the cases we usually hear about in the media, the relations were lived without strife, fear, humiliation, anger, or hurt, and triggered entirely positive feelings.

Hence, one could erect the hypothesis that the negative effects that are usually found resulting from parent-child incest are probably the result not of the incest itself but of the hurting, stressful or even humiliating conditions it was forced to survive in and that, finally, led to its discovery and persecution. I think, as a general rule of life, it is not easy to live anything in life positively if, on a social scale, the matter is valued negatively or even considered a crime. This is a psychological fact we cannot just wipe under the carpet. And much more research is needed to see where the truth is in this highly complex matter!

What we can say so far is that we will hardly get at clear-cut answers in this important question, but rather will be able to paint a grayscale view with infinite subtle shades.

One possible result of such future research could be that the judicial follow-up of incest will probably completely change. First of all, criminal justice is



rather inept, incompetent and ineffective to handle incest in whichever form it may occur. What presently is done by police forces and justice in incest cases is blind and blunt damage, destruction and chaos, for all parties involved.

All observation of the various realms of living corroborates that incest is an exceptional form of love, and perhaps, for this reason, a viable love choice for exceptional people, and to a lesser extent, ordinary people. While I believe that a child can potentially consent to incest, the question still is how sensibly and responsibly the parent handles their power position in relating sexually to their child.

All this is not a matter for pathetic pro or con statements, but a topic for serious scientific research, because this research could possibly deliver totally new insights into the essential truth of sexuality as a human experience, which is not the mere instinctive and procreative sexuality of the animal because human sex is *primarily emotional and not mechanical*, and it therefore can go largely beyond what we see with animals.

That is, after all, our prerogative and our right as humans. This is also the reason we should actually talk not about sexuality but about *human sexuality* or *intimacy*.

## OVERCOMING THE SPLIT

My research on the topic of violence against children opened my eyes to what I came to call ‘the legal split in child protection,’ an example for judicial schizophrenia. I became aware quite early that to resolve the legal split in child protection, we have to handle both physical and sexual violence against children in one and the same legal bill. This requires us to have a deeper look at what many still believe is necessary educational violence. As long as a majority of citizens upholds the view that violence is good when it’s educational, we probably can wait until the end of times for a change in the law to happen here.

The same people who tend to vote for upholding the physical punishment of children tend to affirm the righteousness of inflicting violence upon prisoners, and prisoners of war. They tend to justify *all violence*, because they belittle violence, unaware of the long-term damages violence brings about for society as a whole. They carry violence virtually in their bones. They have been nourished not with mother milk and love, but with father milk and the whip, which is the only milk a father under patriarchy is supposed to give to his child, namely in the form of beatings, and of spanking.

In fact, the harmful effects of spanking have only recently been recognized internationally. It was not long ago that so-called ‘positive parenting’ was recognized as something so important that it would receive government funding because it’s a social policy that works. According to a poll by iVillage in 2005, 73% found physical violence against children as a form of discipline either ‘okay, when nothing else works’ or ‘an effective type of discipline’.

This poll says more than well-sounding declarations. It says that the majority of Americans, while considering violence against adults criminal, find violence against children okay when it serves to render children obedient. This means that the concern for protecting the child against violence from the side of adults is an entirely hypocrite endeavor!

This fact suggests that most American parents are not responsible citizens, but domestically violent. Furthermore, it indicates that American culture is not a peaceful culture, but rather something like a primal horde because it does not consider the child as a respected entity, but as a slave and poison container. These people, and it’s the majority in most of our modern industrial cultures, are not aware that violence

brings decay, both in the individual life and in the life of a group, of a nation, of a country.

The subject is even more complex, for those same people who tend to uphold educational and state violence, consider sex as something highly dangerous, something highly explosive, something that needs tight control and supervision. Accordingly, they belittle violence, while making of sex a myth; instead of putting their mind into the true causes of violence, they worry about the silly daily right-or-wrong of sex. It's silly because sex is natural. Violence not. But in their utter confusion, they are unable to comprehend this truth.

When we see that laws in a particular field are ineffective, arbitrary, irrational and nonsensical and that they bring about more social confusion, more violence, more harmful behavior than at the time when those laws did not exist, why do we want to uphold these laws?

My answer is simple. Because we are afraid of freedom! If there is something we are most afraid of, even abhor, it's freedom. Yet we pay lip service to the contrary. We are prison-hungry, and like to be a slave in a group of slaves. And we try to kill each and everybody who is feeling he's not a slave, but a king. Because, to repeat it, we, as a society, abhor true freedom. We ar-

gue that freedom brings chaos. That's so because we do not understand nature. Nature does not need control to be good. Nature brings about all living and maintains the sun to shine without needing governmental control or funding. Nature has brought about sexual attraction. Man has brought about sexual violence. Nature has created pleasure, man does all to destroy it. Nature has given us freedom, man does all to do away with freedom and establish unfreedom as the order of the day. Nature has instilled in children sexual curiosity, man has distilled age of consent laws—and without asking those who are concerned by these laws, the children. Every age of consent is arbitrary in some way and dependent on the myth of children's innocence in sexual matters, as well as on ambiguous religious or cultural assumptions and customs.

History research brought to daylight that throughout human history, ages of consent constantly varied according to the economic and social context of a given society or community and the value system resulting from this context. It is since long disproved that it is procreation ability that grants children competence and capacity for giving or receiving sexual pleasure. The truth is that procreation capacity is *not necessary* for a child to be able to consent to body touch or for

exchanging sensual pleasure with certain preferred persons whatever their age. Especially for children below the age of reason, our usual societal regard upon *sex as a matter of 'acts'* and their distinction into non-penetrative and penetrative ones does not make sense.

When a child is enamored with an adult, the child tends to express willingness also for a penetrative embrace, even if the child is physically not yet ready for intercourse. In the magic world of a small child, loving interaction with an adult is part of an *integrative worldview* that makes no difference between the nature of various pleasures, and where the sexual game is a matter of fantasy, not a factual understanding of its physical reality.

The actual willingness for full sexual intercourse often to be encountered with small girls who are enamored with an adult man is not surprising. It is not based upon what sexology calls the 'facts of life,' but an expression of that *magical reality* the small girl lives in and expresses in a poetic language. It does not bother about the size of the genitals that are going to be put 'in each other,' while this may funnily be expressed that way, and it has no act-centered sexual opinions. It is based upon *emotions*, and the *flow of emotions as a vital ingredient of love*. It is beyond body poetics and

rooted in the small child's encompassing magical reality.

We may not fully understand child sexuality, but I think I can safely say that for the child the *magic anticipation of intercourse* is an intrinsic element of psychosexual growth and a sane expression of small children's fantasy world. This psychological reality, to say this clearly, does *not justify pedophilia as a political agenda*, or a future political agenda. It asks for protecting the magical space of the child by not imposing educational control and supervision of the child's intimate sphere. It's, so to say, a *principle of non-intervention* that I advocate here. Or, to use the much simpler terms of Bob Marley's wistful song, 'Let the children play.'

## THE GREAT SINNER

Age of consent laws perhaps had some rationale in times where the actual age of puberty of a child coincided with a child's sexual and social maturity. This is historically thus valid for the Middle-Ages where it was with around twelve to fourteen years that a young person could consent to sexuality, marry and establish a business. In all later periods, and especially in modern times, an evident clash is to be noted between the ac-

tual *emosexual maturity* of a child and his or her legal age of consent.

This brings about social and legal uncertainty and actually degrades children instead of helping them to mature functionally into responsible adults and interdependent members of the community.

Present age of consent laws hold children back from natural sexual and non-sexual life experience and hold them imprisoned in an *artificial cocoon of immaturity* that retards and even disables the full expansive blooming of their bioenergetic and spiritual potential. Research has shown that a rigid age of consent barrier as legal discrimination between unlawful sex and lawful sex with children is in practice of little functional value because of the differences in the actual development and maturity of every child.

Instead, it has been seen that it is rather a matter of *values* why social groupings opt for more severe or else more liberal sex laws.

It became particularly evident during the reform discussions in the Netherlands that it is not in children's best interest that reform is undertaken, but for a *political purpose* and with the after-thought of realizing certain political goals. Those who share liberal social



views and emphasize the autonomy of the child tend to favor a low age of consent while those with traditional views and right-wing political orientation tend to emphasize strict sexual laws with a pronounced attitude to holding children back from autonomous decisions, thereby implicitly denying children's innate right for self-determination.

In principle children are able to give valid factual consent to sexual activities with adults. This ability is independent of the child's age; it is unrelated to certain biological events such as puberty or sexual maturity, or else emission capacity. It is a mere question of *actual willingness*. Besides that, it is a matter of culture and education if, or not, a child only shows sexual curiosity and engages in autoerotic sex play, or shares, more actively, in a fuller range of sexual interaction with others. The assumption made by early psychoanalysis that sane children were 'only' autoerotic and not able for partnership, is superseded by newer sexological, psychological, ethnological and psychoanalytical research showing that children, when given freedom, will explore all that is sexually possible, including complete intercourse with both children and adults. It is not a matter of any fictive or legally recognized maturity.

—See, for example, Larry L. Constantine & Floyd M. Martinson, *Children & Sex* (1981), Larry L. Constantine,

Treasures of the Island (1976), Susanne Cho, *Kindheit und Sexualität im Wandel der Kulturgeschichte* (1983), Françoise Dolto, *La Cause des Enfants* (1985), *Psychanalyse et Pédiatrie* (1971), *Séminaire de Psychanalyse d'Enfants* (1982, 1985, 1988).

Early psychoanalytic findings, such as those by Sigmund Freud that seem to show that children tend to engage only in autoerotic sexual satisfaction were rendered under the spell of the *highly puritan morality of the industrial bourgeoisie* of that time. On the basis of the child's general capacity to give and receive pleasure, the child is able to decide in each instance what feels right and what feels wrong regarding sex and love with oneself and others. The fact that societal attitudes through the process of educational conditioning will influence the child's general attitude in sexual matters cannot be a reason for letting societal interests shun the emotional and sexual needs of children!

Besides that, even the proponents of traditional legal solutions did not generally and per se wipe the idea of a factual consent of a child to sexual activities from the table. These people usually point to the fact that under the present laws, any such factual consent of a child to any child-adult sexual activity is deemed legally invalid. We face a tautology. The reply does not answer the question. It elegantly circumvents it. Somehow, many researchers from the strata of traditional-

thinking people have in my view not totally excluded the possibility of a socially adequate range of nonviolent sexual activities between children and adults, leaving open the possibility of a different and sexually more liberal social situation being one day realized within a different legal system that backs it up. In the commentaries on statutory rape is to be found that the factual consent of the child is *legally invalid* or *immaterial*. This argument logically implies that such factual consent is possible!

It is inconsistent, then, to argue with traditional criminal law experts that children generally did not know what they consent to when it regards their sexual wishes or desires. Children do have the ability to *know what they find pleasurable and gratifying, on one hand, and what they find appalling, on the other*. Sexuality is a way of exchanging pleasure, it's a form of *communication*, and it is as such only one of various experiences that enrich our lives. And as with all other life experiences, there will be a first time when this pleasure is experienced and there will also be one or the other form of initiation to it.

That such initiation of a child, when it comes from the side not of a child, but of an adult, should be abusive in every single case has little or no factual backup.

Research speaks rather for evaluating every case and restraining from general judgments because set opinions about the matter can hardly cope with the variety of possible experiences.

More recent research repeatedly confirmed that trauma is not generally experienced through the sexual initiation itself but through certain behavior from the side of the adult that the child feels is inappropriate, or that is appalling because of coercion or because the child is silenced by threat with the purpose of keeping the experience secret.

—See Laretta Bender & Abram Blau, *The Reaction of Children to Sexual Relations with Adults* (1937), 500-518, Brant & Tisza, *The Sexually Misused Child* (1977) and Cook & Howells (Eds.), *Adult Sexual Interest in Children* (1980).

In commentaries on traditional sex laws it is often said that premature sexual knowledge and experience had to be avoided by all means or that early sexual experience would disturb the sexual development of the child. This argument evidently contradicts the truth that all in life grows and evolves *as a result of experience* and not as a result of avoiding experience; as such, this argument simply cannot serve as a basis for legislation.

Upon deeper regard this argument, often to be found in right-wing circles of society, appears to be an

ideological credo that serves to maintain an *artificial image of childhood* that in little or no way cares about the real needs of children. It can be argued that in former highly patriarchal societies the sanctified power of an adult male when sexually approaching a child would regularly be qualified as abuse. There is certainly some truth in this, but the value of this argument changes considerably for present-day culture that has considerably restricted the power of the adult male when it goes to sexual mating.

According to modern research, violence and power abuse in sexual encounters between adults and children rarely occurs and is rather the exception than the rule of such encounters. While traditional child rearing required from the child an almost total submission under the command and the authority of the parents and teachers raising and educating them, in modern democratic society the child is not invariably and totally subjected to authority but granted a substantial amount of freedom and personality rights that include free speech and a still expanding range of options and freedoms for self-realization as well as a constantly growing impact upon deciding about his or her own professional future. It can even be argued, and it is rhetoric among leftist groups in Western society, that it

is the *authoritarian system in politics, society and family itself that brought about child abuse in the first place*, and not the modern view that considers children as members of the community in their own right.

It cannot be denied that physical child abuse is to a large extent justified by patriarchal morals; while sexual abuse is a controversial matter.

Traditional circles of society tend to blind out the existence of child abuse or project it on sexual minorities; on the other hand, more progressive circles tend to overreact and exaggerate child abuse in modern society.

Whatever opinion one may personally have, it cannot be denied that our culture that is still basically patriarchal has built, over times, a high degree of structural violence that makes it very difficult to change sex laws because of a basic lack of trust in the self-regulatory systems inherent in nature. This is why only a responsible legislator can change those laws rather than waiting for a majority of the population to be ready for this change. Modern legislation must care about the best of the subjects to be protected by the law, as is children in this case, and not or much less about ideological, religious, traditional or custom opinions of the majority of the population.

In a strictly authoritarian system children range among slaves; abuse will occur without being called abuse. In a democratic society, however, children are partners and have choices to engage in life in ways that may be unthinkable in highly controlled social systems but that meet children's need to grow, and also, to grow in autonomy.

There is no essential difference between the consequences of physical and sexual violence against children. Both physical and sexual violence can have traumatizing effects on the child's psyche.

By contrast, in the absence of violence in sexual relations, children tend to receive some form of gratification from the experience. In addition, psychology corroborated that children are *emotionally indiscriminating*, and that it is generally not the age of a possible partner or mate that is decisive for them to love this person, but other, emotional factors such as friendship, care, closeness, availability, understanding or continuity.

A study conducted by Anna Freud on children kept in shelters during the heavy German bomb attacks in London during World War II came to the result that children are not invariably emotionally attached to their parents but to *anyone who cares for their nutrition and emotional needs*. As a matter of fact, some of the

children only unwillingly accepted to get back to their parents after the end of the war because they had *emotionally attached* to one or the other caretakers in a shelter. The study also concluded that fear is not inherent in children, not even in war times but a result of the parent's own fear that is transmitted to them telepathically or by implicit action. Without parental enticement to be afraid, Anna Freud concluded, children are matter-of-fact and able to enjoy virtually any situation that arises, how dangerous it ever may be.

From all the factors that are decisive in sexual relations between children and adults, one factor has been found the least important, *the child's age*. A girl of sixteen can be totally unable to consent to a sexual activity with a peer or an adult while a girl of four may feel safe and competent to agree to sex with an adult she loves. Sexual development in fact has shown to depend much more on factual and positive life experiences than on certain biological key events.

The latter are still necessary and important to happen but *relatively secondary* with regard to a child's factual love capacity. The inherent danger that children can become victims of emotional or sexual exploitation, are equally independent of the child's age. The danger exists for all children, with the difference how-



ever that the experienced child will be much more able to cope with unwanted sexual approaches than children that are raised in overprotection, fear and guilt, and sexual ignorance.

Highly protected children have shown to be much more vulnerable to exploitation than children who can experience love and sexuality according to their own curiosity and the opportunities that life brings to them naturally. Children raised in authoritarian settings are generally unable to cope with unexpected situations because in the normal course of events decisions are taken for them and not by them, and they are not the rulers of their destiny.

By contrast, children from liberal families tend to develop a more or less effective self-protection that shields them against actual exploitation. The law does not have and does not want to have the function of keeping children immature but must consider children as beings-in-growth in accordance with the child's need to build more and more autonomy as they grow up.

Effective legal protection can only be provided on the basis of *equal rights for children*, and it has to be seen that the abandonment of authoritarian structures in education will in last resort make the passive sub-

mission of children to physical or sexual attacks on them less likely to occur.

On the other hand, it has often been argued by criminal lawyers that a legal system with strict ages of consent bears the advantage to provide strict guidelines about what is permitted by the law and what is illegal.

There is certainly some truth in this argument. But apart from the fact that in love encounters it is quite uncommon to inquire about the exact age of a mate, I claim that for adults to assure that the sexual activity with a child they engage in is *nonviolent under the definition of a statute* is a legal fact easier to verify than finding out about the exact age of a child.

A future legislation should be sex-affirming, positive and rational, as well as effective for defeating violence. It should not be moralizing, but built upon scientifically corroborated findings and experiences. As such its primary intention should be to prevent violent crime, and violent sexual crime, instead of nailing people with useless draconian punishments.

To achieve this goal, the legislation should be highly restrictive toward violence encompassing even slight forms of psychic pressure under its definition. Such an

approach would then be consistent with the insight that it is violence that is to be feared, that is dangerous to a child, an adult or the community, and not sensual pleasure and sexual diversity.

Basic novelties of such a future legal bill should be the abandonment of age of consent and the retreat of state and federal authorities to ruling and policing into the family and into love and intimacy, thus abandoning the age-old *persecution of nonviolent and consenting relationships between persons of different age*, regardless of their sexual or non-sexual nature. Eventually, the most daring novelty is the establishment and legal authorization of special consultants to effectively deal with cases that are to be qualified as violent physical or sexual attacks on children.

The allocation of the burden of proof should be drafted as an exception to a general rule of nonviolence put up as a starting point of the bill. With regard to the criteria of the activity in question to be nonviolent, it should be legally presumed that the child consented to the sexual activity when that activity was nonviolent and that the child was able to estimate to what they consented to, except in those particular circumstances where consent was deemed legally invalid.

In cases of doubt, the defendant should bear the risk that consultants prove the child was unable to consent either by showing that there was no factual willingness of the child or by proving that the child exceptionally lacked the necessary ability to make an informed decision. The burden of proof should be reversed when the activity was to be qualified a violent sexual assault as an aggravating judicial circumstance.

Research demonstrated that physical violence against children cannot effectively be dealt with by a legal dichotomy of lawful corporal punishment, on one hand, and unlawful child battery, on the other. Besides the fact that under some jurisdictions even brutal and truly harmful physical attacks on children would still be justified as lawful corporal punishment, if only the parent or educator acted in 'good faith,' the dividing line between the two areas is extremely difficult to draw and the legal uncertainty thus considerable.

This lack of sharpness of the pertaining laws is certainly not for the good of the child. It rather serves the *perpetuation of an authoritarian, repressive and inhuman educational system* that is outdated because it produces uncreative, fearful, and codependent human beings. And whatever position one may take, there is no doubt that both corporal punishment and child battery are

violence inflicted upon children. Hence, there is no rational reason to treat both forms of behavior in a different way.

Actually, the only difference is an internal factor—good faith—which is what lawyers call a chewing-gum clause because it's very hard to prove or disprove in reality and thus serves judge and jury to get at about any thinkable outcome that serves to corroborate their feelings and that, by doing so, opens the door to all and every form of prejudice.

The intention of a democratic and childcaring legislator can only be to prohibit the infliction of violence upon children. Moreover, it has no rational basis to grant certain adults such as parents or educators a *free license to violently attack a child* for whatever reason, educational or other.

The general law policy behind any future legislation on prohibiting violence against children should also consider that mere gifts or promises given in exchange to sexual favors are not depriving the child of their personal autonomy and do not directly impinge upon the child's psyche.

In general, they can be said to represent, to a certain extent, socially adequate behavior in that they are

only indirectly impacting upon the child's consent. In the same way as a child can accept or refuse kisses and caresses already as a baby, they can accept or deny to engage in any nonviolent sexual activity, and this regardless of age.

The burden of proof should be with consultants for the fact that, in the particular case, the child did not consent to the sexual activity when *prima facie* such consent was given. It is equally on consultants to prove that the child exceptionally lacked the capacity to estimate what they consented to. If the defendant did not know about the child's state of incapacity to consent, the consent of the child should legally be deemed to be valid. Such a provision is pertinent for the rather exceptional cases where the child was willing and consenting but mentally retarded without appearing to be retarded, or in any other way in a state of *mental or emotional confusion* or incapacity to consent, while however appearing to be normal.

It should be presumed by the statute that children do not consent to violent physical or sexual interactions. The burden of proof should be on the defendant for the fact that, beyond reasonable doubt, the child consented to the activity despite its violent character.

To summarize, what I suggest as a drafting technique for any future bill that sets out to unify the social fight against physical and sexual violence against children, commonly called ‘physical and sexual abuse,’ is to follow the principles of drafting statutes established for civil law procedures, as they are valid, still today, not only in the United States and the United Kingdom, but also in former members of the British Commonwealth called common law jurisdictions such as, for example, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, India, Pakistan, Burma, Singapore or Sri Lanka.

Such an approach would be in accordance with my initial proposal to *decriminalize sexual behavior for all members of society*, and establish a consulting service composed of trained and experienced psychological, psychiatric and sexological advisors to deal with these matters as *legally empowered professionals* working for the public good and in execution of governmental duties and responsibilities.





# CHAPTER SEVEN

---

## PEDOPHILIA NEEDS TO BE SOCIALLY CODED

Obvious for the attentive reader, according to my theories of etiology regarding both homosexual and heterosexual pedophilia, I start from the premise that pedophilia is not 'laid in the cradle,' so to speak; in other words, we are not born as pedophiles, as it's today often wrongly assumed.

At the basis of the pedophile affliction, there is always trauma suffered, hurt experienced, early in childhood, and often throughout childhood and youth. Hence the importance for pedophiles to build awareness of the inner wounds, and one's past, and work through the emotional stuckness, so that the emotional flow becomes again smooth and normalizes itself.

Consciousness work, and body work both can contribute in this healing process. If this work can be done alone, or needs psychiatric help, I am not able to assess, for I am not a psychiatrist. I can only plead for

pedophiles to *avoid harming children* through awareness building, especially for avoiding any unreflected and impulsive sexual acts inflicted on the love child.

As I mentioned it already, ideally relations should remain in the sphere of socially acceptable sensuality, be it for the sole reason to keep the child from being entangled in a later discovery process that can easily assume gigantic and unbearable dimensions when we consider the mass hysteria that is present today in most countries regarding this topic.

In my prisoner support work, I have seen that not all pedophiles are able to build this kind of emotional awareness, and may be driven by an egoic demand for self-gratification, which has reasons on its own; it can be a narcissistic fixation or just simply an overly demanding compensatory ego structure.

Contrary to common assumptions, I have not found in my research evidence for the claim that all pedophiles were suffering from a narcissistic hangup. However, it has to be seen also that in the view of the tight social control system and the dangers involved in pedophilic activities, we should not wonder when many pedophiles actually suffer from pathologies that are not directly related to their pedophilic attraction, but are a result of the social situation in which they are

forced to live and that they cannot control. This is one of the reasons why pedophilia should be socially coded, and legally revised.

Sex laws regarding pedophilia should be revised first of all because all existing laws were not drafted by a rational attempt, and through modern lawmaking; hence, they are lacking out on any empirical research and evidence, as they are simply the successors of Canon law, the laws made by the Church's Inquisition, hundreds of years ago.

I have inserted in this chapter a sequence that might be realized one day in a film, and that shows that there is not one monolithic image of possible adult-child erotic relations, but a *plethora of potential adult-child relations*; each relation may bear its own flavor, and may be acted out in a different social and psychological setting.

In all those relations that depend on the mindset of those who are the actors in the drama, the behaviors are different, not uniform, *not standardized* as the modern literature on pedophilia suggests it. There simply is no such thing as a typical 'pedophile relation,' as there is no typical 'pedophile' as a personality type or standard concept of sexual attraction.

Much here is myth and fairy tale still, and very little is actually rendered conscious. And this is exactly one of the reasons why our society doesn't really responsibilize itself to eventually draft effective yet human laws on the matter and tolerates the present situation which favors violence against children because the laws in place are arbitrary, draconian, and unacceptable in a modern democracy.

In addition, what is perhaps worse, the present situation favors blackmail and exploitation of pedophiles by cunning mothers who want to cash in twice, first from the pedophile himself, then from the state when they denounce the relationship as 'child abuse.' The present system therefore contributes to violent and disruptive relationships, and it favors all kinds of paracriminality and vigilante activism because it has rendered social communication under certain circumstances a crime. What is erotic love of children other than a specific form of social communication? Who has declared it a crime? Where is the rational for doing so? I would like to leave this question open; for the reader to find his or her personal position based either on superstition and denial, or else correct information gathering.

You may argue that you can't voluntarily get rid of your power thirst that may be the result of a violent education or horrendous humiliation suffered in your childhood, or else the result of repression in a deeply life-ignorant society. You are right! Since this is a fact, you are so much the more called upon *to do something about it*.

This insight namely should lead you to abandoning all mental or religious concepts that have in common that they only reinforce the inner controller or the inner critic, and lead to still more fear, to still more repression, to still more inner conflict.

Behold, the violence you do to yourself is violence you potentially act out against others! And this in turn attracts violence done to you! The way to peace is giving yourself peace, tolerance and freedom in the first place. It means for you to be more permissive toward yourself and to be less permissive toward outside influences that impact on you.

Is that uncanny? To make myself understood, let me give you an example. For years, first in my quality as a lawyer, later as a counselor, I was in touch, by correspondence, with prisoners who have got long sentences. There was one who got the longest fine among all of them, one hundred thirty-five years. He was in a

terrible situation. Despite the fact that he lived a peaceful life and was highly useful for the community in helping many people within the prison with his intellectual skills, nobody took him for what he was. When there was a riot, he got punished despite the fact that he had not participated in it. Every day, his life became worse. His affair had been a show spectacle for the news because of his love with two adolescent boys for whom he had been the stepfather. The boys were positive about him and none had complained about the love and sex relation, but he was branded as the devil in person and humiliated to the extreme. The woman and mother of the boys he once had dated for marriage, felt bitterly deceived by him and it was actually this woman that brought him to being found and sentenced.

I developed for him a kind of power plan that was destined to turn his negative inner spiral into a positive spiral and a growth process. I had really taken care of him more than of others in similar situations. I even had sent him money, something that is usually not part of prisoner care. His fate and his excellent character had moved me.

However, our friendship broke because he, not me, closed our correspondence! He simply stopped writing

me after five years of an extended correspondence and after I had submitted and explained to him the growth plan with detailed daily affirmations and a positive mind program. He had taken it as a sectarian approach to life that he could not subscribe to, as he replied to me in writing.

What actually happened was that he wanted me to follow his most foolish wishes, such as getting him little friends for correspondence, trusting the prison authorities' statements that the mail was 'not censored.' I had written him repeatedly that I would never do this for him since it was not only a bad service but would endanger him and me. Whereupon he wrote that I was lacking understanding for his dreadful longing for love, that, as a friend, I should be more understanding, and so forth. I said I understood him perfectly—and really did—but that complying with his wish could possibly mean to close his prison door forever. After all, he himself wrote me about the fascist prison system in which he was caught (Virginia) and I strongly felt that these authorities were not to be trusted and that probably they watched him very closely.

In the following exchange of letters, I tried to raise his awareness that he had himself attracted all that happened to him, because of his terribly negative and

life-denying mindset. What I actually found in my analysis was that he unconsciously complied with the distorted and hyper-violent value system of the society that judged him so harshly. He himself had internalized that system, had subscribed to it and he himself had inflicted the punishment, with society as the longer arm of his own punitive mind.

He could not accept this insight and stepped out of our relationship. Of course, we can always close our eyes to *not see the truth of our lives*. And we have the right to do so. For me, it meant that I learnt I cannot be of help for somebody *when that person is not ready and willing to help herself*.

This man's problem was that he could not accept freedom. The notion of freedom scared him more than the very lack of it. I had told him the story of a murderer who had been imprisoned in Georgia, a state that equally maintains a very repressive correction system.

This murderer was set free after a few years inside the walls. He had found the way to his true religion and was filled with such an abundance of love and commitment that no walls could any more hold him back to fulfill his mission of love! My friend said I was talking like somebody from the *Salvation Army* but not as a true friend. Maybe it sounded like that to him but



it was not meant to be *emotional wax*, I wrote back to him. I really had shared the happiness of that man whose book I had read. He had not been false or pretended something to get out of prison. He had changed his mindset and had become really positive, having used affirmative prayer to overcome his punitive inner controller, and to affirm himself, his true being.

I know that such a change is unusual and rather difficult to make. I do not pretend that it's easy. I do not talk about illusions or easy make-believe. I wrote him that if he wanted, he could be free, but that he had to *reach this freedom first of all inside his own mind* and that he could change his destructive inner program if he wanted to. I also was very clear that he had to accept his love for boys as a primary condition for his inner healing since, unconsciously, he identified with his oppressors and made himself down because of his being different from others. He did not see that we are all different in a way and that our differences in sexual taste are accompanied by many other personal characteristics that render us distinct and unique as soul beings.

As long as our fear to be different is stronger than our courage to be ourselves, we cannot realize our soul

power and inner growth. We then lack identity and actually do not live our own life but the life of some mysterious stranger that is inside of us and that dominates our life like an anonymous shadow.

Identity is built through accepting one's fate and turning it to its positive side so that the seeds contained in it can grow. Personal safety goes along with identity and it comes about naturally.

As long as identity is not built, as long as we are prisoners in a value system that is deeply false and violent, as long as we have not achieved true inner freedom, we are potentially unsafe. In this situation, however, there is help through the support of the higher forces of destiny that are taking care of our spiritual growth, which is our way to true identity. We only have to connect with these forces and ask them to help and protect us. This is done through positive prayers as they are referenced, as examples, below.

There are practical ways that are more or less known to most people, but there are also spiritual ways. The latter are far more effective, although usually people ignore or belittle them. Among the practical ways, the first and perhaps most important is to incarnate a certain level of wisdom in our speech and write. This means namely to refrain from negative talk about

others, from gossip, from slander and from statements that express powerlessness, frustration, emotional distress and hopelessness. The latter emotions tend to undermine the positive structuring of the psyche and they also undermine the building of a feeling of safety and confidence in relationships.

How can we get to a point to avoid such kind of destructive self-talk in our daily exchanges? We have to clear our inner space before we begin to talk with others! How to do this? This kind of inner space clearing is exactly what meditation is about. It is a *dynamic process* that involves dealing with our inner mind and that brings about constant positive changes in that mind so that it becomes stronger and more flexible. The more flexible our mind is, the stronger it is since it can more easily adapt to changes in our outer life situation.

Thus, to come back to our initial question of accepting pedophilia, I think that indeed when you feel emotionally and sexually attracted to children, the best is to *accept this attraction*. The next step, then, is to see the beauty in it, and to cope with it on a daily basis. That means to live it constructively, which implies to handle the emotions that go along with it, and also to handle the guilt. After all, only if you assume the re-

sponsibility for your attraction, you can feel *empowered enough to handle it*, instead of succumbing to it and incurring the danger of inflicting possible hurt to others and yourself.

There is no alternative to self-acceptance, and the first thing is perhaps to stay away from the public debate and instead focus inside. Truth can only be found inside, and the intricacies of our love attractions are a good and valid reason for starting out on a spiritual and self-exploratory journey.

When behavior is not socially coded, savage forms of conduct rise up. That is how society, failing to establish a social code for the erotic love of children creates confusion and instability instead of clarity and stability. When society chooses prohibition as a means and strategy to regulate conduct, it creates black markets. Black markets create criminality. Thus the good old paternalistic *knowing better what is good for the people* actually is a root of crime, not a rule of peace.

What I am talking about here is what I call the *Little Man Rule* which is another feature of the moralistic paradigm. In moralistic education, those who win are the ones who repress their emotions and deny being themselves. It is the robots and the ones who shoot others in the back who become the leaders.

Under the present anti-pedophilia paradigm and the corresponding laws of consent that are rather laws of dissent, the *Little Man Rule* is in full blossom. Here as well, those who win are those who shoot others in the back.

What is the result? A society of denunciators, persecutors, spies and cheaters. Those who play the game will be paid twice. They make their deals on the back of those who are condemned to lose, backed up by the community that pays them well for their lack of character, their lack of loyalty and their lack of honesty. Thus, moralistic society educates the masses to become immoral and unvirtuous—which is exactly what already the old Chinese sage Lao-tzu observed in his *Tao Te Ching* when he wrote:

18. HYPOCRISY

When the Way is forgotten  
Duty and justice appear;  
Then knowledge and wisdom are born  
Along with hypocrisy.

When harmonious relationships dissolve  
Then respect and devotion arise;  
When a nation falls to chaos  
Then loyalty and patriotism are born.

Moralism appears to be a *pretext for immorality*, a hypocrite façade of pseudo-values that are built on

moving sand. Throughout the ages, the most virtuous is tempted once in a while. This is not only true for saints, but also for lovers, and not less for pedophiles. Temptation agents are not the children but their mothers. ‘Hi man, wanna taste my little ones?’

It’s not that outspoken, of course. But on a subtle level it’s that message. Of course, those mothers are not the first ladies and not the well-groomed, in most cases divorced, with a long abuse story on their back, ugly, poor, greedy and violent.

Some time ago, in a poetic moment, I sketched down a teaching tale around one of those stories as they are happening daily all over the world. It could serve as a script for a film clip.

## THE ‘LITTLE MAN’ RULE

There she sits with the two princesses to her right, at a pizza snack, waiting for the opportunity of her life. The girls have pale, ugly and sad faces, but a beautiful body under their simple clothes. They are around eight or nine. One of them turns around and gives me a deep look.

Doesn't dare to smile or, I guess, is too sad in her heart. The other eats, with great intensity. She must be very hungry. Their hair has no shine, no beauty. Dull, like their faces. I feel that their sadness is infectious. My heart feels heavy once of a sudden. There is such an intensity in the regard of that girl. There is a *demand* in it that I read as 'Take me away if you can!'

I guess that many pedophiles, in similar situations read such body language as 'Take me to bed if you can!' and that may be true, too. But if so, behind the wish to go to bed which is meant as an honest form of payment is the deeper wish to be freed from oppression, from abuse, from violence. The pedophile is oversensitive to those messages.

Let's see how stories of this kind tend to continue, not in all, but in many cases. After the mother saw that her daughter has spied out a potential victim, she whispers something into the child's ear, smiling, peeping several times over in my direction. She grins. She's even more ugly when she tries to smile and I see that she has not truly smiled since years, that she has forgotten what a smile is. Her grin is more ugly than the expression of hate and disgust that is the usual make-up of her face. I smile back, mechanically, wondering how I could ever get to exchange smiles with such a

monster of a mother. Now the smaller girl who has finished eating and got an idea of what's going on, turns 'round, in a gracious gesture that I had not expected. She shakes her long blond hair and I look into her beautiful eyes. I am petrified, *in love at once!* She says lightly 'Why don't you come over to us? Seems you haven't got a chair yet. There's one free next to me ...'

I feel like a robot, without will, without resistance, without getting a pinch from heaven that whispers 'Watch out, man!' ... and there's only one thing in my heart and one thought in my brain: love!

The rest of the story spins like a film. It can go either way. Let's see how it goes in cases that end up in court, violence and disruption, and then how it ends up in cases that continue in peace and bring about rich fruits.

In the first case, the mother profits from the *Little Man Rule*. She'll be an accomplice from the start, encouraging the man to come more often to see her daughters, teach them something or take them out to the movies. She'll ask for little gifts in return. First, the bills that have not been paid, second one needs a new fridge since the old one 'just broke down the other day,' third the girls' school fees are overdue.



The man thinks he's a good guy after all, only giving and not taking anything in return. In fact, the mother gives him the impression that he *can take something in return*, this something being the love with her daughters or the one that he prefers; to be true, in a world and society where nothing is free, this impression cannot be avoided. The man, supposed he's a true pedophile, will get into an inner fight since he by no means wants to abuse of the situation.

On the other hand, he doesn't really see what the mother thinks or intends. The inner fight is ended by the small girl herself, one day, when they are alone, watching television. The mother went out for some shopping with the older daughter. Here they are, and begin to caress, to fondle. They are at ease with each other.

He controls himself, or tries hard to. There is some fear, though. He is surprised about the changes that have taken place with both of the girls. Their hair now is shiny, their skin smooth and their manners more refined. He has done work with them, honest work, work that was not paid. He has given most of his free time and care and, on top of it, he paid for being together with them. He had accepted their mother's deal,

but did he know what this deal was really about? And what, really, had he received yet?

However, he did not think of gratification. He was happy since he was in love. His little friend was so beautiful now, just incredibly attractive. The girl had no fear. What should she be afraid of? She knew him since weeks and months and fully trusted him. They had slept together in the house and the man was like a father to her, a father that both of the girls never had. Now, they dropped into a new kind of conversation and into a new kind of story. The girl said:

—You know, my daddy was always ugly to me. When he was drunk, he used to beat my mom and us. Then he would go to sleep, but when he woke up, he would beat us again. I only liked him *once*.

—Yes? He asked, shyly. Why, this time, then?

Chuckling, she added:

—That afternoon, we'd been alone in the house and he was so joyful, so funny, I don't know why. He was joking and caressing me and called me his *little star*. He's never said that before, and I felt so happy! And then he tickled me down there, and it felt good. You know?

He did not say anything. His desire was aroused. As if dreaming, he put his hand and continued looking into her eyes to see if she felt uncomfortable with that move. He would have withdrawn his hand right away if he had seen the slightest resistance in the girl's eyes. Yet what happened was that she began to smile and then closed her eyes and whispered:

—More ... , it's so good ... I like it!

Shortly after, she suggested to move over to the couch 'since it was more relaxing to play the game over there.' So they played the game. And liked it. And played another, more intimate one. And so forth.

You know or you don't know. I know and I don't know. I have not lived this story. It just came to mind and was a short form of many similar stories I have got to know, true stories of course. There may have been a time when they had complete relations, at least orally or anally since he was strongly resisting the urge to deprive her of virginity.

Later, when all went wrong since the mother got to know, either by surprising them or by some funny talk the girls had about their big friend and that the mother spied out, and he was charged with rape, they said he had 'brutally sodomized' the girl, that he was a rapist

who had managed to get to know those girls by tricking out the mother, preparing his assault during months. That he was particularly dangerous because of his cunning way to entice the girl into illicit sex after months of preparation during which he spied out all possibilities and played the Samaritan, that he had brutally abused not only of the girl but also of the mother and, at the end, of the whole family, of the *holy family*. That he was thus a family offender on top of being a sex offender!

His problem was that he was admitting, thus no lawyer could help him. The police had cheated him, offering him help if he was doing a full confession, pretending the girl had ‘anyway told it all.’ In reality, the girl had remained silent. He was charged on his own allegations, taken for eternal truth. The girls were put in a home where they got moral lessons every day and pretty harsh treatment. Their mother went alone to the pizza snack, with a still more hateful and more disgusting expression in her ugly face, feeling still more abused, still more a victim.

‘These men, they are all the same. She knew it always, once forever.’ She had forgotten, then, about the deal she had made at the start of that affair, about the rosy perspective she had painted in her thought, about

the joy she experienced with this man whom she had liked as a friend, because he had *respected her*, until this ugly thing he did and that she would ‘never understand.’

Really not? Was she not a woman and was he not a man? And what was actually the crime he had committed?

And what about her own complicity, what about her expectations? What about the input he had given, the care and love he had bestowed on the girls and, if she was honest enough to admit it, also upon her, being available every time she needed him, for a repair, for paying a bill, for getting advice, for defending her in front of a social authority that threatened to take away the girls since she had been on drugs for quite a time.

What about the friendly, peaceful talks she had had with him, the confidence, his tactful attitude and discretion, his friendly protective attitude that she had never known with other men? But he was ‘a pedophile’ after all, and if he had been really interested in her or at least also in her, she would perhaps not have called the police ...

She felt uneasy then, trying to get this thought out of her mind. She felt ashamed when confronting him in court, she felt ugly, but she did not show it. Anyway, her face was as ugly as always, marked by a deep expression of disgust that the judge put wholly on the back of the culprit. Yes, it was obvious he had, in some way, also abused of the mother ...

The *Little Man Rule* means to cash in twice, first from the lover and then from the state that offers its paternalistic protection and care, consisting in destroying the family, rooting out the evil by throwing the baby out with the bath water.

## A DIFFERENT STORY

That kind of story, you know it all. You are used to read that in your papers that you call newspapers. This is how you like it, with this kind of ending so that your *Little Man Worldview* is kept safe. The beginning of the story, the details, you carefully overlook so that they may not shake your emotional security. For, if you were more sensitive, you *would be shaken* by the truth, you would revise many of your opinions, of what you *opinionate*.

You would catch that baby that is going down the sink when the new State-Inquisitor executes the modern witches, and you would look at it and ask

—Where, baby, is your wound? Where, the hell, are you hurt? I can't see it!

And despite your conviction that this is the *only kind of story*, I would like to present you another, more uncommon one. Since in that kind of stories, there is a happy end, there is nobody reporting them. So where could you possibly read about them? There are no films about those other cases because, strangely, people tend to make films about tragedies only. Which shows that in filmmaking, too, the *Little Man Rule* pays twice. And what's motivational is what pays. That's how it is in *Little Man's World*. It's not what is uplifting or teaching us something about life, some truth. It's what brings cash.

In this other story, the mother was different from the start and the girls had not that abused look, and there was beauty all around them, and not ugliness, but I don't know for sure. Perhaps *you* know? But I know that there was a moment when the man was sitting with the mother in the kitchen and she would suddenly smile at him and say:

—You know I always liked you but if I had known that you hurt her with your passion, I would have defended it. And I would have had the power to do so, believe me!

He looked puzzled, and she continued.

—I am not a fool and I am not an accomplice in what could be considered a criminal offense ... But on the other hand, I am *not foolish enough* to believe or expect that you love *me*. I know you love and loved *her* from the first moment, right?

—Yes, it's true. Thanks to be so honest. I appreciate it.

—Yes, I myself appreciate that I can be honest with you. It shows me that you are mature enough to assume a form of responsibility in loving her.

—So you are not against it, in fact?

—Well, there's still some inner fight going on, to be frank. It's not that easy for me. I'm a woman, after all. I have my fears. But ...

—Yes ... ?



—I have talked with her about it. She said she likes you and likes to be loved by you and she likes it all, all, you understand what I mean?

—Not ... really.

—Well, I know you sleep with her or let's say kind of. I know you are not brutal and you don't force her. Anyway you couldn't do that to her, I know her too well. I have educated her that way.

—What way?

—To know what love is and, more so, what is not. [Suddenly smiling] Her sister is jealous, you know?

—Yes, I know.

—Perhaps ..., you could give her some affection, too. I mean, you don't need to force yourself upon her, but *she does feel neglected*, she feels ugly. You are too exclusive with my little one.

—What do you suggest?

—I do *not* suggest you to have group sex with them!

[They are both laughing] I suggest you to give her some fatherly kind of affection, some caresses, too. I know she looks a bit less cute now, she's quite tall for

her ten years and her face is not so babyish cute as you kind of men like it. [Both laughing again] You understand?

—Yes. I thank you so much for your understanding! From my side, it will all be the best I can give. I am so happy you agree with my love, with *our* love.

—I know my girls well. If something was wrong, they would have told me. They must love you very much. They did not tell me about intimacy with you, and I do not insist to know it, but somehow I felt it, intuited it. It's not my business. I respect them, and you. I trust you. After all, if I did not trust you, we couldn't have such kind of ... unusual ... relationship. In fact, we would not have *any* relationship, right?

—Yes, true. And I trust you the same way because you know well that you could destroy me *with one single phone call!*

—Yes, I know the system. But I have got information how it acts out in other cases and I do not really agree with that. I see that my girls have a sensuality, too. I am not prudish enough to have overlooked the signals. And my husband, as long as we were together, was not a Puritan either. Especially the small one was quite sexy from young age. I think she's very feminine,

and that's healthy after all. She's going to grow into a very attractive woman, don't you think?

—Certainly. She's unusual in many ways, very creative, too, not only in love. She's creative in all she does, she's inventive, joyful, exuberant. After all, she's truly innocent, in the right sense. Do you understand what I mean?

—Yes. I understand that you mean it probably not in the same sense as the majority in our society think about it.

—Right. I think she's innocent in a sense that she knows about the truth of life, but she's honest, she's loyal, she's wonderful as a friend and human being. She has something *royal* in her character, something very giving, very charming, too, something strong and conscious also.

—She's always been like that and I guess that's why most people like her more than her sister. But that's exactly the reason I asked you to help her older sister a little bit to love herself more. I feel that I am no more in state to help her much with that and that it has to do with her growing into womanhood.

—You are very sensitive as a mother, I feel.

—Yes, I am open and I just *feel* things. I trust my feelings. I do not intellectualize. That is *my* form of innocence.

—I really like it. I like you.

—I'm happy about it, I'm happy about our relationship. It's very unusual and I think it's precious.

—I share that feeling with you and it's perhaps what most unites us while I do not love you like a lover ...

—I know, but that does not matter. The kind of friendship we have is *perhaps more valuable than love and passion*. I would never have thought that it's possible.

—I knew it was possible but only if a mother is sensitive, intelligent, peaceful and discerning as you are. It's not easy to see a way out into freedom in the present confusion and public hysteria about adult-child sexual relations, and to keep true to one's own intuition and sense of value.

—Yes, I believe it's only possible if inside, deep in your heart, you never marry the system so that, at every moment of your life, you remain yourself.

—It's daring, though, it needs much courage!

—Yes, indeed. I feel that you appreciate it and that means much to me since I have almost nobody I could share that with. For protecting our little deal [smiling], and I do not at all feel guilty about it, I cannot share it, not even part of it, with the best of my friends. That would endanger all of us.

—You are fantastic! Tell me always, please, if anything is wrong or if you think my loving your daughter goes too far. I will never contradict you and we will together see what the best is for her, for you, for all of us.

—Thank you for this, man. It reassures me much! I feel you are not only a lover, but a real friend.

## EVALUATION

Did this mother apply the *Little Man Rule*? If she did, she would have followed the system, sold herself as ‘abuse victim’ and had tried to cash in twice.

However, this unusual woman decided to not marry the system, trusting her own information, keeping to her own feelings, and her own sense of what is right or wrong according to her own value system.

She trusted her heart as a human being and not as a wheel in a social machinery. She was *mature enough* to not consider her daughter as a sexual rival for a man whom, as she openly admitted, she liked very much and would have liked as a partner. She was able to transform her love into a deep friendship. She had an unusual amount of courage and independence, and she truly loved her daughters and wanted the best for them.

She wanted them to grow into attractive women and not into fearful over-protected slaves of a system. She loved them as persons in their own right and not as mere prolongations of her body as a life-giving mother.

## THE TRAP OF CHILD PROTECTION

Slaveholding is not educational. It served to maintain a cheap labor force. When it's applied to raising children, it must fail. Nobody can tutor a child that is jailed, be it within the parents' home or in a school. Without freedom, education does not work. This is not a propagandistic idea, but the simple truth. Without freedom we do not grow, but shrink. All history of humanity serves as proof for this fact.

Many parents who think they are ‘modern and generous’ are in reality consume-training their children, *thereby molding them into codependent ersatz partners*. All this, of course, in the very name of child protection and within the entangling claws of *Oedipal Culture*.

Unconsciously such parents act as the long arm of political systems and ideologies subtly hypnotizing their children with the concepts they have themselves been fed with. It is for this reason revolutionary, if not considered subversive to rear children in truth and autonomy, because such kind of education is not compatible with the Oedipal-paranoid worldview that mainstream education is based upon. To raise children responsibly does surely not mean to charge them with a burden of premature responsibility.

However, the contrary is worse; *to infantilize children, to discard them out of real life, to institutionalize them in plastic worlds of pinkish crap and relegate them to obligatory play means to render them truly useless*.

Do what you will, but children treated as pleasure cuties will never become responsible citizens. Yet this false play and all the hypocrisy and sentimentality that goes along with it is part of the Oedipal confusion that justifies its manipulative tactics with being ‘child protective.’

The Oedipal confusion brings about highly adapted standard citizens that are deeply disloyal. In fact, the reigning *Oedipal Culture* is a community of secret anarchists who obediently say their credo, but silently sabotage the very content of it.

By contrast, *education toward autonomy* is based upon recognizing the existence of soul values and the unique truth of every single child, also and especially if this individual truth is contrary to the reigning sociopolitical ideologies.

In this context, it is useful to recall that the repression of the child's sexuality has exactly started with the onset of the industrial bourgeoisies, at the end of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, and not, as many researchers wrongly believe, with the beginning of patriarchy. Dolto, in *La Cause des Enfants* (1985) reports about the childhood of French King Louis XIII:

Until he was six years old, adults behaved with the prince in a perverse way: they played with his penis, allowed him to play with their genitals and to sleep with them and play 'the little devil' with them. All this was allowed. But suddenly when he was six years old, they dressed him like an adult and he had to follow the royal etiquette. Despite the trauma that could follow, he had nonetheless kept something essential since, during the first years of his life, he could live his sexuality with other adults than his parents. He had here more chance in spite of the precocious adult



clothing they put him in. His example is only valid for the rich classes. However, in other levels of society, how could a child of that time repress his incestuous desire and sublimate it?

—Id., pp. 28-29 (Translation mine).

Historical studies on child rearing practices in Europe stress the fact that still in the Renaissance, the sexuality of the child was not interfered with. Back in the Middle-Ages, apart from orthodox Christian circles, it was completely free.

Have you ever met an emotionally healthy child, a child who is sexually active? Such a child has a dark-pitched and slightly smoky voice!

The fundamental conditioning of man is accomplished at the age of six, which is since Freud an *established assumption* in psychoanalysis. What comes later is only polish. However, the Oedipal confusion cheats about this truth. It creates a confused mind within an immature and rigid nonsexual body that has lost its natural intelligence.

This is neurosis programmed into culture. Oedipal confusion plays the game of eternal maternity until the baby is far older than thirty! It loves *naive mother dependence and shuns and mistrusts children who are precociously mature*. It blows the child care industry up to a

gigantic worldwide business with children as their products! Children who resist cultural castration and maintain their natural capacity for sexual love and sensual pleasure are put in the corner and labeled as ‘sexualized and delinquent.’ If they still dare to play their own game, the child psychiatrist is ready to interfere and to issue a certificate which will mark the social death blow: *schizophrenic* or *epileptic*.

Child protection is what it is, a dollar-producing business, and only when considering it as such, we can begin to understand it.

Somebody who thinks primarily not of money, but of children, cannot be a child protector. This is simply so. As a lawyer I would argue that the burden of proof is on child protectors to disprove the veracity of this fact.

## THE TRAP OF MORALITY

Morality is no solution either. In the contrary, it’s perhaps the worst of all traps. Morality creates violence and violence does not solve our problems, and it will not create the world of peace we wish to create for our children. Morality, if ever, puts up fake solutions, by decreeing that dividing life into a *white moon* and a

*black moon* will allow people to reside on the white moon in order to be clean and functional. Morality is a fascist trap in that it reigns over life as Cesar by the maxim of *divide et impera*. It dissects life in good-and-bad sections and then admonishes everybody to remain on the good and sweet parts of the cake of life, and to avoid the bad and bitter parts.

All this is of course completely fictitious, a mind-splitting, a form of public paranoia, but the worst of it is that people who are affected by the plague of morality never look through the veil.

Life is simply whole, a unity, and when you split it off in dualistic concepts you project an idea upon life, which is not life. It's the finger that points to the moon, taken for the moon.

Morality is not effective and has never solved a problem. In the contrary, it creates many problems that naturally are solved by the creative intelligence of life. But when there is morality, this creative intelligence is rendered dysfunctional. Morality is a form of control and when life meets control, what happens is that problems arise. This is naturally so because *life obeys to higher laws of functionality* that are beyond the residual human concepts of control.

Moralism is a short term for a very large phenomenon. It has nothing to do with true morality, but is the very perversion of it. True morality is implicit, enfolded, coded in life. When we are truly human we are in accordance with that structure that is Divine and that is *love*—love not as a concept, but as a function of the *life force* or a *dynamic pattern of living*.

Hence, the contrary of morality is not immorality, but naturalness. Wanting to fight abuse by boosting morality or *public morals*, as it is often called in legal textbooks, means to fight war with war. It's a fascist trap in that it denies life's intrinsic complexity.

When abuse meets love, a different path is opened, and the way out of the maze of violence is shown. To get there, trust must be built, not hate. When our inner structure and identity was hurt through abuse, we need not begin on the outside to fight abusers, but on the inside level, we need to meet our own inner abuser, who was the one who suffered abuse as a passive introjection of the abuse pattern.

Healing can only come from healing our self-love, and thus is a process of turning inward and working through the pattern *until it is fully understood and integrated*. Morality does not help in this process of integration, but in the contrary works counter to it. And

worse, it encourages projection and denial. It leads to persecution and hate, thus making out of a small problem a big one.

In a new society, abandoning morality will not be a free license for immorality—which is what usually is painted by moralists, but a return to the *self-regulation* that is inherent in all life, as one of the dynamic patterns of living that I discovered to be present with all peaceful societies.



# GLOSSARY

---

TERMS COINED AND DEFINED BY THE AUTHOR

In 2005, friends advised me to create a glossary to make what they called my ‘outrageous’ terminology more accessible to the readers of my nonfiction books. I thought it was a good idea and I carried it out diligently, first as a website, then as a PDF.

The short glossary here in the book defines only some of the main terms I used in the text, while the website is much more detailed. Here is the link:

<https://glossary.ipublica.net>

An introduction and further links can be found here:

<https://ipublica.net>

**Animus/Anima (Definition)**

<https://glossary.ipublica.net/glossary/general/anima-animus/index.htm>

The notion of the anima first appears in print in Carl Gustav Jung's study *Psychological Types*, in 1921.

Some psychology writers pretend that C.G. Jung's dichotomy of animus/anima were gender-specific archetypal structures in the collective unconscious that are compensatory to conscious gender identity. Some even construe from this Jungian idea something like a contrasexual archetype, developed out of Jung's desire to conceptualize the important complementary poles in human psychological functioning. I believe that animus/anima have nothing to do with our gender or gender impregnation, but that they are notions related to wholeness and the dualism of polar energetic forces in us. They are thus related to both our soul and our individual bioenergetic or **emonic** setup. In this sense, anima is the archetype symbolizing the unconscious female component of the male psyche and it embraces tendencies or qualities often associated with being 'feminine' in character or expression.

*Anima* is a Latin word and means something like breath of life, something that is animated with life or with soul. In patriarchal society it's especially important to stress the existence of anima as many men completely repress their feminine side and associated characteristics which clearly impoverishes them. The prototype, then, is the macho who is but interested in beer and football, who considers women and girls as 'household items' or at best pleasure dolls



and who makes down knowledge and study as 'past-time for weaklings'—the result are the well-known 'hit and sweat' religions that we encounter especially in Anglo-Saxon and Latino cultures and that are grouped around right-wing and neo-fascist political movements and interest groups. I simply coin it *The Hero Cult*.

On the level of the soul, anima is a personification of the feminine values. Venus, Persephone, Ariadne, and others are personifications of the anima archetype.

### **Emonics (Definition)**

<https://glossary.ipublica.net/emonics/index.htm>

Emonics is a science, or scientific research concept that I created in order to facilitate scientific investigation of human emotions, especially in the form of emotional identity in the etiology of **sexual paraphilias**.

The paraphilia research that I conducted over more than twenty years has given me conclusive evidence that every human being possesses a unique emotional identity code, something like a vibrational ID code, that works like a cosmic identifier and sets us apart as absolutely unique beings.

Emonics research allocates to emotions a quality that is much different from traditional research on emotions. While traditional psychology has to some extent admitted the cognitive nature of emotions, it has related emotions to thought and perception only and located them in the brain.

Emonics, in accordance with an overwhelming number of perennial science traditions and newest research on the cosmic life energy shows that emotions are located in the human aura and that they possess an inherent quality of flow.

Emonics research clearly shows that thought and emotions are vibrations that flow through our etheric or luminous body. In this sense, also animals and plants do have emotions, which was something completely discarded or overlooked by traditional psychology.

Hence, Emonics research can be said to transcend psychology and to some extent unify biology, psychology, parapsychology and physics into a unified field theory of emotions that holistically inquires into the nature of emotional identity.

The final application of Emonics Science is to explain the beneficial and self-regulatory nature and biogenic functionality of sexual paraphilias.

### **Emotional Flow (Definition)**

<https://glossary.ipublica.net/emotional-flow/index.htm>

*Emotional Flow* is a notion I have developed in the context of my research on the bioenergetic etiology of **sexual paraphilias**, and it describes the natural flow condition of our emotions, when no distortion has taken place in the bioplasmatic setup, through a life-alienating moralistic education, and/or the suffering of **emotional abuse** in the form of an ongoing parent-child codependence in childhood and/or adolescence. It could as well be called emotional

sanity, for this is what we are talking about here. My research on sexual paraphilias provided conclusive evidence for the fact that every human being possesses a unique emotional identity code, something like a vibrational ID number, that works like a cosmic identifier and sets us apart as absolutely unique beings. This is valid not only for humans but this vibrational pattern is unique also for animals, for plants and even for inanimate matter such as rocks. I have coined a scientific vocabulary from these findings that I call **Emonics**, and have written a study in which I present the whole research and the vocabulary, entitled *The Science of Emonics*. This being said, our emotions are clearly intelligent manifestations of the cosmic energy, and its antithesis, the *Emotional Plague*, expression artfully coined by the genius Wilhelm Reich.

### **Parent-Child Codependence (Definition)**

<https://glossary.ipublica.net/co-dependence/index.htm>

Codependence is a dependency problem that typically develops in the parent-child relationship for the first time after the critical mother-child symbiosis and thus usually after the baby's 18<sup>th</sup> month.

What is generally very little known is that even before the infant reaches the age of 18 months, mother and child interact in a subtle communication about boundaries, which shows to what extent the mother is able and willing to give the infant autonomy or not. It has been shown that this early dialogue, which is mostly nonverbal, deeply conditions people for their later relational behavior patterns.

This is more true in the mother-son relationship than in the father-daughter relationship because of the different structure of the mother-son relationship on the one hand, and the father-daughter relationship on the other. The male psyche is naturally more fragile than the female psyche, and this has been confirmed by much research to date. Another reasoning would say that this is simply because the ‘matrix-giving’ mother has more power over the child, be it boy or girl, than the ‘sperm donor’ father. This assessment of the primal scene has been found by both Freudian analytical psychoanalysis and transactional analysis, and as such it is not a question of cultural conditioning or adherence to matriarchy or patriarchy. is

Codependence is an important building block in the political and social entanglement scheme of **Oedipal Culture**.

### **Emosexual / Emosexuality (Definition)**

<https://glossary.ipublica.net/emosexuality/index.htm>

I created the term emosexuality to emphasize that sexual orientation is based on an emotional preference and not the other way around, on so-called sexual drives, as sexual science has long assumed. The term is not simply a combination of the words emotionality and sexuality. It expresses not only that emotion and sexuality naturally resonate together, but that this union creates the unique experience we call love.

The term has nothing in common with the same term from popular culture, because in the latter case it refers to a sexuality without penetration, which is merely caressing. This is not the case in my idea of emosexuality, which encom-

passes full sexuality but also full emotionality, unlike the robotic sexuality scheme of modern sexual science, which defends an artificial concept of sexuality that is somehow detached from human emotions and has an automatic, self-executing character.

Emosexuality describes the complex process of interaction between our feelings and the sexual desire we strongly experience when we love someone. The term sexuality has in fact very little meaning as it is limited to genital activities. Emosexuality is a much broader term and is intended to help sexology and cognitive psychology to better formulate the results of their research on the meaning of love and love relationships between people.

**Emotional Incest/Abuse (Definition)**

<https://glossary.ipublica.net/emotional-abuse/index.htm>

Christopher Bagley writes in his book *Child Abusers: Research and Treatment* (2003)

‘Emotional abuse does most long-term harm to children, although combinations of emotional and physical and/or sexual abuse do most damage to long-term mental health.’

But what is emotional abuse, emotional incest or covert incest?

I think that many men today have a rather sadistic relationship with women and often and quite unconsciously want to punish their mothers for the codependence they have lived through with them and for the lack of autonomy that is the sad reality in this kind of exclusive relationship.

The problem in our culture is the mother-son relationship, and virtually all our social and relationship problems stem from this great distortion. Many men later project their controversial feelings towards their mothers onto their spouses, girlfriends, and even little girls they meet, with the result that the ambiguous, ambivalent, and barely conscious aggression they cultivate towards their mothers is projected outward in society and wreaks havoc in male-female and male-girl relationships.

The aggression in men arises from a combination of a lack of childhood autonomy, absence of the father, demanding attitude of the mother to keep the son at home, strict upbringing with frequent humiliating punishments, isolation of peers through maternal overprotection, sacrificial attitude of the mother, together with an explicit or hidden command for emotional closeness and doing things together rather than letting the boy play with peers.

A way out could be a certain stubbornness of the boy in the face of such a situation, and a determination on his part to develop, insisting on his right to have relationships with peers, teenagers and adults who are not protective figures and not family, and that he ask for a certain limited time, every weekend, to go out alone and unsupervised. This could give the young man the opportunity to talk about his emotional pressure, the humiliation he suffers and his confused feelings, especially when the boy enters adolescence and these feelings of aggression begin to sexualize and become drives.

While overprotected adolescents generally have a problem of acceptance at the beginning of any group relationship

and may feel a certain amount of hostility at the beginning, it can only be beneficial for adolescents to leave their nest from time to time to seek out peers and also adult males and females who may be able to support the boy in his rightful aspiration for autonomy and respect.

The advice I can give is to strengthen personal autonomy and to enter into an inner dialogue with the shadow and the inner child, in order to uncover the hidden distortions in the mother-son relationship that have been internalized and that can gradually be made conscious through this kind of work, which I specialize in. I learned it during hypnotherapy more than twenty years ago and since then I have continued to work on myself and also tried to help others who were trapped in the bondage of codependence. The result of my research on abuse and sexual paraphilias is that these sexual distortions are the result of mother-son codependence, which has reached a degree of severity that qualifies as emotional abuse, and is then considered one of the greatest relationship problems of our time.

Unfortunately, Western psychiatry has only recently been made aware of this, and when I began my research in 1985, there was no book on emotional abuse. Emotional abuse is now considered the worst and most long-term form of abuse because it is the primary etiology. Sexual abuse is only one of several consequences of emotional abuse. Emotional abuse has become something of my research focus, and even now, I discovered, very few books are published about it, while entire libraries have been written about sexual abuse and physical abuse.

I myself was hopelessly dependent on my mother, and at the same time, although I grew up in homes most of the time, I was the loneliest child. Even up until the time my 17-year marriage broke up, I still suffered from the scars of long-term physical abuse and bullying in my childhood, from teachers and peers.

**Child Protection (Definition)**

<https://glossary.ipublica.net/child-protection/index.htm>

Modern educators such as Maria Montessori (1870-1952) came up with the idea of adapting the child's living environment to the child's age and height, thus segregating adults and children into separate worlds. In view of the child's natural need for a variety of contacts in order to grow into a sociable and friendly human being, child protectionists argue that such contacts can endanger the child's health, physical safety or emotional balance. Someone who, like me, has lived abroad or has often spent holidays in cultures where the educational paradigm still prevails will agree that children in these cultures are more responsible and independent, more helpful and far less naughty. And yet, while these children live in a potentially unsafe environment, they are actually safer than children in most Western countries. Crime statistics show, for example, that the number of rapes, violent murders, sexually motivated murders or abductions of children in these countries is minimal compared to the statistics for these crimes in Western societies.

Western crime experts who justify the Western child protection paradigm tend to argue that these statistics cannot



be relied upon because the majority of child abuse in these cultures has not been reported. This is certainly a factual argument and also an argument that is very difficult to refute. On the other hand, since I have been living in developing countries for more than twenty years now, I can say that, with one exception, I have not heard or seen cases of this kind from personal reports or from local newspapers or any other reliable source in these countries.

Whereas, when I was studying in the United States thirty-five years ago, I was constantly reminded of child abductions when I received my daily milk, the milk crate on which every morning a different child was depicted with a photograph and details, who had been abducted within the last three or five months and where every search by police and intelligence services had been in vain. And when I turned on the television, there was at least one moment every day when the subject of child abuse, abduction or murder was discussed for the thousandth and first time.

Of the many cultures in which I have lived and worked over the last forty years, the most insecure country has been the very country that has emphasized the safety of children and the need to protect children effectively: the United States of America! It is the country which, among all peaceful nations, has had the highest number of crimes against children for many years.

And this is really ironic, if not a key to understanding this very contradictory culture, because it is none other than the US organizations that have developed the concept of child protection. This contradiction between the reality promoted by American media propaganda and the actual reality in

this culture is an all too typical feature of the hypocrisy in Western countries regarding childhood.

The United States is only one extreme example, but the arrogant, hypocritical and know-it-all way of thinking permeates all Western societies.

### **Moralism (Definition)**

<https://glossary.ipublica.net/moralism/index.htm>

Moralism is a short term for a huge dilemma. It has nothing to do with morality, and I would go as far as saying that moralism is a perversion of true morality. One of the first perpetrators of violent moralism in human history was the Babylonian King Hammurabi. He was also the first ruler who used moralism as a political strategy.

Moralism is a cover paradigm and fake concern when there is in reality the most cynical indifference both in society and in government, and where there is a high level of structural and domestic violence and a strong suppression of truth and free speech. Every form of political fascism begins where these basic conditions are met; moralism is used strategically for the following pursuits:

- denial of sexual, emotional, cultural, ethnic or racial complexity;
- covering up uncomfortable or unpopular political reality;
- political strategy against dissidents or free thinkers;
- hegemonial strategy used to publicly pillory foreign states or governments;

—fascist strategy to curtail down civil liberties for social scapegoats.

**Narcissism (Definition)**

<https://glossary.ipublica.net/narcissism/index.htm>

I first learned about narcissism through the books of Alice Miller (1923-2010) and Alexander Lowen (1910-2008), back in the 1980s. Both psychiatrists specialized in narcissism for many years, and thanks to their unique contribution and unwavering efforts, the seriousness of narcissistic suffering has been recognized in mainstream psychiatry today. Indeed, this was not the case when they began publishing on the subject in the 1970s. At that time, narcissism in psychiatry was all but overlooked and not considered a serious illness. Today, while health professionals recognize the severity of narcissism as a psychiatric disorder, there is a state of confusion and misinformation in the public mind about the concept and nature of narcissistic disorder that I have seen in hardly any other psychiatric problem. It is astonishing to see that psychological essays on narcissism often all contain the same false assumptions, which are actually pure nonsense, because if narcissism, as these authors regularly assume, meant love for oneself, there would be no problem with narcissism at all. But narcissism is the exact opposite of self-love, it is the denial of love for oneself and that makes it a problem, because such an inner vacuum of self-love prevents the development of an authentic identity.

### **Oedipus Complex (Definition)**

<https://glossary.ipublica.net/oedipus-complex/index.htm>

The Austrian neurologist and co-founder of the psychoanalytic school of psychology Sigmund Freud (1856-1939) believed that psychosexual growth occurs in three phases, the so-called oral phase (0-2 years), the anal phase (2-4 years) and the genital phase (4 to 7 years), followed by the latency period (7-11 years) and adolescence (11-16 years), and that the child always and consistently goes through these phases.

Freud also argued that the sex drive structure is built through identifications, especially identification with the same-sex parent during the anal phase, which Freud called homosexual identification, and subsequent heterosexual identification with the parent of the opposite sex during the genital phase. This last cog in the psychosexual machine of sexual growth is called the *Oedipus Complex* by Freud. More specifically, Freud and later psychoanalysis require the child to successfully liquidate any phase or fixation, and conclude that if a child were unable to make such a liquidation, the sexual energy would become stuck in the particular phase where development has come to a halt, and this would later have profound consequences for sexual habits.

It is argued, for example, that if a child does not successfully liquidate the Oedipus Complex by developing a strong heterosexual relationship with the parent of the opposite sex (but without acting out this attraction as incest), the child would probably become homosexual later. Freud first noted this for boys in relation to their mother, and later ad-

ded it for the girl-father relationship, which he called the *Elektra Complex*.

**Oedipal Culture (Definition)**

<https://glossary.ipublica.net/oedipal-culture/index.htm>

My criticism of Oedipal Culture is inseparably interwoven with my criticism of Sigmund Freud's concept of culture, psychoanalysis, and here especially with my criticism of his theory of the **Oedipus Complex**. Many young parents believe that psychoanalysis has contributed to the liberation of the child; they judge it as another form of permissiveness or as a variant of permissive education. Nothing could be further from the truth. Freudian psychoanalysis applied to children is not permissive, it is *normative* and in fact a tool to forge the ideal consumer child within a consumer culture based on the economic paradigm of total consumption.

**Pedoemotions (Definition)**

<https://glossary.ipublica.net/pedoemotions/index.htm>

Pedoemotions are temporary, transitory, recurring or exclusive **emosexual** desires and fantasies of children.

Although pedoemotions are not primarily of a sexual nature, they do direct our emotional attention to children in such a way that children become more important, attractive, more interesting to society, more engaging and seductive than a control person with a lower degree of pedoemotions.

Pedoemotions are present in both men and women, and their love objects can be either male or female children or, in a bisexual form, both boys and girls.

**Pedoerotics (Definition)**

<https://glossary.ipublica.net/pedoerotics/index.htm>

Pedoeroticism is the eroticism that arises when **pedoemotions** are sexualized. It is often a blissful situation with corresponding ecstatic feelings and deep moments of euphoria when the lover accepts the attraction. On the other hand, it is experienced as oppressive, as an urge or desire that is difficult to control when it is suppressed. When men or women sexually abuse children in order to achieve orgasm without the consent of the child, the pedoerotic desire is regularly suppressed and not embraced. Therefore, it is important to liberate and socially code pedoeroticism as a blissful state that sees in children their inherent beauty and vibrant eroticism.

There is a difference between the neurotic urge to sexually conquer a naked child on the one hand, and the sharing of tactile pleasure between an adult caregiver and a child on the other. It is not easy to put this difference into words, but a sensitive, emotionally healthy and intelligent person will intuitively understand what I want to convey.

In certain cases, **pedoemotions** can be sexualized, which can lead to an adult feeling erotically attracted to a child or an adolescent to a younger child or baby. Such an attraction may or may not be acted out. However, research has shown that in most cases this attraction is not experienced through actual sexual penetration of the child, but rather through

caressing, kissing, licking and shared nudity, as well as through masturbatory tenderness and sharing.

**Sadism (Definition)**

<https://glossary.ipublica.net/sadism/index.htm>

Sadism is a blockage of the natural **emotional flow** through a predominantly **moralistic** or puritanical education, often accompanied by physical punishment, which leads to a repression of the natural streaming of the hot and melting sexual energy and as a result, to demonic emotions, and violence, because the naturally deep sexual discharge becomes shallow or even is inhibited. As a result, the naturally hot and tender sexual feelings are disintegrated and distorted into a compulsion for sex targeting at strong explosive sexual discharge, as a matter of abreacting an urge, instead of embracing a mate. Sexual discharge in fact temporarily alleviates the fear armor but tends to entangle the person, who is unconscious of the affliction, long-term in sexual aggression, assault and generally a bullying, racketing or abasing behavior, that degrades and dehumanizes the mate to a passive dummy.

Sadism was badly understood before Wilhelm Reich's in-depth research on the sexual orgasm revealed that the natural sexual drive is by no means aggressive or compulsive, but controlled by empathy and love for the sexual mate. Only in sadism, which is a distortion of the natural emotional and sexual setup, this empathy tends to be overridden by an overwhelming longing for egocentric, and power-ridden, satisfaction virtually on the back, and to the detriment, of the sexual mate. This is why long-term sexual

sadism leads to a corruption of the personality, as the pattern for abuse then is laid also in a general manner, and the person tends to take advantage of others in the form of a habitual behavior structure, and thus becomes what is called an abuser.

But for this to happen, the pattern must have been ingrained for long, and the person must never have gained consciousness about it. This is rather the extreme case, as often people become aware of their sadistic needs and begin to become suspicious about the obvious violence of their sexual behavior, and then begin to look for a way out, and may seek out a minister, physician, psychiatrist or psychotherapist for advice and consultation.

Breaking the sadism pattern is greatly facilitated through being around babies and small children, and generally, when men are actively involved in taking care of things, of children, of trees, of gardens and flowers, or for cooking and cleaning the house. Hence, the need for involving males in early child care. All these tasks are getting men in touch with their *yin* side, or **anima**, thereby helping them to overcome the macho or hero spirit that is negatively conducive to building the abuse pattern as a long-term affliction and personality trait. For we have to see that sadism is not only an individual problem, but also a societal concern.

Our Western culture is largely sadistic and this sadism can be shown and demonstrated with many examples from the historian's or the psychohistorian's toolbox. Thus, sadism is a direct outflow and consequence of centuries if not millennia of moralism as a sort of emotional plague that has



distorted our emosexual behavior structure. Our value system is deeply freedom and touch hostile and this value system was built because our deep emotions are out of touch with our natural emosexual base structure. This value system is against nature because it favors violence and shuns natural sexual tenderness and respectful non-violent embrace among generations, as a prolongation of necessary and health-fostering touch among all members of society.

**Sexual Paraphilias (Definition)**

<https://glossary.ipublica.net/sexual-paraphilias/index.htm>

In psychology and sexology, *paraphilia* is a term that describes sexual arousal in response to sexual objects or situations which may interfere with the capacity for reciprocal affectionate sexual activity. Paraphilia may also be used to imply non-mainstream sexual practices without necessarily implying any dysfunction or moral deviance.

The main paraphilias in the context of my research on pedophilia are:

—**Gerontophilia**

*Gerontophilia* literally means love for the elderly, or, if a child is concerned, for adult intimate partners. Gerontophilic desires are the complementary desires to pedophilic desires and signify love and sexual attraction for older people than oneself.

Gerontophilic emotions can be present in adults or children. For example, workers in institutions for the elderly

may at times experience **emosexual** attraction to one or the other elder patients.

Children commonly have gerontophilic feelings and desires for adults, probably not for all adults they consider as caretakers or close friends, but for some of them. Child psychology and sexology, under the spell of quite rigid mainstream paradigms, have till now not been able to reveal the patterns that make for our love choices in general, and the love choices of children, in particular.

In my research it appears that gerontophilia is a conditioned response in children reared in societies that do not allow children to live their sexuality, early in life, with peers, and thus direct children's emotional and sexual energies toward their parents. What Freud found to be existent in our culture as the so-called **Oedipus Complex**, then appears logically as a conditioned response to cultural and sexual conditioning. Freud's assumption the Oedipus Complex was universal is in the meantime refuted by anthropological research.

In tribal societies where children enjoy uninhibited peer sexuality, it appears that they are not or very little gerontophilic, and in fact in these societies, for example the Trobriand islands, pedophilia and gerontophilia have been found equally non-existent by the field researchers Bronislaw Malinowski and Margaret Mead as early as in the 1920's.

Psychoanalysis has corroborated that gerontophilic feelings and tendencies are present in children toward their parents, a topic that in psychoanalysis is discussed under the header of oedipal desire or oedipal attraction. Regarding other adults than the parents, caretakers, educators, friends or

even strangers, psychoanalysis was and is very reluctant to admit children's gerontophilic emotions.

Among the few professionals who were outspoken about the fact that those desires are present, as a matter of potentiality, in all children, and projected upon potentially all adults, subject to individual love choices, was the French psychoanalyst and child therapist Françoise Dolto (1908-1988).

—**Pedophilia / Childlove / Boylove / Girllove / Nepiophilia**

My approach to pedophilia is markedly different from the one taken by mainstream psychology, sexology and the mouthpiece media of international **child protection**. I acknowledge the hitherto suspiciously overlooked existence of **pedoemotions** as a universal form of adult-child attraction that is biologically programmed for the continuation of the human race.

Pedoemotions are a natural manifestation of pedophilic attraction, without however being per se sexual—as the word says. They are namely first of all *emotional*, as the primacy in attraction is emotional, not sexual. And I say this in full consciousness that it's against the mechanistic setup of sexology research.

Pedophilia then, is to be considered as a condensation and sexualization of pedoemotions. Why pedoemotions can crystallize into an exclusive emotional attraction for children that becomes sexualized is not yet known, and I keep away from daring speculations.

Many hypotheses have been screwed up in the air that show more of the individual bias of the researcher than anything else. The more mainstream ones stress that early abuse with the reverse effect of abused becoming abuser is to be found in a high number of cases. But of course, forensic research always only investigates cases that go to court, and thus where things have gone wrong in one way or the other.

Lesser known theories come up with genetic or karmic factors, or consider the possibility that pedophilia may be a hidden form of incest (Lloyd DeMause). The latter hypothesis seems to contradict the fact that pedophilia is by definition a relationship between an adult and a child not affiliated with each other, as in the contrary case we speak about incest in direct or indirect line.

To mix up this clear distinction means to mix up dream and reality. One may well fantasize about incestuous relations, but that does not make one a pedophile. In fact, much research on heterosexual men and women has been undertaken that found a considerable amount of incestuous fantasies during masturbation, and yet these men and women were and remained heterosexual in their overall sexual behavior, and did not suddenly turn into pedophiles just because of their fantasies.

Hence other factors, that we still ignore, must be found so as to establish a clear scientific etiology of pedophilia. Interestingly, neither Bronislaw Malinowski nor Margaret Mead have found pedophilia present in Melanesia's Trobriand culture where children enjoy the utmost of emotional

and sexual freedom. However, typically, children in this culture are sexually active with peers, and not with adults.

See, for example, Bronislaw Malinowski, *The Sexual Life of Savages in North West Melanesia*, New York: Halycon House, 1929, *Sex and Repression in Savage Society*, 1927, Reprint Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985 and Margaret Mead, *Sex and Temperament in Three Primitive Societies*, 1935.

In other tribal cultures, a bit around the world, pederasty with pubescent boys is practiced as a temporary kind of endeavor, mainly serving to accompany the boys' initiation into the adult male group.

However, the fact of men or women being exclusively sexually attracted to pre-pubescent children, refusing to have sexual conduct with any adult is something very seldom to find in tribal cultures. In my research on native cultures and shamanism, I found references for such behavior, but in every case the person that the author was referring to was considered to be the village idiot, a marginal freak that most people did not take serious and that often was allowed to have his way with children who were equally considered marginal, typically mentally retarded or handicapped children.

And last not least, we should consider that human beings are not automatons and make love choices, which means that they vote for options. There may be a certain amount of conscious choice involved in the fact that a person becomes as it were a pedophile, for years or even decades of their lives. There may be a love choice for children, or for boys only, or girls only, as a result of emotional frustration,

a broken marriage or many broken or accidented heterosexual or homosexual relations with adult partners.

This has hardly ever been considered in research and this is logically so because sexology is completely mechanistic and considers human sexual attraction more or less as a set of automatisms that result from early sexual conditioning.

I believe there is much more choice involved in creating a pedophile identity than that has been so far recognized by research. While this identity may be a *fake identity* as it is based solely on sexual attraction, and not upon soul values, it's an identity nonetheless. Why men and women choose this identity is hardly known, and it's difficult to comprehend because suffering surely is involved in this choice because of current society's virulent paranoid fear and resulting reject of this kind of attraction. But I believe we will gain much insight in the human nature, and in love, when we began to dare revisiting pedophilia research with this special perspective and focus in mind. It may also lead to a greater understanding of men and women who have done such love choices, despite the often painful social situation that this involves.

For sure, sexology knows nothing about the true etiology of pedophilia, which can be elucidated only through an energy-based approach to research on emotions, and not on sexual behavior, as I suggest is with **Emonics**. This is so because sexual attraction follows emotional addiction, and not the other way around. So the answer if the hen or the egg was first can be answered clearly in this case: first comes emotional attraction, and then, if ever, such attraction may become sexualized for reasons that we still ignore.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

---

## CONTEXTUAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

ABRAMS, JEREMIAH (ED.)

---

RECLAIMING THE INNER CHILD  
New York: Tarcher/Putnam, 1990

ALSTON, JOHN P. / TUCKER, FRANCIS

---

THE MYTH OF SEXUAL PERMISSIVENESS  
The Journal of Sex Research, 9/1 (1973)

APPLETON, MATTHEW

---

A FREE RANGE CHILDHOOD  
Self-Regulation at Summerhill School  
Foundation for Educational Renewal, 2000

ARIÈS, PHILIPPE

---

L'ENFANT ET LA FAMILLE SOUS L'ANCIEN RÉGIME  
Paris, Seuil, 1975

CENTURIES OF CHILDHOOD  
New York: Vintage Books, 1962

BACHOFEN, JOHANN JAKOB

---

GESAMMELTE WERKE, BAND 2  
Das Mutterrecht  
Basel: Benno Schwabe & Co, 1948  
First published in 1861

BAGLEY, CHRISTOPHER

---

CHILD ABUSERS  
Research and Treatment  
New York: Universal Publishers, 2003

BARBAREE, HOWARD E. & MARSHALL, WILLIAM L. (EDS.)

---

THE JUVENILE SEX OFFENDER  
Second Edition  
New York: Guilford Press, 2008

BENDER LAURETTA & BLAU, ABRAM

---

THE REACTION OF CHILDREN TO SEXUAL RELATIONS WITH ADULTS  
American J. Orthopsychiatry 7 (1937), 500-518

BERNARD, FRITS

---

PAEDOPHILIA  
A Factual Report  
Amsterdam: Enclave, 1985

BRANT & TISZA

---

THE SEXUALLY MISUSED CHILD  
American J. Orthopsychiatry, 47(1)(1977)



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

---

### BRONGERSMA, EDWARD

---

AGGRESSION AGAINST PEDOPHILES

7 International Journal of Law & Psychiatry 82 (1984)

LOVING BOYS (VOL.1 & VOL. 2)

Amsterdam, New York: Global Academic Publishers, 1987

### BULLOUGH & BULLOUGH (EDS.)

---

HUMAN SEXUALITY

An Encyclopedia

New York: Garland Publishing, 1994

SIN, SICKNESS AND SANITY

A History of Sexual Attitudes

New York: New American Library, 1977

### BURGESS, ANN WOLBERT

---

CHILD PORNOGRAPHY AND SEX RINGS

New York: Lexington Books, 1984

### BUXTON, RICHARD

---

THE COMPLETE WORLD OF GREEK MYTHOLOGY

London: Thames & Hudson, 2007

### CAIN, CHELSEA & MOON UNIT ZAPPA

---

WILD CHILD

New York: Seal Press (Feminist Publishing), 1999

CALDERONE & RAMEY

---

TALKING WITH YOUR CHILD ABOUT SEX  
New York: Random House, 1982

CAMPBELL, HERBERT JAMES

---

THE PLEASURE AREAS  
London: Eyre Methuen Ltd., 1973

CAMPBELL, JACQUELINE C.

---

ASSESSING DANGEROUSNESS  
Violence by Sexual Offenders, Batterers and Child Abusers  
New York: Sage Publications, 2004

CHAPLIN, CHARLES

---

MY AUTOBIOGRAPHY  
New York: Plume, 1992  
Originally published in 1964

CLARKE-STEWARD, S., FRIEDMAN, S. & KOCH, J.

---

CHILD DEVELOPMENT, A TOPICAL APPROACH  
London: John Wiley, 1986

CONSTANTINE, LARRY L.

---

CHILDREN & SEX  
New Findings, New Perspectives  
Larry L. Constantine & Floyd M. Martinson (Eds.)  
Boston: Little, Brown & Company, 1981

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

---

TREASURES OF THE ISLAND

Children in Alternative Lifestyles

Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1976

WHERE ARE THE KIDS?

in: Libby & Whitehurst (ed.)

Marriage and Alternatives

Glenview: Scott Foresman, 1977

OPEN FAMILY

A Lifestyle for Kids and other People

26 FAMILY COORDINATOR 113-130 (1977)

COOK, M. & HOWELLS, K. (EDS.)

---

ADULT SEXUAL INTEREST IN CHILDREN

Academic Press, London, 1980

COVITZ, JOEL

---

EMOTIONAL CHILD ABUSE

The Family Curse

Boston: Sigo Press, 1986

CURRIER, RICHARD L.

---

JUVENILE SEXUALITY IN GLOBAL PERSPECTIVE

in : Children & Sex, New Findings, New Perspectives

Larry L. Constantine & Floyd M. Martinson (Eds.)

Boston: Little, Brown & Company, 1981

DEMAUSE, LLOYD

---

THE HISTORY OF CHILDHOOD

New York, 1974

FOUNDATIONS OF PSYCHOHISTORY  
New York: Creative Roots, 1982

EDWARDES, A.

---

THE JEWEL OF THE LOTUS  
New York, 1959

EISLER, RIANE

---

THE CHALICE AND THE BLADE  
Our history, Our future  
San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1995

SACRED PLEASURE: SEX, MYTH AND THE POLITICS OF THE BODY  
New Paths to Power and Love  
San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1996

ELLIS, HAVELOCK

---

SEXUAL INVERSION  
New York: University Press of the Pacific, 2001  
Originally published in 1897.

ELWIN, V.

---

THE MURIA AND THEIR GHOTUL  
Bombay: Oxford University Press, 1947

ERIKSON, ERIK H.

---

CHILDHOOD AND SOCIETY  
New York: Norton, 1993  
First published in 1950

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

---

FARSON, RICHARD

---

BIRTHRIGHTS

A Bill of Rights for Children

Macmillan, New York, 1974

FINKELHOR, DAVID

---

SEXUALLY VICTIMIZED CHILDREN

New York: Free Press, 1981

FORTUNE, MARY M.

---

SEXUAL VIOLENCE

New York: Pilgrim Press, 1994

FOSTER/FREED

---

A BILL OF RIGHTS FOR CHILDREN

6 FAMILY LAW QUARTERLY 343 (1972)

FOUCAULT, MICHEL

---

THE HISTORY OF SEXUALITY, VOL. I : THE WILL TO KNOWLEDGE

London: Penguin, 1998

First published in 1976

THE HISTORY OF SEXUALITY, VOL. II : THE USE OF PLEASURE

London: Penguin, 1998

First published in 1984

THE HISTORY OF SEXUALITY, VOL. III : THE CARE OF SELF

London: Penguin, 1998

First published in 1984

FREUD, ANNE

---

WAR AND CHILDREN  
London, 1943.

FREUND, KURT

---

ASSESSMENT OF PEDOPHILIA  
in: Cook, M. and Howells, K. (eds.)  
Adult Sexual Interest in Children  
Academic Press, London, 1980

FROMM, ERICH

---

THE ANATOMY OF HUMAN DESTRUCTIVENESS  
New York: Owl Book, 1992  
Originally published in 1973

ESCAPE FROM FREEDOM  
New York: Owl Books, 1994  
Originally published in 1941

TO HAVE OR TO BE  
New York: Continuum International Publishing, 1996  
Originally published in 1976

THE ART OF LOVING  
New York: HarperPerennial, 2000  
Originally published in 1956

GELDARD, RICHARD

---

REMEMBERING HERACLITUS  
New York: Lindisfarne Books, 2000

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

---

GIL, DAVID G.

---

SOCIETAL VIOLENCE AND VIOLENCE IN FAMILIES  
in: David G. Gil, Child Abuse and Violence  
New York: Ams Press, 1928

GOLDSTEIN, JEFFREY H.

---

AGGRESSION AND CRIMES OF VIOLENCE  
New York, 1975

GORDON, ROSEMARY

---

PEDOPHILIA: NORMAL AND ABNORMAL  
in: Kraemer, The Forbidden Love  
London, 1976

GROTH, A. NICHOLAS

---

MEN WHO RAPE  
The Psychology of the Offender  
New York: Perseus Publishing, 1980

GUNN, JOHN

---

VIOLENCE  
New York/Washington, 1973

HÉROARD, JEAN

---

JOURNAL DE JEAN HÉROARD SUR L'ENFANCE ET LA JEUNESSE DE LOUIS XIII  
Paris: Soul/Barthélemy, 1868

HOWELLS, KEVIN

---

ADULT SEXUAL INTEREST IN CHILDREN

Considerations Relevant to Theories of Aetiology in:

Cook, M. and Howells, K. (eds.): Adult Sexual Interest in Children  
Academic Press, London, 1980

HOOD, J.X.

---

SEXUAL CURIOSITIES OF LOVE, SEX AND MARRIAGE

A Survey of Sex Relations, Beliefs and Customs of Mankind in Different  
Countries and Ages

New York, 1951

JACKSON, STEVI

---

CHILDHOOD AND SEXUALITY

New York: Blackwell, 1982

JOHNSTON & DEISHER

---

CONTEMPORARY COMMUNAL CHILD REARING: A FIRST ANALYSIS

52 PEDIATRICS 319 (1973)

JONES, W.H.S., LITT, D.

---

PLINY NATURAL HISTORY

Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1980

KRAEMER

---

THE FORBIDDEN LOVE

London, 1976



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

---

KRAFFT-EBING, RICHARD VON

---

PSYCHOPATHIA SEXUALIS

New York: Bell Publishing, 1965

Originally published in 1886

LAUD, ANNE & GILSTROP, MAY

---

VIOLENCE IN THE FAMILY

A Selected Bibliography on Child Abuse, Sexual Abuse of Children & Domestic Violence, June 1985, University of Georgia Libraries, Bibliographical Series, No. 32

LICHT, HANS

---

SEXUAL LIFE IN ANCIENT GREECE

New York: AMS Press, 1995

LIEDLOFF, JEAN

---

CONTINUUM CONCEPT

In Search of Happiness Lost

New York: Perseus Books, 1986

First published in 1977

LOCKE, JOHN

---

SOME THOUGHTS CONCERNING EDUCATION

London, 1690

Reprinted in: The Works of John Locke, 1823

Vol. IX., pp. 6-205

LOWEN, ALEXANDER

---

DEPRESSION AND THE BODY

The Biological Basis of Faith and Reality

New York: Penguin, 1992

FEAR OF LIFE

New York: Bioenergetic Press, 2003

HONORING THE BODY

The Autobiography of Alexander Lowen

New York: Bioenergetic Press, 2004

JOY

The Surrender to the Body and to Life

New York: Penguin, 1995

LOVE AND ORGASM

New York: Macmillan, 1965

LOVE, SEX AND YOUR HEART

New York: Bioenergetics Press, 2004

NARCISSISM: DENIAL OF THE TRUE SELF

New York: Macmillan, Collier Books, 1983

PLEASURE: A CREATIVE APPROACH TO LIFE

New York: Bioenergetics Press, 2004

First published in 1970

THE LANGUAGE OF THE BODY

Physical Dynamics of Character Structure

New York: Bioenergetics Press, 2006

MALINOWSKI, BRONISLAW

---

CRIME UND CUSTOM IN SAVAGE SOCIETY

London: Kegan, 1926

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

---

SEX AND REPRESSION IN SAVAGE SOCIETY

London: Kegan, 1927

THE SEXUAL LIFE OF SAVAGES IN NORTH WEST MELANESIA

New York: Halycon House, 1929

MANN, EDWARD W.

---

ORGONE, REICH & EROS

Wilhelm Reich's Theory of Life Energy

New York: Simon & Schuster (Touchstone), 1973

MARTINSON, FLOYD M.

---

SEXUAL KNOWLEDGE

Values and Behavior Patterns

St. Peter: Minn.: Gustavus Adolphus College, 1966

INFANT AND CHILD SEXUALITY

St. Peter: Minn.: Gustavus Adolphus College, 1973

THE QUALITY OF ADOLESCENT EXPERIENCES

St. Peter: Minn.: Gustavus Adolphus College, 1974

THE CHILD AND THE FAMILY

Calgary, Alberta: The University of Calgary, 1980

THE SEX EDUCATION OF YOUNG CHILDREN

in: Lorna Brown (Ed.), *Sex Education in the Eighties*

New York, London: Plenum Press, 1981, pp. 51 ff.

THE SEXUAL LIFE OF CHILDREN

New York: Bergin & Garvey, 1994

CHILDREN AND SEX, PART II: CHILDHOOD SEXUALITY

in: Bullough & Bullough, *Human Sexuality* (1994)

Pp. 111-116

MASTERS, R.E.L.

---

FORBIDDEN SEXUAL BEHAVIOR AND MORALITY  
New York, 1962

MEAD, MARGARET

---

SEX AND TEMPERAMENT IN THREE PRIMITIVE SOCIETIES  
New York, 1935

MILLER, ALICE

---

FOUR YOUR OWN GOOD  
Hidden Cruelty in Child-Rearing and the Roots of Violence  
New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1983

PICTURES OF A CHILDHOOD  
New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1986

THE DRAMA OF THE GIFTED CHILD  
In Search for the True Self  
translated by Ruth Ward  
New York: Basic Books, 1996

THOU SHALT NOT BE AWARE  
Society's Betrayal of the Child  
New York: Noonday, 1998

THE POLITICAL CONSEQUENCES OF CHILD ABUSE  
in: *The Journal of Psychohistory* 26, 2 (Fall 1998)

MOLL, ALBERT

---

THE SEXUAL LIFE OF THE CHILD  
New York: Macmillan, 1912  
First published in German as  
Das Sexualeben des Kindes, 1909

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

---

### MONTER, W. WILLIAM

---

WITCHCRAFT IN FRANCE AND SWITZERLAND  
Ithaca & London: Cornell University Press, 1976

### MONTAGU, ASHLEY

---

TOUCHING  
The Human Significance of the Skin  
New York: Harper & Row, 1978

### MONTESSORI, MARIA

---

THE ABSORBENT MIND  
Reprint Edition  
New York: Buccaneer Books, 1995  
First published in 1973

### MOORE, THOMAS

---

CARE OF THE SOUL  
A Guide for Cultivating Depth and Sacredness in Everyday Life  
New York: Harper & Collins, 1994

### MOSER, CHARLES ALLEN

---

DSM-IV-TR AND THE PARAPHILIAS: AN ARGUMENT FOR REMOVAL  
With Peggy J. Kleinplatz  
Journal of Psychology and Human Sexuality 17 (3/4), 91-109 (2005)

### MURDOCK, G.

---

SOCIAL STRUCTURE  
New York: Macmillan, 1960

NEILL, ALEXANDER SUTHERLAND

---

NEILL! NEILL! ORANGE-PEEL!

New York: Hart Publishing Co., 1972

SUMMERHILL

A Radical Approach to Child Rearing

New York: Hart Publishing, Reprint 1984

Originally published 1960

SUMMERHILL SCHOOL

A New View of Childhood

New York: St. Martin's Press

Reprint 1995

O'BRIAN, SHIRLEY

---

CHILD PORNOGRAPHY

2<sup>nd</sup> Edition

New York: Kendall/Hunt, 1992

PATRIDGE, BURGO

---

HISTORY OF ORGIES

New York, 1960.

PLUMMER, KENNETH

---

PEDOPHILIA

Constructing a Sociological Baseline

in: in: Cook, M. and Howells, K. (Eds.):

Adult Sexual Interest in Children

Academic Press, London, 1980, pp. 220 ff.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

---

PORTEOUS, HEDY S.

---

SEX AND IDENTITY

Your Child's Sexuality

Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1972

PRESCOTT, JAMES W.

---

BODY PLEASURE AND THE ORIGINS OF VIOLENCE

Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, 10-20 (1975)

DEPRIVATION OF PHYSICAL AFFECTION AS A PRIMARY PROCESS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF PHYSICAL VIOLENCE A COMPARATIVE AND CROSS-CULTURAL PERSPECTIVE, IN: DAVID G. GIL, ED., CHILD ABUSE AND VIOLENCE

New York: Ams Press, 1979

PRITCHARD, COLIN

---

THE CHILD ABUSERS

New York: Open University Press, 2004

REICH, WILHELM

---

CHILDREN OF THE FUTURE

On the Prevention of Sexual Pathology

New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1983

First published in 1950

THE FUNCTION OF THE ORGASM (THE ORGONE, VOL. 1)

Orgone Institute Press, New York, 1942

THE INVASION OF COMPULSORY SEX MORALITY

New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1971

Originally published in 1932

THE SEXUAL REVOLUTION

©1945, 1962 by Mary Boyd Higgins as Director of the

Wilhelm Reich Infant Trust

RENAULD, MARY

---

THE PERSIAN BOY

New York: Bantam Books, 1972

ROSENBAUM, JULIUS

---

THE PLAGUE OF LUST

New York: Frederick Publications, 1955

ROSSMAN, PARKER

---

SEXUAL EXPERIENCES BETWEEN MEN AND BOYS

New York, 1976

ROTHSCHILD & WOLF

---

CHILDREN OF THE COUNTERCULTURE

New York: Garden City, 1976

RUSH, FLORENCE

---

THE BEST KEPT SECRET

Sexual Abuse of Children

New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1980

SANDFORT, THEO

---

THE SEXUAL ASPECT OF PEDOPHILE RELATIONS

The Experience of Twenty-five Boys

Amsterdam: Pan/Spartacus, 1982



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

---

SATINOVER, JEFFREY

---

HOMOSEXUALITY AND THE POLITICS OF TRUTH  
New York: Baker Books, 1996

SCARRO, A.M., JR. (ED.)

---

MALE RAPE  
New York: Ams Press, 1982

SINGER, JUNE

---

ANDROGYNY  
New York: Doubleday Dell, 1976

STEKEL, WILHELM

---

AUTO-EROTICISM  
A Psychiatric Study of Onanism and Neurosis  
Republished, London: Paul Kegan, 2004

PATTERNS OF PSYCHOSEXUAL INFANTILISM  
New York, 1959 (reprint edition)

SADISM AND MASOCHISM  
New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1953

SEX AND DREAMS  
The Language of Dreams  
Republished  
New York: University Press of the Pacific, 2003

SYMONDS, JOHN ADDINGTON

---

A PROBLEM IN GREEK ETHICS  
New York: M.S.G. House, 1971

VANGUARD, THORKIL

---

PHALLÓS

A Symbol and its History in the Male World

New York: International Universities Press, 2001

VON RIEZLER, SIGMUND

---

GESCHICHTE DER HEXENPROZESSE IN BAYERN

Stuttgart: Magnus Verlag, 1983

WARD, ELIZABETH

---

FATHER-DAUGHTER RAPE

New York: Grove Press, 1985.

YATES, ALAYNE

---

SEX WITHOUT SHAME: ENCOURAGING THE CHILD'S HEALTHY SEXUAL DEVELOPMENT

New York, 1978

Republished Internet Edition

ZUKAV, GARY

---

THE DANCING WU LI MASTERS

An Overview of the New Physics

New York: HarperOne, 2001

# PERSONAL NOTES

---





