

Ipce

NEWSLETTER

Number E 6, July 1999

CONTENT

- 02 Introduction
- 03 **Repression of Eros and it's alternative**
- 03 Speaking about Littleton
- 03 Into the wilderness; homosexuality & the massacre
- 05 Repression of Eros
- 07 Boys' self-esteem depends on the 'Highly Involved Man'
- 07 Manzie lover attempts suicide
- 08 About Friendship
- 08 **Groups discuss**
- 08 DPA wrote to UNESCO
- 09 The Leipzig Conference
- 11 Ipce decides about Ipce again
- 17 **Research**
- 17 Most child sex attacks committed by relatives, family friends
- 17 About recidivism
- 20 Mister President..., The USA is shocked by the research of Rind, Bauserman & Tromovitch.
- 25 Documentation Service List July 1999

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

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

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

Introduction

Here is Ipce Newsletter E6, the 6th electronic version. This is the first issue that you do not need to receive by E-mail, but that you can read and download from the web.

Yeah, it was quite a job to learn the Html language and to make and upload a web site, but here it is at last. I had promised it in May or June, but on June 2, my computer crashed and the work done was deleted. It required a lot of time and private money to repair and reinstall all the hardware, to reload and reinstall all the software and to make this Newsletter again but it's July now and here we are again.

Good old Eagle, co-secretary of Ipce, had a lot more problems. Again, all of his hardware and software has been raided. Clearly, his files have been read and some of them have been illegally leaked to the press. A UK Newspaper wrote an article about the case. This article is not published in this Newsletter because it was only lying from start to end. The article stated that the *PIE* members, now that they are free, had united themselves again in a new organization - 'clearly' an organization of very dangerous people. Eagle has brought a charge against The State because of this illegal leaking.

In the meantime, he has been charged for acts that he never did, after a youngster had been seen in his garden and - you guessed it - a 'social worker' had called the police. Eagle is at home on parole now, pending the case.

As you know, your secretary is also struggling with The State about acts from many years ago. The case is pending now in the High Court, which will take quite a while to resolve. Supposedly, I'll remain free until it is resolved.

Randy took over the job to change my Dungleish (Dutchy English) into real English.

By the way, Ipce is mentioned in a Dutch book. The book is only negative about what is called 'pedophilia'. It refers to the minutes of the Ipce meeting in Copenhagen in 1993. Remarkably, only the minutes about the problems in several countries are mentioned, but not the long discussion we had there about the ethics, discussing the 'Danish paper about Ethics'.

The content of this Newsletter leads us first to Littleton, the town in the USA where two teenage boys killed many of their schoolmates. What is the connection between murdering teenagers and mutual relationships? It's the oppression of Eros that awakes this kind of violence. The alternative is to be a *highly involved man* and to make friendships.

The next section is about the discussions that took place in Denmark, Paris, Leipzig, Germany, and on line between the Ipce members.

The third section is about research. You can read about 'Relatives' and about 'Recidivism rates'. At the end, you can read about the people in the USA that were shocked about the results of the research of Rind, Bauserman & Tromovitch. The article gives a chronological overview of the reactions.

The next Newsletter will give three longer articles about this kind of research. I will describe the arguments used against the *Rind et al.* research reports and the counter arguments given by several Ipce members and others. Two guest writers will give their view on the usual CSA research. That Newsletter, number E7, will appear in due time, yet hopefully during this summer holiday.

As usual, a documentation service list is at the end of this Newsletter.

I will advise the readers of the paper version of this Newsletter to go on line as soon as possible. At least you could go to the local library and learn to surf on the Internet. For the Newsletter and for Ipce, reader as well as writer, it's much cheaper and easier. You can visit the growing Ipce library and see most of the documents of the documentation list directly. Or at least you could buy a second hand computer and ask for the Newsletters and documents on diskette.

For me, for us, it is necessary to inform ourselves about what's happening in the world, especially to know the arguments and discussions about mutual relationships between children or adolescents and *highly involved* adults.

Your secretary,

Frans

SECTION 1: Repression of Eros and it's alternative**Dialogue about Littleton**

By Rod D

When the boy asked Red about Littleton [the suburb of Denver in Colorado where 13 adolescents were murdered last month in their school by two teens, who then committed suicide], Red said, "I think it's sexual repression. You've got all these thirteen and fourteen year old boys brimming with hormones, and everybody's telling 'em to keep it in their pants. They gotta do something, so they pick on each other until, sometimes, it gets outta hand. What do they expect? If we were all more open with our sexual expression, we'd be a lot less crazy. Especially boys your age. You don't get enough sex. But sadly, we, as a culture, are more comfortable with violence than sex. It's easier to express anger, and cry for justice, and hunt for the culprit than [to express] the intimate, the vulnerable, the Dionysic feelings of sex."

Red didn't just say it. He broadcast it in the crowded line at Six Flags [a very large amusement park, often crowded with teens], so everyone could hear. It was the [high school] graduation excursion day, mobbed with teen-agers. The girls in front of us were all giggling. I couldn't believe Red said it ... and so loud like that, too!

"What is Dionysic?" I [the boy] asked.

"It's blinding mad passion: the chaotic soul of creativity itself," Red answered.

What a trip! Red was great! [the boy thought] The boy grinned and flashed a thumbs up.

Tatta ta tum tum pow!

Red struck a pose, and the girls giggled again.

(c)1999 Rod D

INTO THE WILDERNESS

Homosexuality & the massacre

By Bill Andriette

From The Guide, June 1999

Nowhere else in the world do boys shoot up schools like in America-- not in South Africa, Pakistan, or the former Soviet Union-- places rife with social tension and awash in Kalishnikovs. There've been six mass shootings in 18 months-- enough to become its own crime category, but still rare enough to remain shocking. The deadliest occurred April 20th in Littleton, Colorado, where two boys killed 15 at Columbine High School, including themselves, and injured some 20 others. So far the school-shooters are all white boys. The mayhem they've wreaked has become a Rorschach for middle-class America's anxieties-- about the young, the Internet, media violence, lax parents, teen culture. But with Littleton, that other perennial anxiety-- homosexuality-- came to the fore.

A gay angle surfaced almost as soon as the shootings hit the news, with rumors circulating that the boys with the bombs and guns were -- variously -- certainly gay, absolutely heterosexual, or self-avowed bisexuals. But almost everyone at Columbine High agreed they had been taunted as queer.

The right-wing seized on their the killer's possible homosexuality. "The two homosexual boys came to school Tuesday in fatigues, pipe bombs strapped to their chests and shotguns... under their long black coats.... with one thing on their minds-- to kill students who refused to accept their perversions," declares a Web site, www.thundernet.com, amidst pages promoting skepticism about the Holocaust. More PR-savvy, the Christian-right Family Research Council declared simply that mainstream media were deliberately underplaying the killers' homosexuality from deference to the gay lobby.

Many gay public relations experts thought it best to downplay Eric Harris and Dylan Klebold's possible homosexuality. "We have to take a very cautious approach," Ben Stilt of Gay and Lesbian Alliance Against Defamation told Boston's Bay Windows. "Ultimately the kind of story that could get out there is that gay and lesbian youth in high school can be confused and prone to violence." Fearing violence, the local sheriff reportedly told staffers at Equity Colorado to "lay low" and not respond to rumors.

Others tread boldly out on the limb GLAAD's spinmeisters feared could break. "[C]ampus jocks remember calling Eric and Dylan 'faggot,' 'homo,' and 'queer' because 'they showered together' or 'were seen holding hands,'" noted a press release from the Metropolitan Community Church. "The bullies and jocks who survived the Columbine massacre will always wonder... if their violent words pushed Eric and Dylan to this violent act," the MCC statement continued, ignoring how random a swathe the killers cut through Columbine's student body.

Whatever homophobic harassment the high school jocks dished out to the two gunmen, however, it would be hard to make over the killers into sympathetic victims of hate speech. If Matthew Shepard's death could be likened to the crucifixion, Dylan Klebold and Eric Harris were Antichrists. Gay commentators chose agnosticism-- whether the two were gay or not was a fact that could never be firmly established. With palpable relief, they noted that the two boys had girlfriends.

But asking whether Klebold and Harris were "really" gay misses the point. Like a wick in gasoline, their relationship was soaked with homoeroticism. The theme of braving death together in battle runs through the literature of queer love from Achilles and Patroclus to The Shropshire Lad. In his diary, one of two spun out a fantasy of living on an island alone with the other. Time magazine dubs them "The Monsters Next Door," but 17-year-old Harris gazes off the cover friendly and fey, his pal, 18-year-old Klebold, looking like an Eagle Scout caught in a goofy grin. "When we we read Shakespeare," a girl in Klebold's English class told the Denver Post, "he would always get the hidden meaning." The Nazi rhetoric the two clumsily embraced makes less sense as a political program-- Klebold's grandfather was Jewish, and African-Americans had counted among their friends-- than for fascism's iconics of heightened masculinity, its promise of blood bond among the chosen cemented by hate for those outside. Whether they had girlfriends or not, Harris and Klebold shared a pact-unto-death that, if twisted horribly, also was romantic.

Yet whatever their intimacy together, Harris and Klebold's deep disconnect to everyone else also may relate to homoeroticism-- or rather what has been the cleansing of it from the culture of American boyhood. Taunts the two killers received about taking showers and holding hands indicate how much routine same-sex physical exposure and contact is now suspect as a sign of "being gay." School shower-taking is now virtually unknown in the US, so sexually charged is simple nudity. Roughhousing and piling bodies together in play always carries a sexual undercurrent, and sometimes segue into covert sex games. This intimacy is the shared secret of adolescent boys the world over. This sharing of skin is vital in male socialization, and virtually absent among girls, who from an early age play at social relationships directly-- whether with dolls or in their lively webs of gossip. Boys' connection to the social often takes root only underground, under the guise of fighting's thrusts and parries.

The same fear of sexual danger that keep boys apart also puts a wall between the generations. Late 20th-century America has perhaps the most rigid age-apartheid of any society in history. The kind of suspicion cultivated to separate women from men in fundamentalist Islam, and which existed in the post-Civil War South between black males and white women, now rages in America between adults-- especially men-- and the young. Schools and clubs forbid unrelated adults from ever being alone with teenagers or children. In Massachusetts it's a misdemeanor for an adult to initiate a conversation with an unknown minor. America's age apartheid ends supposedly in the home, but it didn't in the spacious

suburban ranches of the killers, whose parents were oblivious to the arsenals being assembled in their bedrooms and garages.

Anywhere US culture does not dominate, boys walk arm in arm, and adults and kids talking casually on the street-- these are small threads, but important in weaving a social fabric. Readily available automatic weapons and incessant media violence are hardly social goods. But Harris and Klebold cobbled a rationale for slaughter less out of Gothic rock and Nazi chat rooms than their total human isolation, their lacking any larger sense of social and temporal reality. Thus could a gang rivalry eclipse all else.

The Columbine massacre shouldn't have happened here, said county officials, pointing to their state-of-the-art "juvenile assessment center." When Harris and Klebold became juvenile offenders for smashing a car windshield, the county gave them psychological assessments, tested them regularly for drug use, and required attendance in an "anger-management" class, which they passed with flying colors. Everything from their boys' piss to their emotional states was carefully monitored. But nothing was comprehended.

As usual, there's a grain of truth to the right-wing's claims. The Columbine killings had something to do with homosexuality. But the real picture is not the one the Christian fundamentalists would draw-- of twisted homo youths bent on bloody revenge. Neither is it necessarily the lesson that MCC might take from the massacre-- the need for more sensitivity training in public schools. That bonding among boys means being gay, and that adults are sexual dangers and must be kept at arm's length from the young are claims encouraged, for their various purposes, by both the left and the right. These falsehoods, taken uniquely far in America, have helped choke off paths through the wilderness along which boys become men without becoming monsters. **

--

The Guide
PO Box 990593
Boston, Mass. 02199
USA

<http://www.guidemag.com>

Repression of Eros

By WR.

Eros is the love of God incarnate in the world continually seeking new and more satisfying syntheses of all the manifestations of experience, which constitute the universe. On the human level Eros seeks primarily more luminating patterns of understanding and more loving forms of community. Eros is at the heart of the motivational system of every person. It is the divine spark within. It can and should be trusted. Eros knows what we most want and need. Unfortunately the child rearing and pedagogical practices of our society are based on a profound mistrust of the Eros of children. We want children to cease to act from their own motivations. We do not want them to pursue those activities and relationships that most excite them, that they are most curious about, and that they most desire. We want children to relinquish any uniqueness in their ways of seeing. They should come to share uncritically the views, the loves, the hatreds, the prejudices and the vendettas of their society.

Those attacks on children that are aimed at suppressing their Eros by alienating them from their own motivations and ways of seeing have sometimes been referred to as "breaking the child." The cruel and violent practices often employed in breaking horses do, in fact, provide an apt metaphor for an egregious set of child rearing practices. If "breaking a child," cannot be accomplished by beatings or humiliations, it must attempted subterfuge. More recently the degree of suppression that is needed for the normal functioning of our schools is accomplished with drugs. We give them ritalin because we are no longer permitted to beat them. Always, of course, it is done in the name of the well-being of children. Often it is called therapy. But in reality the suppression of Eros is profoundly damaging to emotional and interpersonal health.

The central reservoir of desire in human beings is not, in its natural state, as Freud portrayed it in his concept of the Id — an antisocial monster bent only on the basest kinds of pleasure, and willing to destroy the social fabric if it gets in the way. It is important to correct this negative image of what human beings most want because it serves as the justification for all the life-hating pedagogical practices that are regularly forced on children. In so far as the most powerful life forces within children come to resemble Freud's Id, it is because these forces have been twisted through repression and fear.

Children do not need to be broken. From the moment of birth, children seek loving, bonded relationships. Children are naturally social. They want to please adults, and to imitate those that they admire. More than anything they want to belong. Children are naturally curious. They are full of questions — they want to know everything. They do not need to be broken in order to become either socialized or interested in learning. Breaking children, in fact, produces antisocial impulses and crushes the natural curiosity, which should be a primary motivation for learning. A society that requires the breaking of children in order to survive is not a society worth preserving. Even horses do not need to be broken

Sex is only one of the many forms that Eros takes. However, in our society sex has a special significance because the most powerful attacks on the Eros of children are generally aimed at the body and its desires. The myth of the sexless child is used to justify the alienation of children from their own sexual interests and feelings. Any act on the child's part that challenges this myth is cause for concern and is responded to in a punishing manner. Children are only begrudgingly allowed to masturbate, are seldom allowed to run naked, are shamed if they express too much interest in the bodies of other people, are humiliated should sexual interest become attached to those of the same sex, and are verbally and at times physically attacked should they involve themselves in sex play with other children. And should a child exhibit that most horrifying of all possible manifestations of Eros — a sexualized interest in an adult — that is taken as proof that he or she has been abused. The cumulative effect of this is that children learn to experience the body as a place of dangerous, shameful, and dirty impulses. This is the normal way of raising children in our society. This is the way good parents and teachers do it.

When the natural Eros of children is crushed by their caregivers, children feel rage. The erotic impulses refuse to go away, even though their expression is forbidden. These impulses fester outside the range of verbal consciousness and then merge with the rage created by the repression. Finally, these combined energies reemerge, organized around metaphors of sexualized rage: the club, the battering ram, the sword, the gun, the loud and powerful airplane or car, the missile, and the bomb. This rage must be displaced — it must be directed away from the parents, teachers and caregivers who are responsible for the repression. It is too difficult to live without the approval and support of the people one loves. Certainly one does not want to destroy them. So the sexualized rage is redirected toward enemies. Any group that we can learn to see as less than human will serve as the needed scapegoat. The repression of Eros in children ultimately leads to the creation of violent, empty citizens who are alienated from their real needs and wishes and who are all too willing to persecute and even kill enemies of various kinds. A society based on the repression of Eros requires enemies.

It is not primarily within the exceptional and the abnormal patterns in this society that we must seek the seeds of violence. Rather, violence is initiated, sustained and fostered by the normal and accepted practices with regard to how we raise our children and treat one another. Naturally any society is loath to permit any serious questioning of its own most fundamental assumptions about the good life. But this is what is needed if we are to become less violent. Specifically we must reassess the deep rooted assumption that civilized life requires repression. We must examine our fear of Eros and all the harmful child rearing and pedagogical practices that grow out of this fear.

BOYS' SELF-ESTEEM DEPENDS ON 'HIGHLY INVOLVED MEN'

By Angela Phillips in London
The Guardian, 17 March 99

FORGET the sensitive New Man and his lager-fuelled opposite, the New Lad. A newer and more positive masculine role model has emerged - the Highly Involved Man (HIM). He is a key factor in building the self-esteem and success of boys, according to a report published on Tuesday. It is the quality of his relationship with the man in his life which marks out the supremely confident boy from his peers. The man doesn't have to live with him, he doesn't even have to be Dad, but he does have to take an interest. Nine out of 10 British boys with a Highly Involved Man in their life were in the top 25 per cent of achievers in the survey, while boys at the bottom tend to have semi-detached fathers who tell them that "boys don't cry".

The most socially successful boys are now the ones who confide in their parents, think that "equality is a good thing", don't think "boys have to be hard to survive", and expect to take equal responsibility for their children. These are the "leading lads" - young men with plenty of what the researchers call "can do" which allows them to tackle life with enthusiasm.

The report, "Tomorrow's Men", by Adrienne Katz, Ann Buchanan and Jo-Ann Brinke, follows on from their 1997 study of girls, entitled "Can Do Girls - A Barometer of Change".

The remainder of this fairly long article in the Guardian is uninspired and totally ignores the finding in the report of most obvious interest to us, namely that the valuable HIM in a boy's life need not be the father. Hence I've clipped it. Extensive web searching failed to reveal an easy source for the full report but an article in the Times did reveal that the research was supported by Oxford University and sponsored by the menswear company Topman. The latter's website said the full report is available from the following snail-mail address, for anyone intrepid enough to follow it up:

Young Voice 12 Bridge Gardens East Molesey Surrey KT8 9HU

Manzie lover attempts suicide

2 May 1999

What is interesting, and slightly positive about this news report is UPI's use of "lover" in the Subject line... indications are fairly definite that the Subject line WAS assigned by UPI.. Even though the text of the article refers to 'molester' someone saw fit to use the much more appropriate term 'lover' in the subject line -- which would be seen by those scanning message subjects, even if they don't fetch and read the article.

N.J., May 2 (UPI) --

The man accused of molesting convicted child killer Sam Manzie is recovering from a suicide attempt. Authorities say Stephen Simmons swallowed 10 antidepressant pills yesterday and was rushed from jail to a hospital for treatment. Simmons, 45, of Holbrook, N.Y., is awaiting trial on charges of sexually assaulting Manzie, then 14, in 1996 after meeting the boy on the Internet. On Sept. 27, 1997, Manzie murdered 11-year-old Edward Werner after the younger boy knocked on the door of his Jackson Twp. home selling items for a school fund-raiser. Manzie pleaded guilty to the murder in March and has been sentenced to 70 years in prison.

About Friendship

Randy

Think about your best friend, the one who knows you best, the one you love the most, the one you would do anything for and who would do anything for you. At one time that friend was a stranger. Over time you got to know this person and grew to trust him.

Suppose you had run away the first time you saw this stranger.

Suppose you never allowed him to get near you. Suppose you refused to answer him when he spoke to you. You would have lost all the good times you could have shared, all the comfort when you were sad, all the help you needed when you were alone.

This is the fallacy of 'stranger danger'. Everyone you know was a stranger at one time. There is always a risk that the next new person you meet will not be friendly to you but the reward that comes from giving people a chance is worth it.

This is every bit as true for children as it is for adults. Children need friends too. Children make friends easily -- and that goes for friendships with grown-up men and women, if they are allowed to make them. Adults who like children can be very good friends to them.

They are very patient and understanding. They will give their time. They will pass on the benefit of their wisdom and experience. Many of the friendships that are formed in childhood can be a blessing for a lifetime if they are allowed to continue. Please don't stamp them out.

SECTION 2: Groups discuss

Open Letter to UNESCO

Danish Pedophile Association
P.O. Box 843, DK-2400 Copenhagen NV, Denmark
Tel. +45 - 47 17 37 28
www.danpedo.dk mirror page at www.danpedo.to

Open letter to UNESCO

To: cii.webmaster@unesco.org
From: info@danpedo.to (DPA)

Subject: Your declaration about child pornography, etc.

Good Day,

We have just read some of your documents at:

<http://www.unesco.org/webworld/child_screen/conf_index.html#declaration>

In one of the documents above, you quote a UNESCO Assistant in this way:

> Commenting on the meeting, Henrikas Yushkiavitshus, UNESCO Assistant Director-General for Communication, Information and Informatics, declared: "Paedophilia is the most dangerous virus on the information highway. It can kill human dignity. It can kill freedom. It can kill the Internet itself. The meeting and its outcome can be seen as a major step towards wiping out this virus."

Although we may agree on most of your assertions about child pornography, we would like to point out that "pedophilia" as such is not necessarily something dangerous, and is, for certain, no virus. Indeed, "pedophilia" means love for children involving erotic feelings. Pedophilia is thus a sexual orientation that, as many other kinds of sexual orientations, is normally connected with loving and caring feelings - in this case towards children. Pedophilia involves respect, and true child sexual abuse (i.e., involving physical and/or psychological violence) is seldom committed by pedophiles.

We would appreciate it if an organization such as UNESCO (which has a certain relevance on an international basis and should act in an unbiased way) would keep itself on a serious level, without contributing to the spreading of prejudices and apocalyptic claims when dealing with difficult and complex issues like this. We find it particularly regrettable - and discriminating - that a democratic organization such as UNESCO issues documents "against pedophilia" as a result of a meeting attended by a lot of organizations with little or no insight into pedophilia (as organizations against child prostitution, child welfare organizations, etc.) and without taking into account the points of view of the pedophiles themselves. Does UNESCO really mean that the presence at the meeting of an organization as ECPAT, which fights against child prostitution in Asia, is more relevant than what pedophiles would be able to tell about pedophilia?

If you are interested in factual and unbiased information about pedophilia and our organization, you can visit our site at: <http://www.danpedo.to> and the many links and literature references you'll find on the site above.

If you have any questions or remarks, you are welcome to contact us.

Sincerely,
Danish Pedophile Association

Privately produced minutes of the

**CONFERENCE OF THE GESELLSCHAFT FÜR SEXUALWISSENSCHAFT E.V. (SOCIETY
FOR SCIENTIFIC STUDY OF SEXUALITY)**

UNIVERSITY OF LEIPZIG, GERMANY
JANUARY 23rd, 1999

"PSYCHOSOCIAL ASPECTS OF PAEDOPHILIA"

The conference begins with a short introduction by Professor Dr. Kurt Starke, of Leipzig, chairperson of the Gesellschaft für Sexualwissenschaft (GSW). He recalls that, in the mid-1980's, the GSW [in the former German Democratic Republic] held a conference about "psychosocial aspects of homosexuality." At that time, the meeting was open to persons professionally involved in the theme and concerned homosexuals. This precedent is followed in this year's conference, "Psychosocial Aspects of Paedophilia."

As next speaker, university lecturer at Leipzig, Dr. Kurt Seikowski, a medical psychologist, defines the term paedophilia. He differentiates between persons for whom the child is only a substitute object [of desire], and the paedophile, for whom the child is the primary object of choice. Mr. Seikowski also reflects on the possible origins of paedophilia. He states that a growing number of researchers assume paedophilia to be a primary sexual inclination.

The sociologist, Dr. Rainer Hoffmann, of Bremen, delivers the next lecture about the way of life of the contemporary paedophile. He alludes to his doctoral dissertation: "Die Lebenswelt des Paedophilen" [The Life and the World of the Paedophile], which was published in 1996 by the Westdeutscher Verlag. He limited that dissertation to the study of the homosexual paedophile. Hoffmann reports, from his sociological point of view, on the contemporary modus operandi of the man/boy paedophile [in Germany], how the paedophile becomes acquainted with the boy, and how daily contacts/interactions occur. He develops the finding, unearthed by his doctoral dissertation, that the framework, within which the paedophile relationship evolves, is often determined by the boy. Hoffmann explains that the paedophile relationship does not necessarily end from one day to the next when the boy becomes older, but that the separation can also evolve slowly over a longer period of time.

Next, social-educator Christian Spoden, of Bremen, talks about "Paedophilia and the Damage to the Child." In his lecture, he makes it clear that he considers the statements of paedophiles as distorted and false, that paedophiles not only search for their own sexual satisfaction but that they focus around the desires of the child. Therefore, it would be more appropriate to use the term paedosexuality. Furthermore, he reports on damage to individual "victims" of paedophilia: he reports general symptoms in the child like bedwetting, fecal incontinence and different forms of anxiety. Spoden asks sexual scientists to dissociate themselves from so called paedophile argumentation and to focus instead on the study of the damage to the individual victim. Furthermore, he recommends the scientific examination of children themselves.

Judge E. Drath, of the District Court in Leipzig, talks about legal aspects. He reported, in particular, the problems around the question of responsibility and guilt and makes clear that the judge depends heavily on professional psychiatric expertise in these matters. Drath, also explains that, in the courts, it is of advantage to the accused, if he contributes -- for instance, by confession -- to the determination of the facts so that the child does not again have to be deposed before the court in the trial. On the other hand, one has to take great care that this understanding does not lead to false confessions, even if the number of those falsely accused of sexual abuse of children is small.

The forensic psychiatrist, H. L. Kroeber, of Berlin, reports on his experiences gained while providing professional expertise to the courts. He maintains that paedophiles are homogeneous and highly verbal. In a missionary-like manner, he reports, paedophiles try to convince the forensic interviewer that reality, as they perceive it, truly corresponds to the truth. In this connection, Kroeber reports on how paedophiles try to deceive the court appointed forensic consultant.

Subsequently, Professor Dr. Gunter Schmidt, of Hamburg, talks about the tragedy of paedophile men. Schmidt contradicts Kroeber in his view that paedophiles represent a homogeneous category. Rather, the opposite is true: there are a variety of paedophile personalities. Furthermore, Schmidt explains that the old sexual morality has been replaced by a new ethic, according to which all sexual actions arranged and agreed upon between equal partners are considered moral. Since a child cannot be regarded as an equal sexual partner for the adult -- sufficient experience and expertise are missing in the [contemporary] child; it cannot consent to something that is not known to it -- a consenting, and thus morally acceptable, sexual relationship between a child and an adult is not possible. An exception may apply in individual cases in which the child has had prior sexual experience. This might be expected nearer to the [German] age of consent [which is 14]. Schmidt insists on differentiating between the moral [determination] and the psychiatric evaluation. In his judgment, every sexual contact between an adult and a child -- apart from the above mentioned exceptions -- violates the right of the child to sexual self-determination, but this does not mean, automatically in the psychiatric sense, that the child was psychologically harmed or traumatized.

University lecturer Dr. H. H. Fröhlich, of Berlin, reports on his psychotherapeutic work with fourteen paedophiles. He reported on the varieties in the living conditions of his clients and about the different behavior of the individual personalities.

Finally, representatives of paedophile self-help-groups spoke.

Dieter Mazurek, of Berlin, reports on the Berlin self-help-group, which consists exclusively of male/boy-lovers. Mazurek explains that the man/boy lover does not relate to his sexual partner as a child, but as a boy. Therefore, the role of the child in a paedophile friendship cannot be compared with the role of the child in the typical adult-child relationship with its potential problems, like the misuse of power.

The sociologist Paul Stacher, of Munich, speaks, in general, about paedophile self-help-groups. First he reports on his consensual sexual experience with an adult when he was a boy of 10. This sexual experience and his professional socio-psychological training are the background for his many years of engagement in paedophile self-help activities, even though he is not paedophile himself. He describes an evening with the Munich paedophile group, the meetings and activities of which he facilitates. The group includes, at present, up to 15 men, approximately half of them being girl-lovers and the other half, boy-lovers. He presents some accompanying papers, including the Coming Out Mirror and explains -- on the basis of a diagram, the Orientation Mirror - that one must question traditional exclusive categories such as heterosexuality, homosexuality or paedophilia. No person can

assign themselves only to a certain absolute direction; on the contrary, everyone [potentially] is sensitive to all the sexual inclinations, in different degrees. He clarifies the consciousness-raising and personality-stabilizing effect of paedophile self-help activities and of emancipation work. He stresses the importance of the work of such groups for all, including, ultimately, for the protection of children from violence. The influence/direction of the group leader is crucial. He recommends that responsible groups of this type be internally strengthened, new groups founded, and advocates consideration that they be publicly funded.

Last Mrs. Renate Held, mother of a young boy lover, tells about the self-help group for parents and relatives of paedophiles, which she founded, and distributes an open letter.

After a short discussion in response to questions, like: "Is a paedophile able to live a balanced life without appropriate sex?" or "Is paedophilia a disease or a sexual orientation?", the director of the GSW, Prof. Kurt Starke, ends the conference, thanking all for their participation.

(C) 1999 SteveS

- This summary was privately written and translated, and was not authorized by the individual presenters. -

Ipce decided about Ipce again

By Frans, Ipce Secretary

Meeting on line

There was no Ipce Meeting this summer because our host, the Lambda Group in Barcelona, did not invite us. So we have met only on line. For those who only read the paper version of the Newsletter, I've made this overview of the discussion and the voting.

The discussion took place on the E-mail list, named "IMO" = Ipce Meets Online. Most of the messages are archived at the internal IMO web site, known by the IMO List members.

You will see that the mission statement (or the colophon at the second page of each newsletter) has been changed, but not yet the name. The discussion about another name and the mission statement is still ongoing. Readers of the paper version can send their opinion by post to the Ipce Secretary, Postbus 259, NL 7400, Deventer.

Start of the discussion by Ted & Frans.

Ted: The use of the word "pedophile" throughout the web site is disastrous from a public relations/communications point of view in *American* English. The word has a different, perhaps less offensive, connotation in Europe. For people who speak American English as their first language, the word "pedophile" is equivalent to "predator" and "child molester." Those who oppose pedophiles insist that they control, at least in America, what that word means, and it is no compliment and not constructive, generally speaking, to proudly identify as a child molester or predator.

Frans: This point is important: the mentioning of the word "pedophilia". This was and is and will be a discussion topic within Ipce. Every year, every meeting, I have proposed to stop the use of this word. Every year, every meeting, a part of the meeting agrees with me. Every year, every meeting, another part of the meeting insists on maintaining the word. Every year, every meeting, a majority decided to maintain the word. Last year, last meeting, the votes were just 50% - 50%, which means that the proposal (to remove the word) is rejected.

Ted has opened the discussion now again.

I strongly agree with his idea to remove the word "pedophilia", at least in the Mission Statement (which is on the home page on both sites) and to change it into "intergenerational love" or "intergenerational consensual love" or words like these.

This year, there will be no meeting, thus no vote. This year, we meet only on line. I have only a list of members or engaged persons. Please, react to this message and give your opinion.

Start of the discussion

I'll not cite every message, but rather give an overview.

NJ mailed:

"Perhaps a descriptive phrase could be used, such as "love between older and younger people" doesn't that exactly describe what we want to say, without ANY trick labels?"

Dennis wrote:

"Contrary to what Ted and others suggest I think the word "pedophile" should remain. It's the word most people understand even if the media has distorted its original meaning.

I think of groups like Queer Nation in the United States that took the word "queer" and redefined it in more positive terms. I think it's our job as boy-lovers to do the same with the word "pedophile." We don't need a new term. We simply need to be re-educating people to view this word in more positive ways. I suggest you keep the word "pedophile" but give a short definition that reflects its positive connotations."

Ted replied in a long message, of which I have selected the main phrases:

"Dennis: What do you think most people actually understand when they read the word pedophile in the newspapers of the USA? I do not want to be associated with, and have never wanted to be associated with, what the public already understands the word to mean: child molester, child rapist, predator, kidnapper, sociopath, child-murderer. The boy lovers I know have *never* identified with that "p" word and those kinds of connotations.

Do you feel good when the media announce that the Catholic Church has paid millions of dollars in damages because a pedophile priest headed some parish? Do people feel warm and accepting when a pedophile scoutmaster is sentenced to prison for 20 years? How do you feel when you learn that there are clinics and prisons that specialize in the treatment and punishment of pedophiles? Do you know anyone in the United States who *wants* their son "to become a pedophile when he grows up"?

[...] It's more than the media, Dennis. It's the psychologists, the incest survivors, the social workers, the law, the police, the courts, the church, the legislatures, the novelists, the movies, the jokes. Even the average child knows that s/he must be wary to avoid being kidnapped or killed by a pedophile.

The timing of your advise [to follow the Queer Nation that redefined the word 'queer'] is off. [...]

When Queer Nation appeared, you are talking about a time in the gay movement after it matured and grew proud. Where are the strong and public groups right now, like Queer Nation, who are taking the name "pedophile" and redefining it in more positive terms? [...]

Your advice is based on a misreading of gay liberation and how it progressed as it got many more members and sympathizers, after it diversified and matured. Boy Lovers and Girl lovers in the United States have not reached anywhere near that level of organizational maturity to support, in their rainbow of organizations, one that proudly announces their pedophilia, using that term. It's just linguistically anathema in American English! [...]

Bad advice, Dennis. We, the few of us that there are, are not masochists nor are we into magical thinking like some very little kids. What we need, IMHO, is to become more clever and develop an activism with more intelligence, pragmatism, creativity and surprise than that. We should also clearly define what our goals are and set a time frame within which the goal will be accomplished and by whom. [...]

Accepting your advice handicaps the Ipce effort in America and wastes precious resources. IMHO, accepting your advice is for the masochistic and self-destructive in the context of the USA. If I were an agent provocateur, hoping to handicap and neutralize and control the potential of the Ipce in the USA, I would encourage and strongly support the use of the word "Pedophile". [...]

I give this List my best advice: if the leadership of the Ipce wants support from American boy lovers and girl lovers, many of whom do not even know yet that you exist and want to reach out to them, avoid, as much as possible, the use of the word "pedophile" until we in the USA are much stronger and diverse as a movement."

Dennis replied - again, I have selected the main phrases:

"Changing the word we use to describe who we are is not going to change the underlying concerns. In fact, most psychologist are quick to acknowledge that most "pedophiles" do in fact "love" children. The fact that "love" is involved, however, does nothing to change the underlying belief that such activity is still harmful to children. [...]

My concerns about avoiding the term "pedophile" however, go much deeper. During the McCarthy era the word "Communist" was the worst of all possible words. The public was responding to "Communists" in the same way people now respond to the word pedophile. I didn't see the communists saying "Let's stop calling ourselves "Communists" so people will be more accepting of who we are. [...]

The main reason I think we should continue to use the term "pedophile" is because it's the term that currently being used by the psychiatric profession, and may be used to deny us our civil rights a "class" of people. How are we going to stand up for our rights if we say we're not part of the group that's being attacked?

I say keep the word "pedophile" and wear it proudly. [...]Our fight is going to be a long one. If we continue to attack those who attempt to defend their rights in a responsible way and loss, than we're our own worst enemy.

NJ reacted, in short:

"While I understand the logical reasoning which Dennis presented, I also think sometimes it is not politically wise to always insist on taking back what has been taken away. [...] When there is nothing left, yet he has not given in, will he have won? Will we have won when all of us are in prison because we insisted on spending our energy arguing about the 'true definition' of the terms used against us? Or would we be better off to use our own definitions, if they get more 'outsiders' to listen to our story instead of immediately 'turning off'? [...]

If we want to sell our ideas, we must present them in a way that outsiders will not take one look and click away.

Isabel wrote, in short:

"I can see that you guys do have a point, at least when it comes to the Anglo-Saxon and North-European parts of the world. In the rest of the world, like Southern Europe or Latin America, the word 'pedophile' can still be saved, since the damage isn't too big yet. So I might opt for a recess on my objection to stop using this word IN ENGLISH in official forums and papers. But when using other languages, I think we should stick to it. [...]

Anyway, the expression 'mutual loving relationship' is a good one, a better one than 'consensual relationship', but it doesn't include loveless relationships, which do exist and can be positive."

Mr. Tom reacted in a long message. I have summarized this post and Tom has corrected the summary that follows now.

- 1) Dennis has made a valuable contribution to the debate, but
- 2) his conclusion that the p-word should be maintained is not necessarily the correct conclusion.
- 3) Rind et al. have given a positive message without using the p-word, thus it is possible to do this.
- 3) Gays, Jews & others do not need the label "Gay", "Jew" etc. to defend their human rights and the rights of others; thus, we do not need this p-label to defend our human rights.
- 4) Changing the p-word into other words will not of itself lead to any positive result in the long term, because the same underlying struggle has to be fought.
- 5) Changing the word is a necessary expedient to enable the case for child loving to be listened to rather than dismissed out of hand.

Dennis reacted to Tom's words about the underlying struggle in a message, shortened by me:

"I would like to thank people for their polite and well thought out responses in our discussion. I think some of the confusion is that the original focus of the discussion was, "Should we use the word as a self-descriptive term for ourselves?" My focus was more general, and is the question of "when" and "where" should we use the word? And [Frans summarizes now:] should we write letters to the media that use the word incorrectly?

Tom made some observations that lead me to a new - but I think relevant area of discussion.

UNDERLYING STRUGGLES AND PRIORITIES

I would like to introduce this discussion by addressing two of Tom's statements:

1. "Gays, Jews & others do not need the label "Gay", "Jew" etc. to defend their human rights and the rights of others, thus we do not need this p-label to defend our human rights."
2. "Changing the p-word into other words will not OF ITSELF lead to any positive result in the long term, because the same UNDERLYING struggle has to be fought."

I would suggest that the issue is not "What is the underlying struggle? Rather, what are the underlying "struggles", and which should be our priority?

I believe that historically the underlying struggle has been to change people's attitudes about adult-child sex, and as a result, legalize adult/child sex and also the stigma attached to being attracted to boys. Twenty years ago this was an understandable priority but now I no longer believe it should be.

The second underlying struggle I suggest is the struggle that boy-lovers face because of their ATTRACTION to boys. In other words, discrimination based on sexual identity. Whether we call ourselves boy-lovers or pedophiles I believe this struggle is reflected in Tom's statement: "Gays, Jews & others do not need the label "Gay", "Jew" etc. to defend their human rights and the rights of others, thus we do not need this p-label to defend our human rights."

The human rights in question for Jews, however, have nothing to do with the "behavior" they may or may not engage in. The same is true for Gay people. The human right in question is: "Should gays be discriminated against because of their sexual orientation? This is more precisely exemplified in the United States military's "don't ask, don't tell" policy.

In the media, for example, a person's ethnicity, race, religion, or sexual identity is no longer an issue. [...] When it comes to person accused of having sex with a child, however, there is a double standard that does not apply in the media. It is not seen as prejudicial to write, "Pedophile molests young child." In other words, it is not seen as prejudicial to associate the persons alleged sexual identity with their behavior.

I would argue that our emphasis on changing laws and people's beliefs about behavior involving adults and children has NOT been productive, and should be open to review. No one takes NAMBLA's request that all age-of-consent laws be abolished seriously, and it makes most BL's look like foolish.. [...]

I would argue that it would be more productive for the boy-love movement to now focus its energies on the POLITICS OF IDENTITY. In other words, changing people's perceptions about what it means to be a boy-lover or pedophile, so that the prejudice and false stereotypes that promote the discrimination we face can be eliminated. Once this is done our efforts to change people's beliefs about adult/child sex will be less controversial and more open to acceptance.

If the word "pedophile" is such a problem I would argue that it's because the boy-love movement has put little, if any, energy into combating the prejudice associated with the word, and this has resulted in incredible harm. [...] The "stigma" attached to being a boy-lover or pedophile still remains. Regardless of our behavior, we're still viewed as being a child-rapist and potential danger to children. [...]

I suggest we may want to make it a priority that we challenge the misuse of the word, which in turn promotes may of the false stereotypes and harmful prejudice we now face.

Isabel reacts to this post with:

I agree with Dennis that we should at least fight in order to educate the mass on the right meaning of the word 'pedophile'.

Martin took up the discussion with:

"Of course I think, we should find some way to communicate with the outsiders, but the question arises as to how far to go with accepting their code. But nevertheless I think, it would be better to find a new, better and all-inclusive word for our self - description, which is considerably different from the P word. This is just for practical reasons. As most of us might already know, the European Union plans to coordinate their net censorship and -- what weighs more -- the total surveillance of all electronic communication within the European Union and possibly to the U.S.A too. There are rumors, that e-mails will be scanned for a list of catchwords -- guess what word will be definitely on their list...

So, we might have to face facts, let us consider something new, which might not bring us so much into danger...

Frans' proposal for a new Mission Statement

"Ipce is a forum for people who are engaged in the academic discussion about the understanding and emancipation of mutual loving intergenerational relationships. In this context, these relationships are intended to be viewed from an unbiased, non-judgemental perspective and in relation to the Human Rights of both the young and the adult partners.

Ipce searches for chances and for ethically responsible forms of these relationships.

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

Frans wrote also:

Let's also discuss HOW to decide. Until now, the Ipce Meeting decided, following the 1998 decision "by normal majority of present votes". But now there is no meeting in any country, there is a Meeting Online. Can we say the 21 engaged persons who are on this "Ipce Meets Online" List are The Meeting? It's not practical to ask the about 25 'paper post' subscribers due to time & costs & risks. I'm sure, most of these subscribers agree with the removal of the word P. Year after year, they have asked for it.

Can we say that for a vote, 11 votes from these 21 Meeting Members are needed? Can we say that a normal majority, in that case a minimum of 6 votes, can take the decision? If the votes are

equal... Remember that the public Ipceweb is on my private web domain. So I take the risk. In that case, may I have an extra vote to create a majority?

Frans' second proposal

To make a long story a bit shorter, I'll not repeat the messages that reacted to this proposal but I'll repeat my overview of the opinions and repeat here the second proposal.

"In the recent discussion about the Ipce Mission Statement, which are the first words of the Home Page of the Ipce public web site, ten members agreed to remove the word "pedophilia" from the mission statement. Because ten people reacted to my proposal, there is a majority at the meeting On Line to change the mission statement

To continue our Meeting On Line, I have made a second proposal from the several suggestions and ideas to change the mission statement. [...]

"Ipce is a forum for people who are engaged in academic discussion about the understanding and emancipation of mutual relationships between children or adolescents and adults. In this context, these relationships are intended to be viewed from an unbiased, non-judgmental perspective and in relation to the human rights of both the young and adult partners. Ipce searches for opportunities where ethically responsible forms of these relationships can occur. Ipce meets once every one or two years in a different country, publishes a newsletter and a web site, co-ordinates the (electronic) exchange of texts and keeps an archive of specific written publications."

Agreement for the time being

Again, several messages followed, which I'll not repeat. Again, I give my second overview of the opinions. In doing so, we open the next stage of the discussion.

"About our Mission Statement, we agree now except one sentence. This sentence is, in my proposal, "Ipce searches for opportunities where ethically responsible forms of these relationships can occur." Of the nine persons said to agree, four of them disagreed with the sentence, "*Ipce searches for opportunities where ethically responsible forms of these relationships can occur*". Tom, Desire, Paul Mcl and Gerald proposed corrections and alternatives. For the time being, I will simply delete this sentence and then we have a Mission Statement about which we agree. We can say: Ipce has met On Line and 'The Meeting has decided' to change the Mission Statement into the next one:

"Ipce is a forum for people who are engaged in academic discussion about the understanding and emancipation of mutual relationships between children or adolescents and adults. In this context, these relationships are intended to be viewed from an unbiased, non-judgmental perspective and in relation to the human rights of both the young and adult partners. Ipce meets once every one or two years in a different country, publishes a newsletter and a web site, co-ordinates the (electronic) exchange of texts and keeps an archive of specific written publications."

This text will be put on the Ipceweb. [...]

It's this text you have seen on the first page of this Newsletter.

Next phase of the discussion

The deleted sentence can, in one form or another, be part of a Statement. Here I list the alternatives that are proposed for it:

> Tom: "Ipce seeks ways in which ethically responsible forms of these relationships can be expressed."

> Paul Mcl: "Ipce searches for situations where ethically responsible forms of these relationships can occur." (Marcos agrees with the word "situations" instead of "opportunities".)

> Desire: "Ipce explores the opportunities that are available to ethically responsible forms of such relationships, as well as ways to extend those possibilities, and the benefits and problems of such extensions, both for the partners involved and for society in general." Desire adds to this: I think the mentioning the disadvantages of such extensions would be a good thing - it preempts claims that we do not wish to see those.

> Gerald: "The IPCE wants to clarify [and educate about] the ethical and responsible consensual forms of intergenerational relationships." Gerald comments about the 'opportunity' sentence: If I read this correctly (native English speakers please correct me) it says that: "the IPCE is searching for opportunities for relationships". If I look through the eyes of people who have different views than ours, that is my first impression of that sentence. The word "opportunities" triggers off negative images of "opportunistic, predatory". "These relationships" means little. Instead of using the word "these" it is better to describe that relationship. Further nowhere in the statement is mentioned the word "consensual", which is the essence of the understanding of the ethicality of such

relationships. Otherwise "ethics" can mean anything to anybody. [Frans comments: the concept of 'consensuality' is not used because it is a tricky concept. We chose "mutual" instead of it.]

> Last but not least Ted's proposal: "Encouraged are discussions about how to overcome current limitations, how adult/nonadult relationships create better lives, how they are moral and responsible, and how they are culturally and societally integrated."

... And now the name...

Ted wrote:

"I can appreciate Frans' desire to get the mission statement up onto the public website [...]. I can also appreciate Frans' desire to have a vote of yes or no, with no chance for revision. But I find this too confining and limiting a way for such a small group of us to work.

And more important is the development of a name for the new forum and mission statement that is clear and easy for people on the web to understand. For this reason, I ask that the adoption of the mission statement be delayed another week or two to consider the following recommended changes.

I suggest, for discussion only, further revision of the mission statement to read something like as follows:

"The Ipce [or some new name for the group] provides a forum for people to come to understand, and to engaged in academic discussion about the emancipation of, mutual love relationships between young people and adults.

These adult/non-adult relationships are intended to be viewed from a warmly accepting, non-condemnatory perspective and with respect for the human rights of both the young and adult partners.

The Ipce [or some new name for the group] meets in a public space every one or two years, publishes a newsletter, hosts a web site, coordinates the electronic exchange of texts, and archives relevant publications."

Ted comments about the Ipce name.

Originally, Ipce meant "International Pedophile and Child Emancipation". When I used this phrase over the years, I always added something like "Annual Meeting" after the term "Ipce", as in: "Ipce Annual Meeting". So the "Ipce Conference" meant: the "International Pedophile and Child Emancipation Conference".

Originally, there was no fully functional Ipce organization during the time when there was no international gathering of people. The Ipce Annual Meeting's International Secretary's primary function, during the year, as I remember it, was to coordinate the planning for the next Ipce Annual Meeting.

This original concept for the Ipce (which first met in Copenhagen in 1986) has now evolved over the years and under Frans' leadership. I recommend reconsideration of the "Ipce" name again -- and before going public on the web. I recommend consideration of completely abandoning the acronym "Ipce" as meaningless for most people who will now get to know this newly evolved forum on the web. I ask that this mailing list brainstorm and hunt around for a less confusing alternative name for this "new" and evolved forum that does not include the confusing acronym/word "Ipce" at all.

Frans reacted:

1. Let's follow Teds proposal to take some more time and proceed the discussion. For me, a new name will be welcome; we never found another, so the meeting in October 1998 decided to use "Ipce" (NOT "IPCE") as a name and not as an abbreviation. We did this, because Ipce is reasonably well known in ped-workgroups, but not outside these groups. [...]

2. Let's at first discuss only about the Mission Statement, which has to be short and clear, and later on about a Statement about what Ipce wants and thinks.

Thus, the discussion is still going on now. For this newsletter, I chose to use my second proposal, which has had an accepted voting... for the time being...

Readers of the paper version of the Newsletter are invited to share the discussion by post. Maybe the next Newsletter will have a new name...

Frans.

SECTION 3: Research

Most child sex attacks committed by relatives, family friends.

(c) 1999 by Agence France-Presse (via ClariNet)

LONDON, Feb 5 (AFP) - Children are at much greater risk of sexual abuse from relatives and family friends than they are from predatory paedophiles, according to new British government research out Friday.

The Home Office report concluded that up to 80 percent of sexual offences take place either in the home of the perpetrator or the victim, by adults they knew.

A survey showed that some 68 percent of attackers knew their victims and 13 percent were related to them. Only 18 percent were strangers.

Also, attacks by strangers were usually one-off incidents, and were rarer and less traumatic than persistent abuse by someone known to the child, the report said.

The report was commissioned in the wake of controversy over the threat posed by paedophiles who, having served time in prison, were released back into the community.

It reckoned that up to 72,500 children a year were attacked in England and Wales, although admitted figures were extremely difficult to establish.

The research found that only one in five men jailed for molesting children was likely to be caught re-offending, compared with reconviction figures of 50 percent for non-sexual offenders within two years of the original crime.

Most abusers did not fit the strict medical description of "paedophilia." Offences were usually carried out by men often characterised as "emotionally lonely."

Fears about paedophile networks are also exaggerated, the report said.

It estimated there were around 240 cases of "organised abuse," involving more than one perpetrator, each year in England and Wales, a small proportion of total cases of abuse.

The research also found that a third of all sex crimes are carried out by adolescents.

The report recommended better risk assessment to identify those who were likely to re-offend, as well as awareness campaigns for parents and carers to look out for signs of abuse.

ABOUT RECIDIVISM

A meta-analysis, reviewed by Dr Frans Gieles

Introduction

'Once a thief, always a thief' is a Dutch proverb. It's not yet a legend, but the belief that 'a sex offender will always keep being a sex offender' is widely spread. At least, convicted sex offenders are compulsory bound to undergo some kind of treatment. At worst, people want to keep them in lifelong custody. These measures are based on the *belief* mentioned.

The Dutch professor Frenken has frequently been quoted in the newspapers and other media. He always gives a recidivism rate of 90% or more. Thus, he expects that 90% or more of convicted sex offenders will relapse. For this reason, compulsory treatment is seen as necessary for every convicted offender. The courts and the treatment center believe him - he's a professor and thus an expert. But is it true that 90% reoffend?

In this article I will review an article about a meta-analyse of 61 recidivism studies. The authors conclude to a mean recidivism percentage of 13.4% for sexual offenders, which is lower than the mean overall recidivism percentage for all offenders. Certainly much lower than Frenken's statement.

Let's first have a look at the title, the authors and the summary the authors made of the article.

Predicting Relapse: A meta-Analysis of Sexual Offender Recidivism Studies,

R. Karl Hanson and Monique T. Bussière,

Department of the Solicitor General of Canada.

In: Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology,

edited by the American Psychological Association,

1998, Vol. 66, No. 2, pp 348-362

Summary

"Evidence from 61 follow-up studies was examined to identify the factors most strongly related to recidivism among sexual offenders. On average, the sexual offense recidivism rate was low (13.4%; $n = 23.393$). There were, however, subgroups of offenders who recidivated at high rates. Sexual offense recidivism was best predicted by measures of sexual deviancy (e.g., deviant sexual preferences, prior sexual offenses) and, to a lesser extent, by general criminological factors (e.g., age, total prior offenses). Those offenders who failed to complete treatment were at higher risk for reoffending than those who completed treatment. The predictors of nonsexual violent recidivism and general (any) recidivism were similar to those predictors found among nonsexual criminals (e.g., prior violent offenses, age, juvenile delinquency). Our results suggest that applied risk assessments of sexual offenders should consider separately the offender's risk for sexual and nonsexual recidivism."

Method

The study provides a quantitative review of the sexual offender recidivism literature. The method of review is a meta-analysis, a generally accepted method of research review that can overview many studies and thus large samples, which yield high statistical power. All participants were sexual offenders. Three types of recidivism have been examined: sexual, nonsexual violent, and general (any).

61 Studies from several countries between 1943 and 1995 have been examined. The reported follow-up periods ranged from 6 months to 23 years, with a mean of 66 months. All studies used the matched, longitudinal follow-up design, which is known as the best available design. All studies were found to be reliable, indicating overall acceptable levels of diligence in identifying recidivists. If differences between the studies were great, they have been made comparable by several statistical techniques. The 61 studies provided information about 28.972 sexual offenders.

Results

A short explanation in advance

To conclude to a recidivism rate, one can count the number of reoffenders among the participants. The rate is a figure between 0% and 100%.

To know which factors influence the reoffending, comparisons have been made between one factor, reoffending, and many other measured factors. A *factor* is a force that can have influence (e.g., insight). A factor has to be measured by some method. The outcome of the measurement is a *variable* (e.g., an intelligence quotient) If such a variable correlates high with reoffending, it is seen as a predictor.

Correlation is the coherence of two variables (e.g., intelligence quotient and school success). The level of correlation is reflected in r , a figure between +1.00 (if it rains, the streets are always wet) and - 1.00 (if it rains, the streets are never dry). The significance of this figure depends on the amount of observations or participants. The more observations, the more significance. Therefore, the number of participants is usually given after the r with the letter n .

To give some more explanation before, *phallogometric assessment* is a method to measure the swelling of the penis at the moment the person sees certain pictures. This method intrudes in the most private parts of the person: not only his penis, but also his feelings. It's a quite 'hard' method. In the library of this web site, you can find research that find out that 26% of the male participants reacted to 'pedophilic stimuli' with an erection.

In this review, I follow the language of the authors ('deviant interests', 'child molesters'). Keep in mind that, in the English speaking world, a 'child molester' can be a person, who violently has raped a little girl, but also a person who possessed one picture of a nude child and also a teenager who kissed a girl's breasts at the school yard.

Average recidivism rates

On average, the sex offense recidivism rate was 13.4% ($n = 23.393$). The average rate for rapists was 18.9% ($n = 1.839$), for child molesters it was 12.7% ($n = 9.603$).

For nonsexual violence, the average recidivism rate was 12.2% ($n = 7.155$); for child molesters it was 9.9% ($n = 1.774$), but for rapists it was 22.1% ($n = 782$).

When recidivism was defined as any reoffence, the rates were higher: 36.3% overall ($n = 19.374$), for child molesters 36,9% ($n = 3.363$) and for rapists 46.2% ($n = 4017$).

Predictors of sexual offense recidivism

The article gives a long table of 71 measured factors. Only some of these correlate with sexual reoffending. Contrary to the popular belief, being sexually abused as a child was not associated with increased risk ($r = -0.01$, which is not significant).

The strongest predictors of sexual offence recidivism were measures of sexual deviance (as the authors name it); sexual interest in children (measured by phallometric assessment) was the strongest ($r = 0.32$). Lower predictors were 'antisocial personality disorder', 'number of prior offenses' and 'failure to complete treatment' ($r =$ respectively 0.14, 0.13 and 0.17). The sole developmental history variable related to sexual offense recidivism was a negative relationship with the mother ($r = 0.16$).

Predictors of nonsexual violent and general (any) recidivism

These predictors were the same risk factors common to general criminal populations. These recidivists tended to be young, unmarried, and of a minority race. They also engaged in diverse criminal behavior, the abuse of alcohol and were likely to have antisocial or psychopathic personality disorders.

Sexual criminal history was only weakly related to general recidivism. Overall, the clinical presentation and the treatment history variables showed small to moderate correlation with general recidivism. Here also, a negative relationship with the mother was a risk factor.

Predictors or risk factors

Sexual recidivism was best predicted by measures of sexual deviancy. In contrast, other forms of recidivism were best predicted by criminal history. Psychological symptoms were, on average, unrelated to any form of recidivism. Negative clinical representation (e.g., low motivation for treatment or denial of any problem) was related to general, but not to sexual recidivism. Finally, failure to complete treatment appeared to be a consistent risk marker for both sexual and general recidivism.

Predicting relapse by combined risk scales

To predict relapse, one should not measure only one variable, but combinations of variables that mark the risk. No variable was sufficiently related to justify its use in isolation. It appeared that clinical assessment (interviews, tests) failed as a valid predictor (the r was about 0.10). In contrast, statistical risk prediction scales appeared to be a better predictor (r about 0.45). One of these prediction scales, the SIR scale (Statistical Information on Recidivism) could predict general recidivism better than sexual recidivism ($r = 0.41$ and 0.09 respectively). Another scale, the VRAG (Violence Risk Appraisal Guide), predicted general violent recidivism with an $r = 0.47$, but sexual recidivism with an $r = 0.20$ ($n = 159$). In other words: sexual recidivism is difficult to predict.

Discussion

The findings contradict the popular view that sexual offenders inevitably reoffend. Only a minority of the total sample (13.4% of 23.393) was known to have committed a new sexual offense within the average 4.5-year follow up period.

This 13.4% is a mean; so some of the 61 studies concluded to a lower rate, other studies (e.g., with a longer follow up period) to a higher rate, but the recidivism rates never exceeded 40%.

Sexual reoffence is difficult to predict, but the strongest predictors were deviant sexual interests, prior sexual offenses and deviant victim choices (boys outside of the family). Most of the psychological variables failed to predict reoffence, except severe personality disorders. A low clinical presentation (e.g., low remorse and denial) failed to predict sexual recidivism. Failure to complete treatment, however, was a significant predictor.

The results suggest that sexual offenders may differ from other criminals. For nonsexual offending, sexual and nonsexual criminals seem much the same, but separate processes appear to contribute to sexual offending.

In this study, measures of subjective distress had no relationship with any type of recidivism; the average correlation was near zero with no significant variability. No measure of a transient state like subjective distress can predict any recidivism years later. This holds on the inter-subjective level. Within the subject, however, subjective distress can trigger a sexual offence cycle.

A remarkable finding is that offenders who failed to complete treatment were at increased risk for both sexual and general recidivism. Reduced risk could be due to treatment effectiveness; alternatively, high-risk offenders may be those most likely to quit, or be terminated, from treatment.

Almost all the predictors of sexual offence appeared to be historical and stable variables. Historical factors cannot change and sexual preferences are difficult to change. Consequently, such

variables cannot be used to assess treatment outcome or monitor risk to the community. The most dynamic factor was treatment attendance.

The authors end their article with a list of risk factors that not yet have been adequately researched (because of follow up research requires many years), but which are generally believed as being risk factors. They advise to research these factors in future studies. Here is this list:

- the use of sex as a coping mechanism,
- associations with other sexual offenders,
- attitudes tolerant of sexual crimes,
- heterosocial perception deficits and
- unfulfilled intimacy needs.

Epilogue

We know that these *believed* risk factors are used in the current treatment practice. The 'therapists' try to diminish the risk by combating, for example, the 'associations with other (potential) sexual offenders' - read: to meet the members of the Dutch ped workgroups - and the 'attitudes tolerant of sexual crimes' - translated: reading Brongersma's book. Would future research conclude that these factors are *beliefs* only, or facts?

Prof. Frenken is wrong with his *believed* 90% recidivism rate; it is only a *belief*, not a result of research. I have never seen any reference to any research report that supports his 90%. Careful meta-analytic research results in an average recidivism rate of 13.4% generally, and 12.7% for 'child molesters'.

Thus, the automatic referral to a compulsory treatment has to be changed by deciding each case on an individual basis. The automatic lifelong custody and the automatic notifying of the community after the release of a convicted sexual offender needs to be changed as well. This is all based merely on a *belief* rather than on knowledge of the facts. Careful research has given us a look at the facts. One of the facts is that sexual reoffending is difficult to predict.

Can we predict whether the teenage boy at the schoolyard will kiss a girl's breasts again? We can expect that he would do this again; but we hope he would do it with the girl's consent and pleasure. So is human nature. Can we predict whether a man would possess another picture in the future? Supposedly, he will and so add a new 'criminal act' to the statistics. Can we predict that the violent rape of a young girl shall happen twice? We cannot but we hope it will not repeat itself.

The weakness of this careful study is this: there is no difference made between one type of 'child molester' and another. To make the difference was not possible in this meta-analyse, because of the lack of difference in the 61 reviewed studies.

The 'therapists' at the current treatment centers are extremely determined to change the *beliefs* of their patients. Shouldn't they also be strong enough to have a critical look at their own *beliefs*?

Mister President...

The USA is shocked by the research of Rind, Bauserman & Tromovich.

Dr Frans Gieles

Introduction

An overview of the research of Bauserman, Rind and Tromovich was attached to Newsletter E4. The paper they presented at the Rotterdam Symposium in The Netherlands, December 1998 was also attached. Anyone who has read these papers is already familiar with the results of the research. The Dutch media took no notice of this research, but the USA has recently discovered it.

In this article I give an overview of the reactions in the USA. In the next Newsletter I shall give many more details about the kind of language used, the arguments used and will gather comments about these arguments. But first, here is an overview.

The reactions were not to the Rotterdam Paper, but to an article published in 1998:

A Meta-Analytic Examination of Assumed Properties of Child Sexual Abuse Using College Samples; Bruce Rind, Philip Tromovitch & Robert Bauserman; in: Psychological Bulletin 1998, 124-1, pp 22-53.

In the Rotterdam Paper you will find a summary under the heading "College Samples".

Abstract of the article

In response to the availability of a growing literature on the psychological correlates of child sexual abuse (CSA), numerous researchers have conducted literature reviews of these correlates. These reviewers have generally reported that CSA is associated with a wide variety of adjustment problems, and many have additionally implied or concluded that, in the population of persons with CSA experience,

- (a) CSA causes psychological harm,
- (b) this harm is pervasive,
- (c) this harm is intense, and
- (d) boys and girls experience CSA equivalently.

However, with few exceptions, these reviewers have included in their reviews mostly studies using clinical and legal samples; these samples cannot be assumed to be representative of the general population. To evaluate the implications and conclusions of these reviewers, we conducted a literature review of seven studies using national probability samples, which are more appropriate for making population inferences.

We found that, contrary to the implications and conclusions contained in previous literature reviews that were focused on biased samples, in the general population, CSA is not associated with pervasive harm and that harm, when it occurs, is not typically intense. Further, CSA experiences for males and females are not equivalent; a substantially lower proportion of males reports negative effects.

Finally, we found that conclusions about a causal link between CSA and later psychological maladjustment in the general population cannot safely be made because of the reliable presence of confounding variables. We concluded by cautioning that analysis at the population level does not characterize individual cases: When CSA is accompanied by factors such as force and close familial ties, it has the potential to produce significant harm.

NAMBLA and NARTH

NAMBLA was the first to publish about the article on their web site. The article has disappeared now, but it seems to have been a shot of joy. NAMBLA described the findings as "good news," adding that it was proof that the current "war on boy-lovers" has no basis in "science" and that most male child sex experiences with an adult were "positive."

It was NARTH (National Association on Research and Therapy of Homosexuality) who read this and reacted on its web site. NARTH is quite a conservative association who believes that homosexuality is an illness that can be cured. Leading persons at the NARTH site are leading persons at some right wing Christian sites as well.

NARTH wrote a long page on the Web, updated December 29, 1998. It attacks the APA, the American Psychological Association, who is the editor of the Psychological Bulletin. NARTH says that the APA is consciously trying to get pedophilia accepted, just as has happened with homosexuality. NARTH gave an overview on the current ideas about 'abuse', 'the victim' and 'the perpetrator' and added a long list of literature.

The public exposure

A Philadelphia radio talk show found out about the study through a caller and interviewed one of its authors on the air in March.

Dr Laura Schlessinger

She is a very popular broadcast speaker with a program to which millions of people listen. She used many hours of her broadcast program, from March 22 and plenty of room on her web site and her newspaper column to attack the APA. The APA has connected itself with 'child molesters', is wanting to normalize pedophilia and to change the laws. "I, like you, right now probably cannot believe this," she told her nationwide audience, "I've read this so many times, I'm sick." And: "If pedophilia is not a mental disorder, what is it?" This was the style of her program. She wrote: "What really terrifies me is the idea that the Rind study will now be used to normalize pedophilia, to change the legal system and further destroy the family." Also the authors were attacked in a way that was soon described in the newspapers as "a crusade".

The APA reacts.

The APA had to react now and did it quite promptly with a declaration, dated March 23: "Childhood Sexual Abuse Causes Serious Harm to its Victims." In short, APA says it has never had

another opinion. The Rind article tells us only that there are various degrees of harm and sometimes mitigating factors. This knowledge can help us to prevent child abuse and to cure the victims. "Such knowledge would, however, in no way excuse any form of abuse. All abuse is wrong, but abuse may not be equally harmful."

This APA cites the other APA, the American Psychiatric Association, who said: "An adult who engages in sexual activity with a child is performing a criminal and immoral act which never can be considered normal or socially acceptable behavior."

The Family Research Council (FRC)

This council says its goal is to represent and to protect the American families. It condemns strongly the possibility that sexual contacts would not be harmful for children.

There was a meeting on May 12, where many organizations, journalists, radio speakers, therapists, victims and politicians were gathered to admonish the APA to keep distance from the Rind article. FRC Chief Spokesperson Janet Parshall said, "Children cannot consent to sex and any study that does not accept this premise should be dismissed." "Pedophilia has no presentable face". "We should treat it as the ugly demon it is and do everything we can to preserve our children's innocence. Adult-child sex is always reprehensible, always harmful and always forced."

The politicians awoke.

One of the leaders of the FRC, Gary Bauer, is also a candidate for the presidency of the United States. The candidate's first job is to win votes. So the scientific and moral case became a political case.

The State of Alaska was the first to make a resolution:

"The Alaska State Legislature urges the United States Congress and the President of the United States to likewise reject and condemn, in the strongest honorable written and vocal terms possible, any suggestion that sexual relations between children and adults are anything but abusive, destructive, exploitive, reprehensible, and punishable by law; and be it further resolved that the Alaska State Legislature encourages competent investigations to continue to research the effects of child sexual abuse using the best methodology so that the public and public policymakers may act upon accurate information."

Similar resolutions have also been introduced in California and Illinois and later on in Pennsylvania and New Jersey.

The Republican Party was prompt in accepting a resolution. This resolution asks the president, in short, to condemn as strongly as possible every *suggestion* that sex with adults would not be harmful.

So the article came to the President's desk. However, a spokesperson for the White House said that the President had, as of May 12, not yet found the time to read it. Since this was not changed one week later, the Republicans stated that it should be clear to the American public how dangerous the Democratic Party is for our children. A great danger is that a child molester could defend himself using this article and so could be free... to molest our children again. This is the view that the public media has taken as well.

The public media smelled news.

Many articles about the case appeared in the press, especially the conservative press including The Washington Post, the Agence France Press and the Jakarta Post. Clearly, the journalists rewrote each other's articles and clearly many of them have not read the Rind article themselves. They quote especially the opponents of the Rind team. They write, for example, that the Rind article should write about 'pedophilia', but that word does not even appear in the Rind article. The authors say explicitly that the law should not be changed.

The newspapers and other media asked experts for comment. One of them, an Indiana psychologist, Nancy Faulkner, condemns the study as "Garbage in, garbage out" without having read it. She admitted that she had not read the entire study but only the portions that have been reported in news articles. Another one, Alaska's Dyson admitted, "For me ... child safety issues and child welfare have been almost an obsession."

Dyson and Faulkner said that, indeed, there could be some specific cases in which a child-adult sexual experience would not adversely affect the child. However, they said that doesn't make it right. "We have universally said that children, particularly when faced with the overwhelming power of a persuasive adult, can't make a decision in certain situations: decisions about firearms, dope and sex. We have made that fundamental decision."

Members of Congress, seeking for publicity, want to investigate how the research of the Rind team is paid for (they have received no funding but have volunteered their time), whether they should be removed from their jobs and whether the University accepts funding from the state.

It's all about "danger" to the newspapers: for example the possibility that 'dangerous' child molesters may keep their freedom and harm another victim. It's the same USA, by the way, that keeps the selling of weapons quite easy, representing a far greater threat to our children.

I find opinions like this remarkable: "whoever does not see the harm, has not looked carefully enough".

In the meantime, also the ALA, the American Librarians Association, has been attacked. Supposedly, they refused to delete the article from their libraries and, factually, they have said something about the freedom of expressing opinions in the USA. Surely this freedom exists, say the opponents, but they act like they *should* only exist for the right wing opinions... These opinions defend Family Values, among which is the Authority of the Father, ignoring the fact that most child sexual abuse happens in the traditional family. But, you know it's all 'to protect our children'.

The other APA

In the meantime, the American *Psychiatric* Association has also been attacked because some feel that they are trying to normalize pedophilia. Frequently, the *DSM-IV-Revisited* has been quoted, the manual in which all kinds of mental illness are mentioned, that pedophilia is the type of illness, that if the person feels unhappy with the feelings then it is an illness. Tell this to a journalist and you will read in the newspapers: 'So, a person who molests a child and does not feel unhappy about it, should not be mentally ill?'

On May 27, the American Psychiatric Association declared that there has never been any movement within their ranks to normalize pedophilia. Every sexual act between a child and an adult, if not an illness, is a crime. It's not possible, they say, for a child to consent. Research that presupposes the *possibility* of consent, can't be good research and the conclusions cannot be correct. If this type of research is not strongly condemned, the pedophiles will maintain their opinions and will be a danger to our children.

The APA reviews its opinion

The first mentioned APA, the psychologists, gave a statement, dated May 25. APA writes:

"Many critics have demanded that APA repudiate the study. Because the article has attracted so much attention. We have carefully reviewed the process by which it was approved for publication and the soundness of the methodology and analysis. This study passed the journal's rigorous peer review process and has, since the controversy, been reviewed again by an expert in statistical analysis who affirmed that it meets current standards and that the methodology, which is widely used by the National Institutes of Health (NIH) to develop guidelines, is sound." APA writes also:

"These conclusions have been distorted and misreported by various groups and media figures who are now claiming that APA is saying that child sexual abuse is not harmful to children, or that young children are capable of "consenting" to sex with adults. Of course, APA's position is just the opposite; child sexual abuse is harmful to children. Pedophilia is WRONG, should never be considered acceptable behavior, and is properly punishable by law."

Yet the APA raises questions for further research. Maybe the college students, who reported no harm, have been in psychotherapy, so the harm is over? Maybe the people who had harm were so harmed that they couldn't go to college? Maybe the harm is not felt at their college study time, but will show itself later on as they are married? (There must be harm, they assume, so they try to find it).

The APA gave their next statement in an open letter, dated June 9, to the Office of the Majority Whip [the Republicans] in the United States House of Representatives. APA says that the language of the Rind article was possibly not correct and that Rind's opinions differ from the APA's opinions about the possibility of consent. APA had not foreseen the public and political consequences of the article. APA repeats its opinion:

"The Association has always condemned the sexual abuse of children. This position is absolutely fundamental to our organization and is demonstrated by our strong record of advocacy on behalf of abused children and our work to educate the public, health, professions, and others about the prevention and treatment of such abuse. We do not support the "normalization" or discrimination of any form of sexual relations between adult and children. Such behavior must remain criminal and punishable to the full extent of the law."

APA shall make a brochure for all USA parents, to warn them about the dangers of sexual contacts with their children. APA shall send letters to all courts to forbid the use of the Rind article as a

defense for child molesters; only the official APA opinion statement can be used in courts. A new statement, condemning all sexual contacts with children, will be presented to the next APA's member's meeting.

APA ends the letter with a long description of the projects it has supported to help the victims and gives a long list of publications that all condemn sexual contacts between children and adults.

Later on, APA has distanced itself more and more publicly from the study, saying that its leadership disagrees with the study's conclusions and that it should have considered the "social-policy implications" of such a paper before publishing it.

That change is the most important outcome of debate on the study, said Heather Mirjahangir, press secretary for U.S. Rep. Matt Salmon (R., Ariz.), chief sponsor of the resolution. "They said, from now on they're going to consider public-policy repercussions," she said. "You don't hear academic journals saying things like that."

The APA's chief executive officer, Raymond D. Fowler, wrote in a letter to another sponsor that his organization rejects the position "that much of what we call child sexual abuse is not particularly harmful."

"While there is doubtless a continuum of harmfulness depending upon the nature, intensity and duration of the abuse, there is no way to be certain that even the mildest forms of noncontact sexual encounter might not do serious damage to a vulnerable child," he wrote.

The Congress (House of Representatives)

At July 12, the USA Congress has accepted a Resolution nr 107 by a vote of 355 to 0 and 13 'present'.

The way of speaking

What stroke me, was the way of speaking of the honorable Members of Congress.

Mr. Salmon (Arizona): "There are no lower life forms than adults who sexually abuse children. Child molesters rob children of their innocence [sic] and subject them to a lifetime of nightmares. Those who engage in this activity deserve the harshest punishment." [...] "Words alone will not protect children from the monsters who prey on them."

Then, he says that the sentences for predators are too light in this country: about 4 years in prison. "In my opinion, the average sentence is about 96 years too short."

"Recidivism rates are quoted as high as 70 percent. Those are just the ones who get caught. In other words, they get out of prison and they prey on children again and again. The next time, the pedophiles may end up killing the child to make sure there is not evidence so they can be put away again." [The readers can compare this 70% with Prof. Frenkens 90% and with the 13.4% in the article here above about the recidivism rates.]

Mr. DeLay, Chief of the Republican's Majority Whip (say: 'Office'), said: "Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the American Psychological Association for clarifying its position on pedophilia. Without question, sexual abuse of minors is child abuse. Child abuse is a plague on this country that cannot be overlooked or obscured by pseudo-scientific doubletalk."

The Resolution

This kind of resolutions is usually one very long sentence. First, many times "whereas....", amongst which:

"Whereas information endangering children is being made public and, in some instances, may be given unwarranted or unintended credibility through release under professional titles or through professional organizations; [...]

Whereas all credible [< sic!] studies in this area, including those published by the American Psychological Association, condemn child sexual abuse as criminal and harmful to children;

Whereas, once published and allowed to stand, scientific literature may become a source for additional research;

Whereas the Psychological Bulletin has recently published a severely flawed study, entitled ..."

Another "whereas..." mentions that Bauserman had written an article in Paidika. Also NAMBLA is mentioned:

"Whereas pedophiles and organizations, such as the North American Man-Boy Love Association, that advocate laws to permit sex between adults and children are exploiting the study to promote and justify child sexual abuse:

Now, therefore, be it Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress--

(1) condemns and denounces all suggestions in the article 'A Meta-Analytic [..etc..]' that indicate that sexual relationships between adults and 'willing' children are less harmful than believed and might be positive for 'willing' children [...]

(2) vigorously opposes any public policy or legislative attempts to normalize adult-child sex or to lower the age of consent;

(3) urges the President likewise to reject and condemn, in the strongest possible terms, any suggestion that sexual relations between children and adults--regardless of the child's frame of mind--are anything but abusive, destructive, exploitive, reprehensible, and punishable by law; and

(4) encourages competent investigations to continue to research the effects of child sexual abuse using the best methodology, so that the public, and public policymakers, may act upon accurate information."

Epilogue

I've always thought that good scientific research could bring more nuances into the debate about childhood sexuality, but reading all these articles and statements has made me doubt it.

I'm a bit astonished by the right wing's reactions. They worry that youth who have had sexual experiences with adults will always have their lives destroyed. Now they can read that the harm could be less than they had thought. One should expect that they should be glad about it. Instead, they got furious. Would they only be glad if research had concluded that every sexual act was disastrous and always destroys each young life? The right wing reactions seem to imply a kind of hidden agenda. What are they trying to accomplish?

What struck me was the careless way in which the research results were published, even by the APA president himself. The next Newsletter will give details about that. The content as well as the intention of the research has been represented incorrectly, if not deceitfully. Right wing Christian groups know themselves that "thou shalt not lie". What struck me also was the amount of names, associations, foundations et cetera (supposedly with lots of money) on the right wing and how easily they can reach the radio, the newspapers, the Congress members and even the President.

All these people have read into the Rind article - IF they have read it! - things that are not written by Rind et al at all. The authors do not plead for 'pedophilia' - they do not even use the word. It seems like a kind of 'moral panic' to read a plea for 'pedophilia' into an article that does not use the word at all. It tells about harm - although perhaps less harm than generally was thought. The authors differentiate between no harm, moderate harm and severe harm. The first is found in consensual man-boy relationships, the last is especially found in families between a powerful father and a young daughter. Why do they so furiously react against 'pedophiles' and NAMBLA and continually plea for "Family Values", of which parental authority is the first one? But let's have also a look at the NAMBLA side. It's first article on the web seems to have been more or less a shout of joy. I've seen many shouts of joy on the web, for example on Boy Chat. For me, I do not see any cause for jubilation when I read that about one-third of the boys had negative feelings afterwards, while two-third of the girls had these feelings. For me, the 4% of permanently damaged girls that were found are 4% too much. If one may say that the chances of a positive or a negative feeling afterwards is approximately 50% on both sides, I am glad that it's not 100% negative and I'm gonna think very long and hard about my opinion as an Ipce member.

DOCUMENTATION SERVICE List July 1999

List of publications - from Ipce Newsletter E 6.

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

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

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

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

| | | | |
|--------|----|----------------|--|
| 99-019 | @B | 10pp | Interpreting the satanic legend, Journal of Religion and Health 37-3, Fall 1998, also published in Ipce Newsletter E5, febr 1999 |
| 99-020 | @B | 4pp | Families for Freedom Child Safety Bulletins, Stranger Danger (Ipce Newsletter E5, febr 1999) |
| 99-021 | @B | 3pp | Robbing kids of their childhood and teaching parents to panic; let children be children and adults be adults, by Frank Furedi, in: Living Marxism 113, sept 1998, and in Ipce newsletter E5, febr 1999. |
| 99-022 | @B | 5pp | Overview of Foucault's ideas, The History of Sexuality, by Ianthe |
| 99-042 | @ | 4Kb | The Rind Papers: Overview with links to abstracts on a web site. |
| 99-043 | @B | 10pp 28 kB | Interpreting the Satanic Legend, *Journal of Religion and Health* Vol. 37, No 3, Fall 1998, pp. 249-263. |
| 99-044 | @B | 14pp 89 kB | Abuse in the balance, by Bob Woffinden; Analysis of UK children's home investigations, 9th May 1998, The Guardian Features: Weekend Guardian, p.34 ff. |
| 99-045 | @B | 2pp 52 kB | Book review: The Economist, London. December 5th 1998. Books: Anne Higonnet "Pictures of Innocence" James Kincaid "Erotic Innocence, the Culture of Child-Molesting" |
| 99-046 | @B | 2pp 50kB | A Call to save our children and our liberties, 2nd version with the list of signers |
| 99-047 | @ | 3pp 35kB | Kiddie pants or kiddie porn ? Nothing comes between kids and their Calvins -- except charges of pedophilia, Salon, March 12, 1999, Deborah A. Lott. |
| 99-048 | @B | 20pp 101 kB | B.C. Supreme Court Ruling of Duncan Shaw (Canada, child porn law) |
| 99-049 | @ | 4pp 36 kB | Children are at risk - from their terrified parents, Frank Furedi, on the implications of last week's report on mental illness in the young, The Independent on Sunday, 7th February 1999. |
| 99-050 | @ | 2pp 26 kB | Parents told to let children take risks, [says Mental Health Foundation in the U.K.), February 4 1999. |
| 99-051 | @ | 5pp 42 kB | CHILDREN are becoming prisoners of a "bedroom culture" because their parents fear for their safety outside, according to a new study, March 19 1999. |
| 99-052 | @ | 3pp 33 kB | Article about: Sex offending against children: understanding the risk, by Don Grubin, Home Office, Policing and Reducing Crime Unit, Research, Development and Statistics Directorate, 50 Queen Anne's Gate, London SW1H 9AT, Feb 7, 1999. |
| 99-053 | @ | 1p 22 kB | Note about the Rimm- or 'Pittsburgh' study. |
| 99-054 | @ | 1p 21 kB | Sex abuse statistics report, A Home Office report, February 5 1999 |
| 99-055 | @ | 4pp 34 kB | Verjährungsregelung bei Kindsmisbrauch: Fehlurteile programmiert [in Schwitzerland], aus „Plädoyer“ 5/98 Seiten 28-29, durch M. Killias & G. Jenny. |
| 99-056 | @ | 3pp 37 kB | Conference of the Gesellschaft für Sexualwissenschaft E.V. (Society for scientific study of sexuality), University of Leipzig, Germany, January 23rd, 1999, "Psychosocial aspects of pedophilia". |
| 99-080 | @ | 8pp | Democracy, Trust, Family and Relationships, BBC Radio lecture by Prof. Anthony Giddens. |
| 99-081 | @ | 7pp | Review of: Moral Panic; Changing concepts of the child molester in modern America, by Philip Jenkins. Yale University Press, 1998. |
| 99-083 | @B | 2pp | USA Congress Resolution 107, July 12, 1999, condemning the Rind et al. research report. |