

Start

Omhoog

*I p c e*

# Newsletter

**Number E 14, October 2002**

Download [a Zipped .doc version](#) or a [.PDF version](#)

02

Introduction

03

**Article**

Ethics and human rights in intergenerational relationships; 'First, do no harm', By Dr Frans Gieles

05

**Report of the 15<sup>th</sup> Ipce Meeting**

**1. The discussion about ethics**

07

**2. A mixture of themes Discussed during the meeting**

a. Our host and guests

09

b. Frontline and background action

11

c. A broader look: other times & cultures

13

d. A paradigm shift, and so, a new model

14

**3. Ipce decides about Ipce**

Financial report; Report of the secretary; The Ipce Newsletter;

15 The public Ipce web; Internal communication; The Ipce teams;  
About interviews;

16 Next meeting

16 **4. Looking back on the meeting**

18 **Manifesto of JOY**

26 **Book reviews:**

Moral Panic: Changing concepts of the child molester in modern  
America, by Philip Jenkins. &

Pedophiles on Parade: Volume 1: The monster in the media; Volume 2:  
The popular imagery of moral hysteria, by David Sonenschein.

31 **Documentation Service List September 2002**

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

**[webmaster@ipce.org](mailto:webmaster@ipce.org)**

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

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

Ipce meets once every one or two years in a different country, publishes a newsletter

and a web site, co-ordinates the (electronic) exchange of texts and keeps an archive of specific written publications.

## **Introduction**

Here you have the 14<sup>th</sup> electronically published Ipce Newsletter. Most of it is the report of the 15<sup>th</sup> Ipce Meeting.

*Ethics* was one of the themes of the meeting. The first article, *Ethics and human rights in intergenerational relationships; 'First, do no harm'*, gives the result of several years of discussion. The article is followed by the report of the discussion at this meeting.

Of the following mixture of themes, one especially asks for our attention: the paradigm shift that is going on now, from 'emancipation' as main theme to 'living together' as the headline.

Then, you will read about the decisions taken by the meeting. One of them is to maintain this Newsletter in a paper version and in the electronic version on the public Ipce web site.

What follows, is a "Manifesto of JOY", sent to Ipce for publication in this Newsletter. As the Secretary, I have received several earlier versions of this Manifesto. Because they all were handwritten in a very tiny font, I could scarcely read them and I have asked for a shorter and better readable version that could be scanned. Well, here it is. The Manifesto is remarkable because of its specific use of an own language, which makes it difficult to read.

Back to normal use of language in the two book reviews we are allowed to republish here. Both books, Jenkin's and Sonenschein's book, describe the creation of a special social construct, named "the child molester".

As usual, a list of documents is at the end of the Newsletter. It is a short list, because most documents and articles are directly placed on the Ipce web site. Thus, the 'real Newsletter' is the section "What is New?" on the Ipce web site.

This web site has had more than 14,000 visitors since the counter has been renewed on January 28, 2002 – more than 50 visitors each day.

As you will read in the report, the Meeting has asked me to continue my work as your Secretary and Webmaster,

***Frans***

# Ethics and human rights in intergenerational relationships

## 'First, do no harm'

By Dr Frans Gieles

In: Ipce newsletter E 14, October 2002

Since the mid-1990s, Ipce members have held discussions about ethics. I have listened to the members. In this article, I will summarize the salient points of several opinions I have heard.

### Introduction

“Ipce is a forum for people who are engaged in scholarly discussion about the understanding and emancipation of mutual relationships between children or adolescents and adults. In this context, these relationships are to be viewed from an unbiased, non-judgmental perspective and in relation to the human rights of both the young and adult partner.” (Ipce Mission Statement)

Human rights and a reasoned discussion are a fundamental basis for the following ethical ideas about intergenerational relationships. One of these rights is that of choice of contacts and relationships with other humans. Contact is necessary for humans, and relationships can enrich life for both partners. This is the basis of reasonable ethical thought about intergenerational relationships.

How much intimacy a contact or relationship has is in the first place a free choice for both partners. This may differ according to the individuals and the situation. There is only one general rule or principle that counts in every relationship: ***Do no harm.***

But there is more to say. What follows are no general rules, nor commandments on tablets of stone for eternity, but guidelines or thoughts, points to take into consideration, together with the local mores, laws and customs in a given society and era. The result, an ethical idea about an actual relationship, will differ with the people and the situation.

In the course of years, Ipce members have developed the following main guidelines or principles.

## **Some main guidelines**

### ***Freedom of choice***

In any intergenerational relationship or contact both partners, the adult as well as the young person, have it in their power to regulate their own lives, their relationships and the grade of intimacy.

Each partner has the right to self-determination and the responsibility to acknowledge this right in the other. Therefore, both partners in open communication will choose the grade of intimacy at any moment.

In *friendship* relationships or contacts, both partners have the freedom to withdraw from the relationship at any moment. Love and dedication are unconditional; they bind partners who are free and independent.

In *dependency* relationships or contacts, (such as parent-child or teacher-pupil) love and dedication should also be unconditional, but freedom to withdraw does not exist in practice. So, extra attention should be given to the right to the self-determination and responsibility of both partners. Here, the grade of intimacy has two limits: complete distance is not possible nor wanted, complete intimacy will interfere with the dependency: complete intimacy asks for complete freedom, which does not exist in dependency relationships.

### ***The grade of openness***

Openness is a typical western value; many other cultures respect and maintain secrets. Openness within a relationship is a good value. Openness to others is a good value as long as they respect one's right to self-determination. So, openness to others may be good, but it is not always necessary and not always possible. For example, intimacy between males is still a great taboo, for instance, in most schoolyards. Or, in many families, the very existence of any form of sexual life in a young person is taboo.

Many young people prefer consciously to have their own secrets. They make their own choices and do not want to be protected. 'Don't treat me as a child', they say. It is their right to have this freedom, the freedom to say *no* and the freedom to say *yes*. There is also a right of privacy. The other side of the coin is that young people should not have to carry too heavy or unreasonable secrets. One has to take into consideration how the young person lives and how his environment may react.

### ***Do no harm***

Harm can come from feelings of shame and dirtiness, learned from society. Harm can come from a society that uses power or violence to force the end of a relationship. One should

consider this risk, as well as the risk of blackmail. The adult as well as the young person is vulnerable in this society nowadays.

## Concluding remarks

My conclusion, and that of several members, is that intimacy in intergenerational relationships in our society nowadays, has the risk to harm both partners - perhaps not through the relationship itself, but by society's reaction to it. Taking this into consideration, I suppose that such intimacy, maybe ethically correct in itself, will be quite uncommon these days.

'Platonic' relationships may be a reasonable choice, but these relationships still include the hidden implication that sex is dirty and taboo.

Not only young gays and lesbians, but also young people in a phase of hetero- or homosexuality, need relationships to explore their orientation and to develop self-knowledge and self-respect. It is their right to have them. They do not deserve rejection. Harm may result from a relationship and society's reaction to it. Harm is also possible by rejection and by not having relationships at all. One should as honestly as possible estimate if any harm might arise. The leading principle remains *Do no harm*.

Every person and situation is different. Young people change in the course of their development from child to adult. Use your own best judgment and that of your partner in any individual case.

[\[Home\]](#)   [\[Articles & Essays - G\]](#)   [\[Newsletter E 14\]](#)



# Report of the 15<sup>th</sup> Ipce Meeting

## 1. The discussion about ethics

### Intro

Several years ago, in Copenhagen and Amsterdam, we discussed ethics. We developed four principles or guidelines. Last year, in Berlin, we took up the thread. Tom presented [a lecture](#), published in the Ipce Newsletter E 12, in which there is also an introductory article by me. Discussion followed on the IMO List. Let's now try further to develop ideas about ethics.

To refresh our memories: the four principles were seen as good in certain situations, but generally too limited and partly contradictory. The principles speak about avoiding a bad situation, but have no positive goal or fundamental expression of what is good. The principle of *openness*, especially, was seen as a debatable one.

The idea was to maintain the four principles, but regard them as thoughts, not as rules, and to put them into a broader frame and add more thoughts. There is [a try-out or a proposal](#) for such ideas in Newsletter E13.

What follows is a report of the discussion at the meeting.

### About ethics

A text about ethics is more or less descriptive of a utopia. The guidelines it gives are ideals to strive for. If those guidelines are meant as *global* guidelines or principles, the text will inevitably look like a theory, and thus for some people, more or less nebulous. Nobody can give exact *rules* for every situation. Such a text provides concepts to have in mind and to take into consideration. One should, however, still make a case-by-case judgment. Therefore, ethical guidelines should also be practical enough to be used in a concrete situation - and thus be more or less tied to an actual culture and era, hence not eternal. Ethics change in the course of time, in the course of the discourse.

Ethics are not plucked from the air; they have a fundament. For some people religion provides their ethics. For us, there are two ethical sources: *human rights* and *reasonable thinking*.

### Our ethics

Our society *has* its rules and ethics about mutual relationships and intimacy between children or adolescents and adults. *Keep your distance* is the rule; fear of sexuality is its basis. In our vision, *this* is not ethical. But we are also part of this society.

This double position, criticizing the society we are a part of, results not only in our handing out sharp criticism, but also in formulating ethical principles that are acceptable to the same society.

Why should we formulate our own ethics? There are several reasons:

- ✿ Every group of humans should develop its own ethics,
- ✿ Members, and especially young and new members, ask for some guidelines, and
- ✿ Society, for example journalists and interviewers, ask for our opinions. If we have no answer, it may appear that we have no ethics at all.

### **The four guidelines**

The proposed text ([Human rights in intergenerational relationships](#), 'First do no harm', in newsletter E 13) has two sections:

- ✿ the text about the four guidelines or principles, and
- ✿ the cadre made around these guidelines.

The meeting discussing this, globally accepted the cadre, and concentrated its discussion again on the four guidelines.

The first three principles are more or less the same, or at least based on the same more basic principle: *freedom of choice*. The second principle, *initiative*, is doubtful. The fourth principle is also doubtful and has another base.

Thus, if we stop *numbering* the principles and make one text from the first three, changing the name of the second principle, and then adding the fourth one as a following text, a more logical text will appear.

### ***Initiative***

The original text states:

*“Initiative:*

Even in a later stage of the relationship, it is always the children who make the choice to have sex.”



To be very practical: everyone who reads the word 'sex' in this context will interpret it as 'penetration'. That's not what we mean to say. We mean 'intimacy' in its many grades.

Then, the concept of *initiative* is based on a wrong idea: the idea that in a loving relationship one *or* the other takes the initiative to a next step in intimacy. It's the theory of seduction, which, in society's view, is always performed by the adult. So, as a kind of defence, we have said, 'Do not take the initiative'. But in a loving relationship, each initiative is taken by one *and* the other, by one *with* the other. Each initiative is only a proposal to the other and the other will respond to it.

It's not realistic to say 'Do not take any initiative'. What we want to say is: 'Be very attentive to the answer and the feelings of the other'. If the other says 'no', it *is* 'no'. What we want to say is: the grade of intimacy in any relationship will be decided by both partners in communication with each other, both having freedom of choice and the right to self-determination.

So, in talking about any relationship, one should always mention both partners, and the rights and responsibilities of both. The adult may have some more responsibilities, the young one also has responsibility and the adult also has rights.

Both partners are members of a society, which generally now has other ethical principles and which especially denies young people their right to self-determination. This is an extra consideration to have in thought for the responsibility of both partners.

In earlier discussions it was said that there are not only (long-lasting) *relationships*, but also (shorter) *contacts*. Ethical guidelines should mention both.

New text:

### *Freedom of choice*

In *any* intergenerational relationship or contact, both partners, the adult as well as the young person, have it in their power to regulate their own lives, their relationships and the grade of intimacy.

Each partner has the right to self-determination and the responsibility to acknowledge this right in the other. Therefore, both partners in open communication will at any moment choose the grade of intimacy.

In *friendship* relationships or contacts, both partners have the freedom to withdraw from the relationship at any moment. Love and dedication are unconditional; they bind partners who are free and independent.

In *dependency* relationships or contacts, (such as parent-child or teacher-pupil) love and dedication should also be unconditional, but freedom to withdraw does not exist in practice. So, extra attention should be given to the right to self-determination and the responsibility of both partners. Here, the grade of intimacy has two limits: complete

distance is not possible nor wanted, complete intimacy will interfere with the dependency: complete intimacy asks for complete freedom, which does not exist in dependency relationships.

### ***The grade of openness***

Openness is a typical western value; many other cultures have the value to respect and maintain secrets. Openness within a relationship is a good value. Openness to others is a good value as long as they respect one's right to self-determination. So, openness to others may be good, but it is not always necessary and not always possible. For example, intimacy between males is still a great taboo, for instance, in most schoolyards. Or, in many families, the very existence of any form of a sexual life of a young person is a taboo.

Many young people prefer consciously to have their own secrets. They make their own choices and do not want to be protected. 'Don't treat me as a child', they say. It is their right to have this freedom. The freedom to say *no* and the freedom to say *yes*. There is also a right of privacy. The other side of the coin is that young people should not have to carry too heavy or unreasonable secrets. One has to take into consideration how the young person lives and how his environment may react.

### ***Do no harm***

Harm can come from feelings of shame and dirtiness, learned from society. Harm can come from a society that uses power or violence to force the end of a relationship. One should consider this risk, as well as the risk of blackmail. The adult as well as the young person is vulnerable in this society nowadays.



## 2. A mixture of themes

### Discussed during the meeting

- a. Our host and guests
- b. Frontline and background action
- c. A broader look: other times & cultures
- d. A paradigm shift, and so, a new model

### a. Our host and guests

#### Our host

Our host, not a member, sponsor or organizer of this meeting was Paul's Church, Rotterdam, the Netherlands. In return we have sponsored Paul's Church by gifts. It was very impressive to see the 24-hours-a-day work of that church community.

Paul's church practices *love thy neighbour*, especially for

- ☀ Drug addicts
- ☀ Refugees,
- ☀ Homeless people, and
- ☀ Sexual minorities.

The church organizes for them

- ☀ A shelter: crisis center, center for the homeless and refugee center, and a free place for drug addicts,
- ☀ Social and medical care and a clean-needles service,
- ☀ Counseling and group talks.

The church also houses a number of religious communities of several denominations from different countries and with different languages.

For imprisoned paedophiles there is a booklet, free for prisoners, 5 Euros for others.

< <http://www.xs4all.nl/~ksa/summary.htm> >, < [kas@xs4all.nl](mailto:kas@xs4all.nl) >

#### A well-known association

Our guest, the chairman of “Martijn” and member of the church community - not an Ipce member – has told us that the association, Martijn, is well known in the Netherlands as a source of information:

“We are regularly asked for classes, information stands, politicians and political groups.”  
“Since the elections, we have had a right-wing parliament and government in the Netherlands. The founder of the new political party, the late Pim Fortuyn, has said: “Listen to those people (paedophiles); that’s far more safe than to persecute them”, but his followers haven’t followed him regarding this issue. They now argue for more punishment on moral issues.”  
”Yes, giving information to classes is more difficult nowadays, due to resistance from Muslim youths and adults.”

### **A sharp contrast: the USA**

Members and guests from the USA were astonished to hear what is still possible in the Netherlands. In California, for example, about 1000 people are behind bars – not for punishment, but for ‘treatment’ – in fact for brainwashing. They have been declared “not able to control their behavior”. This declaration is a decision often reached by scarcely educated ‘experts’ on very doubtful and unscientific grounds.

Severe laws have been enacted in the US as a result of precipitate political action after certain events. Thus, since September 11, 2001, laws have been made that use the word “terrorist”. The meaning of the word has been broadened and those laws constructed so as to apply to a far wider range of activities than the original event warranted. People have accepted this uncritically. It’s an Orwellian world.

Similarly in the UK, an anti-terrorist law is being used against many more people to make arrests without accusation and travelling restrictions.

In English-speaking countries and culture, the word ‘pedophile’ is synonymous with ‘rapist’ or ‘predator’. An encounter with a pedophile is presented as a worst-case scenario for a child – whilst most children suffer and even die because of the guns and cars of their parents; and, if a child has an experience with whatever kind of sexuality, they suffer at the hands of their ‘therapists’.

In sharp contrast with the Dutch “Martijn”, USA’s NAMBLA has many problems: prosecution, Internet service providers, lack of money and more. NAMBLA is seen as the new devil in a simplistic way of thinking like ‘the Indians are bad, the cowboys are good’.

## **b. Frontline and background action**

## **Juridical and media action**

“In my work, I travel all over the world, so I have gained much experience and know many people. My activities are on behalf of ecology groups, gay groups and against discrimination of pedophiles.

For example, I have made a complaint against an ‘expert’ who influenced a jury by falsely contesting that a child murderer was “a pedophile”, which he clearly was not.

I have also reacted to a radio programme that used the expression ‘sex offenders’ as a synonym for ‘pedophiles’. I offered my feedback as an issue of semantics, not as a plea for pedophilia. I did the same to an author who wrote “pedophiles and other dangerous criminals”. This is misleading and dangerous. Not every pedophile is a dangerous criminal. The radio programme staff and the author were surprised, as though I had said something completely new to them. The author changed his article.

I remark that pedophile acts are punished more severely than murder. The public does not receive correct information, so people don’t think correctly – as a result they only become panic-stricken.

No, I never do this on behalf of a group. I always act as an individual only. The media present groups wrongly and consequently groups are not taken seriously.

No, I never give opportunity for an interview. Interviews with the media always go wrong.”

## **Background work & defending people**

“It is very difficult to get the public to think correctly. People are sceptical and cynical. The media deform any information. Especially if one has once been convicted – that’s the first thing the media investigate - and if one does not have a qualification, one seems to have no right to speak at all.

Yet, I have gathered much background information, which most lawyers have not got anyway. So I am able to help people by gathering background information and thus help them with their defence.”

Another member said: “Very good, I do the same. I have made an archive of news clippings and background information, which appeared to be helpful in the defence of people and to inform their lawyers.”

## **Influencing people**

“It is surely difficult to persuade people to recognize nuances. However, I try to do this by writing ‘letters to the editor’ in the media.

I am open to my family and friends. They accept me, but say that other people with feelings of this kind are still bad. Then I say there are far more people like me, and I know many. On request, I give, together with others, information to classes or by information stands. For the public, I am writing a book about my feelings. I shall describe how I am responsible in the way I handle my feelings and contrast this with the standard image of pedophiles. Many people I know differ from that standard image. I have made a logo used now by many ped-groups and sites [not by Ipce].”

Members said during the meeting:: “This does not help, because you in turn set people apart.”

“OK, but it helps people to know they are not alone”.

### **Working on the personal level**

Several members said that working on the personal level is the best way to influence people. These members said they live fully within society, so they meet many people and have many contacts. Especially those who have contact with women tell us that women often think and feel more empathy. Feminism has lost ground. Remarkably, also the most fervent opponents are also women. But for most women, being in the company of children is a natural way of living. Some members have found good listeners in gay groups; others found language groups or ethnic groups and help with translating articles for them.

### **Working in the forefront and the background**

In the forefront are the public media. It is very difficult to work on this level. Media have much influence, but mostly they want only to present hot news, the outing of persons - and they mostly follow the mainstream culture. Culture is moving now worldwide in the right-wing direction.

Members who have experience with outing in the media have learned that not reacting at all is the best way. Sometimes, silence is better than speaking. Media tend to tell lies instead of truth. Other members keep writing to the media – or make their own, like the Ipce web site. All members agree that influence is possible on the personal level. Not in the public area, but in the personal area people will listen and think with understanding. At a group level the public and most media react with panic, but in some scientific circles and universities at least, colleagues react far more thoughtfully. They search for the truth, not for infotainment.

Members report from several countries that it's not possible form a group or hold a discussion in public there. Freedom of speech exists more in theory than in practice. An opinion that differs from the majority's or the government's opinion is seen as 'dangerous' or 'inciting to illegality'.

In several cultures, it is 'not done' to speak publicly about certain issues. For example, in the cradle of our democracy, Greece, it is factually not possible publicly to criticise the president. But in the personal area one speaks the same as elsewhere.

The history of the gay liberation movement tells the same story. However, gay liberation has not succeeded by staying in the closet, but by speaking. However, a ped liberation or emancipation movement – or any other such movement – may have to follow other ways nowadays in a changed and changing culture.

Members also agree that it is necessary to analyse the culture, the society, its ethics and the changes carefully. Better to say: *several* cultures, not only the dominating western one.

It is also important to study the legal systems; they differ greatly from country to country. On the other hand, severe laws originating in English-speaking countries are being introduced by other countries and cultures.

Several members said they read many articles and books so as to understand what happens in society. Some members are performing research or writing books and articles – or translating articles and research reports, or making overviews, and sending them to the Ipce web site.

Other members said they are still searching for their own personal way. “First, I will meet people, and I will start reading basic literature. Then, I will decide what to do.”

It is not fruitful to think in terms of “enemies”. Better to think about people with other opinions, which is their right. Better to try to understand their motives and arguments. “You need a knowledge of anthropology for this”. If they act as enemies and tell lies, they act as a part of a societal system. That system is the enemy, not people. Try to analyse and understand that system.

### **c. A broader look: other times & cultures**

#### **Once upon a time... and now**

“Yes. So, most people with pedophilic feelings are living quite lonely lives. It is a privilege to have a group like this. Anyway, we have.

When I was young, even the word “homosexuality” scarcely existed. The old sexologist Magnus Hirschfeld did research on that issue. All sexology was German in that era. When his book was published, it was kept hidden for students. I needed the permission of a professor even to borrow it from the university’s library. The word ‘pedophile’ did not exist anyway those days. It was a synonym for ‘mad man’ more or less. The early gay clubs named themselves “Shakespeare Club” and so on, and also their addresses were inaccessible to

students. Any kind of information was rare, even in the gay world.

After my work in several quite far off countries, I was able to do research in the Netherlands, in its far more open climate, partly achieved by the Dutch NVSH, which had 40,000 members those days. It was there that ped-emancipation started just after gay emancipation had its first results. I still had to defend my work, and myself, emphasizing that it was research and not propaganda.

After those days, there were many changes. More recently, much has changed again., but this not a going back to the twenties: In those days there was far more isolation and much suicide. A person with pedophilic feelings was simply a mad man then. Now, the situation is far more complicated.

The future? I suppose and foresee further changes coming in waves. If the tide turns again, publications written and preserved now will be usable in the future. So, publish, and carefully save the files already written.

New research is very difficult to conduct now, because it's nearly impossible to get honest answers, and thus, to reach the truth.

It's a *moral* problem, not a scientific one. Scientific data are known. Every honest person can know now that harm is not always the outcome, only that it occurs in a few cases of incest and severe violence. But the spirit of the age says: "OK, no harm – but it is still *not done*."

## **Western and other cultures**

One of the members has written to the meeting:

"I get the impression after being in a lot of places for good lengths of time that there are considerably fewer non-white BL's than among whites. I've come across very few black and Latin BL's. There is a handful in the chat groups but mostly from N. America. Orientals are an interesting lot in that there is evidence of a significant number of Japanese BL's but very few Chinese or Southeast Asian such as Thais and Vietnamese. The more modern (western?) the society, the more BL's there seem to be.

In the Philippines, the boys talked about foreigner BL's but rarely if ever about locals yet there were the movie theaters where the balcony was pretty much reserved for male oriented ped and ephebe activity, situations which were stumbled on by foreigners, not created by them.

Blacks as a group are more sexually active than non-blacks yet there appear to be so few black BL's. I've known one and his interest was actually more ephebe than ped. There are a couple on BoyChat. Those I've known who have been to Africa also didn't



find any local BL's.

I've been of the opinion for some time that ped orientation has primarily if not entirely genetic roots. Could there be cultural situations that are part of the reason one becomes a ped or no? Is Daryl Bem's "exotic makes erotic" theory applicable here? Are male oriented peds that different from female oriented peds?

Do any of you have any knowledge or thoughts about this?"

The meeting has discussed this.

Child lovers are everywhere in the world, but not all are active on the forums. Forums are the domain of the western people with computers and knowledge of the English language. For example, the nambla membership is mostly white and well educated – and male. Moreover, it the western culture that divides people in 'pigeonholes' as sexual categories. If other cultures make pigeonholes anyway, they make other ones. Furthermore, information on this matter is largely informal and not public. In fact, we don't know. We have the research of Margaret Mead about Samoa, but it is claimed that the Samoans gave socially desired answers, such as 'No, there is no criminality here'.

In the Far East, homosexuality and pedosexuality are common phenomena, but there one does not speak about it in those cultures. For the native people, it is taboo; western tourists have more freedom than the native people. Ethnic and indigenous communities keep their information to themselves; tourists can only look from the outside. In the western world, ethnic communities do the same – for example, the Chassidic Jews in London, the Nordic community in Athens, the Arabic communities in Germany, and the large Spanish speaking communities in the Americas.

These communities also have a kind of solidarity that closes the door to western police investigators or to researchers. By studying their languages one can learn the ways people give names to phenomena and the way they interpret them. For example, from even a basic knowledge of Arabic, it is possible to learn that the individual and society, men and women, boys and girls, and the relationships between them are regarded in a completely different way.

"I am living in the Far East. As a researcher, I have concluded that western ways of thinking do not work there. The indigenous communities have their own way of interpreting phenomena like intergenerational relationships – a less problematic way. But if a western person, a tourist or researcher, knocks at their door, the door opens no further than ajar. They also have their own, often for us difficult, languages to give names. For example, intimate contacts between men are not seen nor described there as "homosexual", a term referring to an identity. There are a lot of boy-lovers there, but they are not named with western terms like 'pedophiles' as an identity. They have quite different concepts, words and ways of thinking. So, the concept of

‘pedophilia’ and all questions around it, are typical western phenomena.”

The same holds for phenomena like prostitution. Many religions and cultures have temple-prostitution as well as civil prostitution. In countries like Morocco and India, boys’ prostitution is quite normal. In the Thai culture, man-boy relationships have a positive value. These relationships are not viewed as ‘apart’. But these cultures are like islands, closed to foreigners. People want to have their own room and do not want people who impose themselves on those communities.

A similar question is why there are so few women in the child love movement. There are some, but a few only. For women, it is accepted worldwide if they intimately go about with children, so there is less of a problem. Also, women are viewed as less longing for sexual pleasures. “Women don’t do things like that”, as Queen Victoria said, signing the bill against male homosexuality.

The modern counter variants are the western feminists who try to put feminism on the agenda of the eastern women. Eastern people have a completely other view on males and females and masculinity and femininity, so feminists are quite unwelcome there. Sexism, as well as racism, is a typical western phenomenon.

### **d. A paradigm shift, and so, a new model**

During modernism, the fundamental incentive of the groups was *emancipation*. The underlying theme of emancipation is: power contra powerlessness. Then, discussion groups were formed in which people explored their feelings and opinions in *meetings*. The underlying theme was here: authenticity, and truth versus untruthfulness.

Nowadays, we live in post-modernism, and the former themes are no longer discussed. The new underlying theme is *living together* in spite of differences between people. An example is the ability of fundamental Christians to live together with modern Christians and many different-minded people. After all, religion has changed from a more or less uniform way of living into a wide variety of forms and beliefs.

The great theme is now *living together*, which implies themes like human rights, righteousness, and society. This is far more than emancipation and meeting. There has been a paradigm shift. The new paradigm uses a new language. The old language of the emancipation model no longer appeals to people.

For example, in the emancipation model the priority is to clarify one’s own thinking, or the opinions of one’s minority group. In the *living together* model, the priority is to clarify and understand the opinions of *others*, including your opponents. This kind of thinking appeals to people after that paradigm shift – no longer the notion of emancipation, important as it has

been for our, or at least for my, generation. For my generation, the emancipation model was the central way of thinking and acting.

Nowadays, other models appeal to people, the emancipation models no longer do so. The gay movement has had its emancipation and liberation. The ped-movement has not. These people have to emancipate in an era when the model of emancipation no longer holds any appeal. Also the *Civil Liberation* Movement no longer concentrates on liberation, but on human rights. The paradigm has been shifted.

Foucault studied especially those paradigm shifts in history. These shifts *are* the lines of history, not the straightforward lines thought before. Two such shifts that he described are the ways of thinking about homosexuality and about the prison system. The history of western thinking *is* a history of paradigm shifts. This is 'the archaeology of knowledge', the different ways of thinking in the past. This is the actual way of knowing: exploring the worldwide *different* ways of thinking. It is impossible to understand the modern world by thinking along western lines only.

Nowadays, in the post-modern era, that new kind of thinking is still not a harmonious whole. It is still a kettle with a brew, a mixture of ways of thinking without any structure. We see this, to take the earlier example, in the churches. A mixture of different beliefs exists with and near to one another, with the common task of mutual acceptance. In the past, it was a world of opposing beliefs, orthodoxy versus heresy. This is no longer accepted nowadays.

Now, it is a pluralistic world in which we live, a world that accepts differences between people. The old stable models like Christianity, communism, socialism and capitalism – the one against the other - have lost their strength and stability.

Well, speaking now about people with pedophilic feelings, the time has passed for seeing them – or for them to see themselves - as people with a particular belief that other people have to be persuaded to accept. In our pluralistic world, one can better view them as people who ask for a modest place under the sun – and who give their opponents the same right. But not to have the right to start witch-hunts and systematically to persecute people who hold particular feelings.

A problematical factor relates to our latter-day emperors and popes: the media, with their enormous influence on people's way of thinking. Just as with former rulers, the media want to control people's thought – or want to maintain their power by mirroring the public's way of thinking.

Powerful counter forces nowadays exist in the level of social consciousness and in pleas for pluralism and human rights. Therefore, be conscious of the post-modern society we live in, analyse society and pluralism, and also analyse the way of thinking of our opponents. Remember, too, to use more models than just the western one in that analysis. Discover and

explore the words and grammar of post-modern language, and employ it.





## 3. Ipce decides about Ipce

### Meeting 2002

#### Financial Report

The meeting accepts the [financial report](#) and thanks the treasurer and the control commission.

The meeting appoints Frans as treasurer for the next year. He will send the money to a separate bank account he has. This will make it easier to control.

The membership fee will be 20 Euros for the next year.

#### Secretarial report

The meeting accepts the [report of the secretary](#), thanks the secretary and appoints Frans as Ipce Secretary for the next year.

#### The Ipce Newsletter

The meeting decided to maintain the paper version of the Ipce Newsletter. It is expensive, but for some people it is the only way to receive the Newsletter. Since the same people may not be able to pay more for it, we shall all pay the costs. A paper version is also good for historical reasons: one can keep a paper archive more easily and, in this quickly changing world, maybe longer than an electronic version.

The meeting also decided to maintain the public Newsletter on the public web site, the new one as well as the former ones.

#### The public Ipce web

##### *Report of the web master*

The meeting accepts [the report](#), and therefore the policy, of the web master during the last year.

The meeting thanks the web master for his work and appoints Frans as the web master for the next year.

### ***More balance and new section***

The meeting accepts the proposal to have more balance on the web site – this means: to give more room to overall views other than Ipce’s, as long as these articles have a rational base. Finkelhor is the best example of this. We do not always agree with him, but he has done much research and has written thoughtful articles.

To give more room for reactions and opinions of our visitors, we will open a new section “Feedback”. Here, opinions sent to the web master can have their room, as long as the writer agrees with their being placed on the web, and as long as the opinion is politely written and has a rational base. Hate mails will not be placed. There were none, or, by the way, maybe just one with only one word, “pedos”. The feedback will have its own section, to distinguish shared Ipce Statements from the feedback of others.

### **Internal communication**

As reported, there were problems: interception of e-mails, and illegal access to the internal bulletin-board-like web site IMO. Consequently the IMO archive was suspended just before the meeting, and has now been removed from the web. The meeting has discussed several solutions and options.

With the help of a majority vote, the meeting decided

- 1) not to use encryption;
- 2) to start up a protected web site for “News” & “Background” with a new name and a new URL, new user names and pass words;
- 3) to start up a protected web site for “Bar” and “Discussion” with a new name and a new URL, new user names and pass words;
- 4) to send the URLs, the user names and pass words by encryption or post mail only; and
- 5) to ask the members to subscribe again to one or both internal web sites.

### **The Ipce Teams**

For long-term policy and strategy, and for advice in case of conflicts between members, Ted, Jim, Isabel, Ilja and Gerald were appointed to form a team.

For short-term help and for emergencies, Desire, Peter & Paul from Germany were appointed

to form a team. They will receive the access data for the web sites and the data about the membership.

## About Interviews

### *The English journalist*

There has been communication between the Ipce web master and an English journalist.

The meeting said that the web master's answers were good and wise – but that further communication should now be terminated, because others have been of the opinion that you had already reacted too often and too detailed.

The journalist had no interest in a discussion in an atmosphere of mutual respect, but declared himself “an enemy” who wants to intercept, to infiltrate and to out people.

It's up to the web master to decide if he replies to questions about Ipce – about Ipce only, not about personal matters. However he is advised to not provide more information on Ipce than is necessary to those who are likely to be hostile.

### *The WERC interview*

A speaker took on this task for us. However, we don't want a speaker. There is no single “Ipce Opinion”. Ipce is a forum to exchange several opinions. So, whoever may speak in the future, will speak as a person only, not as a representative, and give only his or her opinion as a person: *à titre personnel*.

## Next meeting

The meeting thanks its host for this year. The next meeting will be in Denmark, if possible somewhat earlier in the course of the year 2003, because a flight is cheaper before the holiday season starts.





## 4. Looking back on the meeting

### Critical feedback

“I’m a bit frustrated and disappointed. Most discussion has been in informal subgroups, and I felt a lack of discipline. As I have said in former years, as a physician, I do not believe in psychology, or in vague spiritual discussions about ethics.

I’m also disappointed about Rod’s interview on the radio and in Frans’ replies to Mega: he has already said too much.

I still appreciate going on discussing by e-mail and meeting each other.”

“I am also disappointed. There was a lack of time and a lack of aims and unanimous direction, and therefore a lack of concrete plans for action, a lack of concrete teamwork. Clearly, I see more advantage in planning for action than in discussions about our ethics – maybe because I’m still young and I want to see action. I’m glad some of the members actively campaign anyway. There is only one group like Ipce, so Ipce has to offer aims, ideas and direction to others.

For me, the first point of action will be writing letters to editors in the media. I especially want to point out the difference between ‘people with pedophilic feelings’ and ‘rapists’. Media equate both, which is clearly a lie. The public only have knowledge of rapists; the public do not even know that people with peaceful pedophilic feelings and responsible acts exist anyway.”

### Positive evaluations

“Permit me to disagree: for me, the meeting was quite productive. The best ideas always come up in subgroups. A small informal group is more creative than a fairly large formal group that needs discipline and a chair. We had a good chair, BTW.”

“I’m also glad to have come here. I had some concern about Ipce, after all the interceptions, “outings”, and so on. Now I see the vitality of the group I’m glad to share the membership.”

“I agree with you. I have visited all Ipce meetings from the first one until now. I like to come. I do not feel any frustration. I do not agree that the discussions about ethics are vague; they were clear and scholarly on an academic level. I also disagree about the subgroups: let’s organize the next meeting *using* subgroups and their power of creativity. Subgroups can be formed by subject or by language to make communication more easy.”

“Indeed, the meeting was very interesting. In accord with my character, I have mostly listened rather than spoken. I still have concerns; I still do not see the light at the end of the tunnel.”



“I do see some light, at least I see the way to go: less western thinking, less Americanism, more humanism and human rights, broader outlooks including to other cultures.

Regarding my country, Germany, there is a national group and there are local groups still active, albeit always discussing, and with some internal problems [it seems to be a German tradition to quarrel]. But anyway, they exist and are active. “

“I agree. In our post-modern culture now, *all* groups become smaller, in every area of action maybe, except Greenpeace. But that’s easy: one gives ten euros as a gift, the conscience is content and one views thrilling action on TV, proudly thinking ‘I’m one of them!’ This area of action is far more difficult.”

“I am glad to be here and to see known faces again. However, I miss the Danish people – let’s go to them next year. I miss the German groups who were very inspiring last year, and the Dutch groups who were also very interesting the year before. So, the UK people here can maybe have influenced the atmosphere of the meeting. We always have to be concerned with our safety and we cannot be optimistic.”

“I completely agree. I am glad to have met the faces behind the e-mails, the humans behind the machines.

About possible attacks on Ipce: we are ‘worthy’ of being attacked because of our keen vision founded on solid research and scholarly thinking. This is threatening for popular and ‘correct’ thinking.”

“OK, I agree. There is not one idea, direction or way of acting, there are several – and that’s good. Let’s use subgroups next year to utilize and maintain that variety of ideas and models for action. Let’s keep being active developing ideas. Let’s keep doing this together.”

“I agree. I’m glad to have met people and I want to keep the contact.”

“I am glad to have been here as a guest, to have met people and to have heard stories from other countries. I am glad I can do things that are impossible in other countries, so I will keep doing what is possible.”

“As the last speaker, I will thank our impressive host for the room and safety given to us. To highlight some wise and courageous decisions the meeting has made and ideas the meeting has given:

- ☀ To continue communication without encryption,
- ☀ To maintain the public Newsletter on the web,
- ☀ To go on with the Ipce web site in a more balanced way,
- ☀ To establish carefully ethical ideas, and



To have a broad view including other cultures and post-modern themes.

This year, there were fewer people here compared with former years. But in Athens, 1998, the meeting was also small but still productive. An important function of Ipce's meetings is always giving and maintaining courage. Look around and you see people from all over the world, from the Far East and the Far West, having sacrificed much to fly here. Thanks for coming and thanks for contributing with your ideas."





**JOY**  
GPO Box 2144

Brisbane Qld 4001 Australia

11th May 2002

## **MANIFESTO FOR JOY**

Shades of Friedrich von Schiller's 'Ode to JOY (originally 'Ode to Freedom'), which inspired Beethoven's Ninth Symphony.

Greetings to friends we love everywhere

Defining Pedophilia -see paragraphs 9-16 hereof. Successful Jolly radical activism demands accurate communication of our idea. In order to express this adequately we were obliged to create our own language where necessary, for example to coin a few words, etc. Our actual motivational advocacy and goal is Child Emancipation.

Therefore, we have various acronyms; colloquialisms, headings, coined words and other terms, meanings and data, all numerically listed together with the accompanying definitions, beginning at paragraph 18 of this Manifesto, and then onwards. The reader can then refer back or refer forward as necessary for definitions, etc. The various acronyms will be the only words that appear in block letters herein, except where the context of an acronym word is not relevant. There is no appendix or index. Key words are given capital letters -- inverted commas are largely dispensed with.

The acronym JOY means: Jollies Out Yet. The homosexual word Gay and our words Jolly and JOY all have a French origin (for example, Jolly: French Jolif gay, pretty: perhaps related to Yule-tide). This fact can readily be a factor lending to all these three words also a certain sexual character (for example, Gay Paris), which defies largely the subsequent loading of a derogatory corruption onto the meaning of these words by rigid people for their own ends.

The meaning of Gay has changed, but it is good that a connection in meaning between the words Gay and Jolly still remains (a sexual connotation now also to Jolly completes the linkup), because Jollies maintain that Sexual Orientation (gender), and Sexual Predisposition (age), both come under the Sexual Identity classification.

Like the Gays, we are the product of millions of years of sexual biodiversity. Therefore, to rigids and other repressives we say -- give it away, there is no way that we will give way, or go away.

Just because the rigids hold rigidly to the majority opinion and conviction that Jollism is wrong does not necessarily mean that majority opinion is right. Because rigid propaganda is repeated ad infinitum from all directions, people generally take its legitimacy (no important points missed, that there is no self-serving, or no political correctness, etc.), in full for granted and without question -- Hitler's propaganda Ministry was a good example.

Pedophilia now involve two phenomena that are psychologically distinct but often are lumped together in order to split and confound radical activism and muddy their waters, and for moral seemingly, and legal consideration.

### **Defining Pedophilia**

(a) Defined as intense and recurrent sexual desire for, and sexual attraction felt towards, prepubescent children (a new definition in the American Psychiatric Assn's Manual includes behaviours involving sexual activity with a prepubescent child).

(b) Defined as sexual advances on sexually mature, but underage boys and/or girls.

Jollies agree with the (a) definition of Pedophilia insofar as the sexual attraction/activity is towards prepubescent children. \_

We do not agree with the implication of abnormal fondness or love for children. The meaning of -philia (in conjunction with children -Pedophilia) implies this abnormal sexual love.

The (b) definition of Pedophilia is not acknowledged by Jollies in any way whatsoever.

Strong objection is taken by Jollies to the fact that nothing in the word Pedophilia suggests any

reciprocal fondness or affection towards adults.

Because of these reservations and other objections to the word Pedophilia, we were obliged to replace it for Kidulteros or Joylove, and Pedophile in favour of Jolly (or Joylover).

The Jolly Movement represents a small group of experienced Jolly activists centering on Brisbane Australia. Because this cause is also an esoterically worthy one, we trust it will be blessed with expansion. We welcome contact from you at any time -- address to: The Secretary, JOY, GPO Box 2144, Brisbane Qld 4001, Australia.

## **1. LIFE**

### **Live In and For the Esoteric**

Our Identity, our subtle socio-cultural rejection, plus the inexpressible nature of all we're dealt, means, for achieving resolution, this acronym is our first imperative.

## **2. LOVE**

### **Legislate Our Vital Enactment**

LOVE, worthy of the name, requires emancipatory legislation first. Jollies make a special effort to observe the law, pending law reform. Quality sexual relations (Joylove), etc. can be established and maintained only in the context of a quality overall relationship, and our culture/laws today dictates a climate which renders this impossible socially, and inevitably sexually abusive -- now, anyway (when compensation worries would be additional).

## **3. CRIES**

### **Culturally Revolutionary and Intergenerationally Emancipatory School.**

"JOY and woe are woven fine,  
a clothing for the Soul Divine."

-- William Blake --

## **4. JOY**

### **Jollies Out Yet**

We all come Out on our own terms, and only to the extent we are able.

Each Joylover, here at Coordinating World Body and wherever, must try hard not to risk burning one's fingers -burn SPICE instead.

## **5: SPICE**

### **Sanctuary for PEACE International and CARER Espousal (SPICE Sanctuary)**

A local Jolly/SPICE Sanctuary can be a spare room or room, a house etc. (JOY's window-on-the-world presence), anywhere in the world -- for the use of a single Joylover, or where local activist Joylovers can also meet on occasion, or when necessary.

See 28: Jolly Sanctuaries -- Local Jolly Activist Leaders in concert with Brisbane.

## **6: EROS**

### **Esoterically Redirecting the Old System**

Nature's footprints are Nurture's signpost. Do not make presumptions -- do the research, and then morally pontificate.

## **7: PEACE**

### **Pursue on Earth the Activists' Campaign for Emancipation**

## **8: CARER**

### **Child/Adult Reciprocal Erotic Rehearsal**

See 31: Common Sense Theory

## **9: CARE**

### **Child/ Adult Reciprocal Eroticism**

When the Redirected Old Cultural sexual System is Revolutionised, not all Adult sexual interaction with Children will be abusive. There will be controls on inappropriate interaction, strict disease monitoring, anti alcohol/coercive criteria, and so on -- you don't just throw the baby out with the bath water. Simplistic, moralistic cynicism in this area has caused untold damage.

## **10: PIERS**

## Primary Intergenerational Erotic Rehearsal Stage

See 31: Common Sense Theory

### 11: WRAPS

#### World Radical Activist/Pacifist School

Australia is a signatory to the international prohibition on sexuality between children and adults by the 'Convention on the Rights of the Child'. This is the extent to which this compounded cultural error has escalated.

We see this as just another challenge in our backlash against Sexual Repression.

We do not envisage, nor would it be propitious for Jolly's leading activists to meet formally at a World gathering in the foreseeable future. Meetings should be discreetly arranged, and held under WRAPS -- for Local and World Activist business. Jollies should use the Internet only with business discretion and discipline. The Internet should only be used as an adjunct to meaningful, concrete and traditional activist structure. The Gay movement needs both -- so do we, with both adapted to our particular brand of lash-back. Where a committed Jolly resides will automatically become a Sanctuary. Business meetings will take place at appropriate Sanctuaries only. We need this human touch in order to maintain our pride in ourselves -- there is a danger -- impersonality does nothing for camaraderie.



### 12: The Jolly Logo

This emblem bears the words SPICE of LIFE -LOVE. Jolly correspondence bears this letterhead.

See 1 : LIFE

See 2: LOVE

See 5: SPICE

The esoteric multi-symbols on this emblem represent Jolly Unity with essential revelation.

(Our Dictionary is 'The Australian Pocket Oxford Dictionary, Fourth Edition' last Reprint ~ 2001, 1295 pages). I

### **13: Kidulteros**

#### **Pronounced Kid-ult-EER-ros**

The Intergenerational name we give to Reciprocal LOVE, courtship and sexuality between a Joykid and a Jolly. This overall unconscious behavioural motivation signifies aspects of Rehearsal, governed by mutual Sexual Predispositional Identification. ~

### **14: Joylove**

**Common term -synonymous with Kidulteros -13.**

### **15: Joylover (pl. Joylovers)**

**A Child or Adult who Sexually Identifies with Kidulteros (that is - Joylove).**

### **16: Jolly (pi. Jollies)**

**A Jolly Adult Joylover is a Jolly.**

### **17: Jolliness**

**State associated with being a Joylover.**

### **18: Jollism**

**Theory Espoused by Intergenerationally Predisposed activists (Jollies). This theory in action.**

### **19: Joyboy (pl. Joyboys)**

**A sexually Predisposed prepubescent boy.**

### **20: Joygirl (pl. Joygirls)**

**A sexually Predisposed prepubescent girl.**

Jollies always qualify the words boy or girl in order to differentiate Joylove from (Man/)boy love etc. We are grateful for past support: there is a limit to the degree of support Boylove is capable of.



### **21: Joykid (pl. Joykids)**

**A sexually Predisposed prepubescent boy or girl.**

### **22: Bilover (pi. Bilovers)**

**One who feels equal sexual attraction (virtually) towards both prepubescent and mature but underage boys and/or girls.**

The Jollies would welcome such a person provided there is an understanding that he or she confines activist energies to Jollism. Such older teen or adult may be married -- most Jollies by far are in a home and family situation.

### **23: Sexual Predisposition**

#### **Intergenerational Age Predisposition (Identity)**

Two more age sections, a Bi-generational Sector (experiential and adaptive) and Generational Predisposition, come under Sexual Identity .

We remain positive -- this variant is part of the human way (genetic).

According to Dr Fred Berlin, a Johns Hopkins University professor at Baltimore, Maryland, USA., Prepubertal Pedophilia is a "Distinct Sexual Orientation". (Of course, as Activists we cannot use the word Orientation because of its association with gender, and Gay law). .

### **24: Rigid (pl. Rigids)**

**Any person who is not of our Sexual Predisposition (there are exceptions), especially if such person is antagonistic to our cause.**

### **25: Flexi (pl. Flexies)**

**Any person who agrees with our theory and our cause, especially if such person identifies with our Sexual Predisposition.**

### **26: The Jolly Movement**

**JOY's continuing CRIES for Out Jollies with SPICE**

**[Sanctuary Pedophiles' for International Child Emancipation].**

But, see 5: SPICE.

## **27. Child Sexual CARE**

**This phrase is all about positive Jolly CARER Activism - Child Sexual CARE is not the same as Child Sexual Abuse (Abuse is an aberration).**

## **28: Jolly Sanctuary (pl. Jolly Sanctuaries)**

**Common term -synonymous with SPICE Sanctuary.**

## **29: Nature's biological blueprint**

**See 6: EROS**

The absolute cover and prevalence of Intergenerational Age dynamics, in all ages, throughout mankind, explains nature's biological mandate to Jollies for introducing Joylove -- see PIERS.

## **30: Make War - not Amour**

**This is the Jolly Slogan.**

The rigids of this world are engaged in an International War against us, and a legion of Jollies has arrived on cue.

We use mainly the most effective battle weapons we possess -- ideas and activism, in order to stage a rearguard action. Though we sustain some casualties, we pick up the pieces and help mend broken lives and spirits.

A few of us still stand to get our fingers burnt -- the nature of warfare, and an enemy which even tries to brush us with their flame -- but we won't play this paranoiac game. War is a terrible thing -- we are fighting for our pride, for the right to our existence, and for a LIFE free of Social Prejudice.

## **31: The Common Sense Theory**

Jollies espouse a Common Sense Theory for Nature's imposition of Sexual Pre-dispositional

Awareness into our hectic present day lives, presenting us with personal, socio-ethical problems.

As here applying to Jollies essentially, this theory would postulate that all human beings, irrespective of race, gender or orientation, are genetically predisposed to gravitate into two natural procreatively imposed LIFE Stages (any interference with this process could cause Sexual Repression and damage because of a child's inherent consensual empowerment), not one only, namely:

1. Primary Intergenerational Erotic Rehearsal Stage -PIERS, and
2. Secondary Generational Love Mating Stage.

The PIERS Stage inclines towards EROS, and in this Stage (Proper), ages range from about 6 years until about the time when puberty commences.

The Secondary Stage inclines towards Love, and in this Stage (proper), ages range from about 20 - 44 years.

An integral part of each Stage is an allied Age Sector on the outer .

The central Age Sector is the Intermediate Bi-generational Experiential Courting Sector. This Sector inclines towards Experiential Eros (usually in accordance, however, with peer group socially perceived standard correctness, and missing a beat here could cause exaggerated problems later), and in this Sector ages range from about the time when puberty commences until about the age of 19 years.

Our position on a common genetic sexual spectrum for example is the crucial factor predisposing us to PIERS (that is, Jolliness). Children born with Sexual Predisposition to PIERS, tend to gravitate towards Adults of like Sexual Predisposition, and vice versa. Hence, the use of the word Reciprocal in CARER and CARE.

Child to child sexual interaction is not of the intrinsic nature of Rehearsal (see CARER and PIERS). Rehearsal, for the Child, for example, involves the critical area of finding oneself and learning (for example, experience of the degree of capacity to/for LOVE), with a congenial Adult partner or role model -- that is, a CARER.

Thus, in theory, nature has provided for sexual LOVE, and experience with loss and resilience therewith, for every Stage and Sector of LIFE. Jollism sets the Stage for emotional health etc., throughout LIFE. The main reason we need a more structured Activism now is to protest with real punch any genetic interference in this natural sequence.

Until such time as meaningful research proves otherwise, we will hold with this theory.

### **32: A New Consciousness**

We are mindful of the words of Dr Deepak Chopra. He said 'LOVE is a healthy state to be in because it is essentially a spiritual experience.'

The most profound need that we have is LOVE -- it makes us truly human.

We are all going through a rough passage at present, fuelled by forces, mainly in the Western World, on a power trip. In these dire straits we Jollies place great trust in the treasured advice

of Dr Ralph Underwager (Paidika 1993), advice which he paid so dearly for proffering to us. Dr Underwager said:

“'Pedophiles' (from an academic), need to become more positive and make the claim that Pedophilia is an acceptable expression of God's Will for LOVE and Unity among human beings.”

This advice is the reason this Manifesto was written, and written in the form it now manifests. We will make an effort to 'become more positive', and to bridge two torrid Stages separating us from LOVE between the generations. Humanity will need every potential for LOVE that it can muster in the future if the forces of evil, terror, violence and mayhem are to be overcome -- and we will overcome. The Jolly Logo symbolizes the 'Unity' of essential esoteric revelation (see 12).

Everyone knows what the views of the church are on sexuality per se. Although nothing has changed, the church has recently come undone in a major way (pedophilia), over this issue.

Which leads us to the question that, if sexuality per se is of such monumental moral importance to the church, why is it that no guiding teaching on sexuality per se (let alone pedophilia), is recorded in the Gospels? If this is so, why is it that we note in the media constantly that we are the ones that had better finish up pronto in the depths of the sea with a millstone tied around our necks? Charitable stuff -- indeed. Sexuality per se has been just used down the ages by the church as a weapon, sadly, we believe -- wielded for spiritual and temporal power. As Lord Acton observed: 'Power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely.'

No -- it is just not good enough. But this serious attempt by the church to wield their real backlash against our Spiritual integrity was the result of their unbalanced moral theology. It has happened, happily for us, exactly at the time of the flowering of A New (Age) Consciousness -- a time not for woe and foreboding, but a time for JOY worldwide -- ageless.

As regards this revolutionary spiritual Renaissance, there is no way that Jollies will ever need

to accept an odd man out status on the basis of our Joylove Sexual Predisposition or any trumped-up conflict between sexuality per se and spirituality.

In disillusion, immense numbers of people will turn away from formalized religion and embrace a LIFE in keeping with the Spirit of this New Age -- the birth of the New Millennium. Jollism is just an extension of what has already begun -- there is room in this inn while our agenda needs LIFE.

This will be a time when scientific and medical research will make giant strides, when big changes take place at a quickening pace. Viral diseases will be conquered, with social/unity thinking changing rapidly. People will resent the law's intrusion into their private family affairs and the consequent heartache.

The incest laws will be liberalized. Why try to enforce something that is impossible to police? (About 70% of present child sexual abuse occurs in the parent, family and relatives situation.)

This will then pave the way towards full (all because we're there), Child/Adult Emancipation, with Jollies in the background -- necessary to assist, watch, be there to oversee this vital process to the degree they are able, because not the usual run-of-the-mill movement.

### **33: Two Basic Requirements**

Jollies maintain that all human beings are inherently good, but unless the infant and child receives social justice -- in -- PEACE in two cultural indispensables, then human goodness is all but impossible, and violence, murder and mayhem will dog humanity, becoming an increasing nightmare for everybody, well into the future.

The cardinal indispensable is primarily a general acknowledgment of the comprehensive wrong done, particularly to the younger age group, by Sexual Repression. Because the insidious scourge of Sexual Repression covers the whole gamut of the human family, the whole human family must be emancipated zero-up, and not simply one up-section of it, however deserving. Early Sexual Repression triggers off violence etc. in later life.

Two basic requirements, for human development and balance, must be given the attention they deserve, or nature will exact vengeance -- that is, violence (negative energy), 'nature abhors a vacuum'. 'There is a time to every purpose under heaven', and 'nothing is as it seems'. It is imperative we get these two requirements right -- correct in time. These form the vital precursor, ensuring that everything associated, and ailing society, including physical and emotional child abuse, will come right subsequently (as regards to incidence). The No.1 Basic Requirement is the cardinal indispensable because International PEACE is dependent on the realization Internationally of both indispensables, and the ideal (satisfactory), International realization of No. 2 Requirement in turn is dependent on the No.1 successful outcome (that is,

Child/Adult -- 'the Child is Father of the Man' -- Emancipation).

All the world's peoples were indeed born free, but everywhere the sexually repressed (and chained), in the so-called free world have everyone else in the whole world also clapped in chains.

The Two Basic Requirements are:

1. Mind, Body and Spirit: Freedom-relative, and in things sexual -- that is, sexpression and not repression -- from infancy. That is, freedom -- human sexual liberation -- as we see, far from harm to others, the end result could not be any more in the opposite direction -- we strongly proclaim this, as cardinally indispensable. In this area of LIFE -- balance and moderation. Adults must satisfy any observed socio-sexual craving rapport somehow, teaching appropriateness, particularly while the toddler's brain develops, until just below the age of puberty.

This is the one critical area where human beings have virtually never culturally and socially given themselves permission for the only adaptation that has the capacity for successful overall socio-cultural outcome for the LIFE of the race.

2. A completion of the cardinal basic indispensable -- essential part of the non-dogmatic inner and outer fabric for social adjustment. Similar principles apply in the responsible manner of offering guidance to a child, and by way of participation therewith in the vital needs for LIFE and abundant LIFE -- eating, drinking, shelter, safety etc. earning respect, and also teaching LOVE, sociability and Spirituality (The Esoteric, knowledge, awareness and meditation, etc. -- self hypnosis, if necessary -- 'we create our own reality', and happiness).

The Jolly Offering -- We are here, for contact, if required -

Yours for *Love Is For Ever*

The Secretary [Signed]

[\[Home\]](#)   [\[Articles & Essays - J\]](#)   [\[Newsletter E 14\]](#)

[\[Home\]](#)   [\[Ipce Library: Scientific Books\]](#)   [\[Newsletter E 14\]](#)

## Book reviews

MORAL PANIC: CHANGING CONCEPTS OF THE CHILD MOLESTER IN MODERN AMERICA. Philip Jenkins. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1998. 302 pp., \$30.00

PEDOPHILES ON PARADE: VOLUME 1: THE MONSTER IN THE MEDIA; VOLUME 2: THE POPULAR IMAGERY OF MORAL HYSTERIA. David Sonenschein. San Antonio, Texas: D. Sonenschein, 1998. 562 pp., \$40 institutions, \$36 individuals plus \$5 S/H; PO Box 15744, San Antonio, TX 78212

*Journal of Homosexuality*, Volume 42, Number 4, 2002, pp. 185-192.

*Der Kreis* ... excludes what was self-evident to the Greeks: the "Eros paidikos," the pedagogical Eros .... Whoever lives this youth-love... may experience all the happiness and blessing proper to every love. But these are such subtle things, in which right and wrong stand on the knife's edge, that here a community cannot take over the responsibility and run against a law ....

-- **Karl Meier**

Der Kreis, December 1948 [\[i\]](#)

*Der Kreis'* editorial characterizing sexual relationships between adults and adolescents as on a knife-edge is telling. In acknowledging the value of *Eros paidikos* while observing the gay community cannot go against the law, one of the world's longest-running and most influential homosexual magazines [\[ii\]](#) reflected a deep ambivalence to the idea of adults having sex with those under the age of consent.

In the 50 years since this was written, this ambivalence has become opposition. Today, those who advocate for a right of adults and minor youth to have sex find themselves outside the margins of what most of the Western gay and lesbian community considers acceptable, even as it has included bisexuals, sadomasochists and gender-variant individuals.

Central to this exclusion has been the moral right, which early on linked homosexual rights with harm to children. Beginning with Anita Bryant's "Save Our Children" campaign in 1977, through the sensational child sex-abuse scandals of the 1980s, gays and lesbians have drawn an increasingly firmer line against sexual relationships with young people.

These two books help explain why. They examine child-sex scandals in North America, how

they come about and their effects. They are focused through the prism of popular culture, but from there their approaches diverge. Jenkins, a professor at Pennsylvania State University, looks at the civil liberties costs of ill-conceived legislation passed during sexual panics. Sonenschein, a former Kinsey researcher, details how society constructs images of pedophiles, children and the adults who protect them.

## **PERIODS OF PANIC**

Jenkins charts a conventional course in describing how claimsmakers who advocate greater censure of adult-child sex have used—and been used by—the news media. He breaks no new ground in reporting how social workers, police and the mental health establishment formulated exaggerated claims in order to advance budgetary agendas.

Jenkins describes three major child-sex panics in the last 100 years. He shows how beliefs have shifted profoundly and repeatedly between a relative lack of concern and panic, and says the reversals mean they are irrational. The result has been,

"Outrage at random violence [against children] is transformed into a largely symbolic crusade against the nonviolent and thus squanders resources on the mildly deviant" (p. 9).

Jenkins performs a valuable service in drawing parallels between new laws which resulted from the latest child-sex panic and their antecedents, such as the now-discredited sex psychopath laws. The far reaching new measures were enacted in the late 1980s and early 1990s. Despite their breadth, they have had little historical characterization.

On the other hand, his is a broad-brush approach, superficial and at times inaccurate. For example, he implies the first federal child-pornography law prohibited mere possession, when in fact this provision was enacted later (p. 145). This may have been due to his reliance on inaccurate secondary sources such as the popular press for legal citations.

The book's biggest flaw is that it does not fully illuminate new laws' civil liberties costs, which go well beyond the groups they target. This may be seen in Jenkins' discussion of the sexually violent predator statutes.

In effect in more than 16 states and under consideration in more than 20 others, they require civil commitment, potentially for life, for anyone who may commit a vague array of non-violent sexual behavior, including, in most states, "any criminal act [found] to have been sexually motivated" (Lieb & Matson, 1998).

The statutes and mechanisms used to implement them generally exclude incest but are weighted against homosexuals, a fact not discussed by Jenkins.



State mental health agencies use actuarial scoring systems to determine predator status. The most popular system is the Rapid Risk Assessment for Sexual Offense Recidivism (RRASOR), published in 1997. (Hanson, 1997; Doren, 1999). RRASOR and its authors' successor, Static-99, use risk-predictor variables to determine whether subjects might have illicit sex.

The risk-predictor variables have numerical scores for acts believed to reflect the subject's core beliefs. The state's evaluator uses data taken from police reports and other unverified sources to determine true or false answers for each risk predictor. While the risk predictors apply to anyone, male homosexuals are exposed to more of them than any other group.

Of the 10 risk-predictors in Static-99, four include homosexual male conduct or status—"any male victims", "single", "any stranger victims", and "any unrelated victims". What had been relatively common conduct among homosexual males may now earn the older partner classification as a sexual predator. For example, an unmarried man who had sex with a 17-year-old youth he had recently met would be assigned points for each of these variables and placed in the second-highest risk group. A charge for a earlier offense, such as publicly soliciting an adult for sex, would put him in the highest risk group. (Hanson, 1999).

Notwithstanding that actuarial systems for predicting criminal sexual behavior are in their infancy, unproven and subject to a high false-positive rate, and do not comport with recent Supreme Court decisions determining the evidentiary reliability of scientific theory and technique (Donaldson, 2000), state mental health agencies—eager for instruments with which to meet statutory requirements a predator have a diagnosable mental abnormality—have implemented them.

It is this requirement for a diagnosable abnormality that raises another civil liberties concern unmentioned by Jenkins: lifetime commitments may be applied to others than potential predators.

Under the predator laws, the accused does not have to be diagnosed with a DSM-IV defined mental illness, but merely found to have a "mental abnormality" or "personality disorder", terms which the Supreme Court decision upholding the laws, *Kansas v. Hendricks*, allows state legislatures to define. Legal commentators have noted *Hendricks* opened the door to labeling as predators any other group that may be potentially harmful, such as juvenile delinquents, habitual drunk drivers and drug users (Falk, 1999; Isaac, 1998; Peres, 1997).

The predator laws represent only one type of legislation passed in the wake of the 1970s-1980s child-sex panic. Others include lifetime registration, which forced hundreds of gay men to register as sex offenders for conduct no longer illegal (Small 1999), community notification of individuals labeled sex offenders, and laws prohibiting the possession of images of sexual children even if the "children" are fictitious (Greenhouse, 2001). Considering his civil liberties focus, it is a shame Jenkins does not analyze these laws' full effects.

Another problem is Jenkins at times does a disservice to the historical record, whose tapestry can be subtler than his discussion allows.

For example, when discussing how the right used the threat of harm to children as an argument against homosexual rights, he observes that the North American Man/Boy Love Association (NAMBLA) was "deeply unpopular" with lesbian groups and that among mainstream gay organizations,

"initial sympathy rapidly [gave] way to deep hostility. ... because acknowledging any commonality of goals was likely to attract the 'molester' label for all homosexuals defending hard-won political rights and public respectability" (p. 162).

He does not mention that in the early 1980s some lesbians and minor youth defended not only NAMBLA's participation in the political process but also the desirability of sexual relationships between minors and adults (Kelly, 1979; Anonymous, 1979/80; Lotringer & Moffett, 1980). Neither does he acknowledge that today many gay and lesbian activists reject respectability and some have called for a dialogue with those who advocate relationships between adults and underage males (Rofes, 1998).

Occasional textual sloppiness compounds these flaws. On occasion he provides an account of statistical claimsmaking that does not make it clear who is doing the claiming and he cites Web documents without providing their addresses. He concludes demographic changes account for the shifts in how child sex abuse has been viewed, but does not mention Joel Best's argument against a demographic hypothesis (Best, 1990).

Those doing research would best be served by using *Moral Panic* as a Baedeker for further exploration rather than relying on it as comprehensive or accurate. These criticisms notwithstanding, Jenkins provides an informative and valuable account of how the latest anti-child sex laws have fixed the sexual deviance / paraphilia model more firmly in our society, to the detriment of children and adults.

## **CONSTRUCTING THE CHILD MOLESTER**

Sonenschein focuses on three principal actors—pedophiles, children and adult protectors—in the symbolic crusade mentioned by Jenkins. His premise is we base social relations upon imagery, using symbols

"animated and dubbed by their makers [which are] accompanied by standard, agreed upon and rigidly enforced texts that demand severe punishment for violation along with the elimination of criticism...." (v. II pp. 9-10).

Though Sonenschein focuses on American twentieth-century popular culture, he covers a great deal of historical ground. His may be the most detailed examination ever of the construction of child molester. For this reason alone, it is an important contribution.

Sonenschein notes homosexuals have been just one in a long list of child threatening figures. He shows what had been a homosexual threat to youth became in the late 1970s a pedophile threat as the moral right shifted its energies to easier targets.

Although Sonenschein observes gays and lesbians were among the first to protest the child-sex panic originating with Anita Bryant's campaign, he does not point out how those analyses—e.g. by Gayle Rubin (1978, 1984) and Pat Califia (1980)—turned out to be the high-water mark in critical assessment, or how, by the end of the 1980s, the gay community's ambivalence as seen in *Der Kreis* had become hostility.

*Der Kreis'* editorial against *Eros paidikos* came about halfway through its life and coincided with one of the U.S. child-sex panics described by Jenkins. It marked a change in how the North American homosexual-rights movement, still in its infancy, viewed sex with young people.

Hubert Kennedy's study shows *Der Kreis* had earlier published numerous short stories and poetry about men and youths in sexual relationships, including drawings of pubescent boys.<sup>[iii]</sup> Indeed, pederast themes had been present in gay publications since the beginning of the modern-day struggle for homosexual rights.

The world's first homosexual publication, the German journal *Der Eigene* (The Self-Owner), regularly extolled pedagogical eros (Oosterhuis & Kennedy, 1991). Sonenschein cites Friedrich Kröhnke as showing many homosexual activists in 1930s Germany were pederasts. The editor of *Der Kreis* quoted at the outset of this review reacted against *Eros paidikos* precisely because it had been an acceptable topic for discourse among homosexuals and lesbians.

Up to the early 1980s, gay / lesbian publications in North America and Europe echoed this heritage. Widely read and/or critically regarded newspapers and magazines such as *The Advocate* (San Mateo, California), *Gay Community News* (Boston), *The Body Politic* (Toronto), *Gay News* (London), *Gai Pied* (Paris)—all but the first no longer published—went beyond child-sex scandals to explore ethical and cultural issues around youth and adults in relationships. Nowadays only a few publications such as *The Guide* (Boston) and *Anarchy* (Columbia, MO) critically cover political issues relating to adult-child sex. *Eros paidikos* has faded into obscurity.<sup>[iv]</sup>

Both Jenkins and Sonenschein conclude the laws arising from child-sex panics are based on ideology more than science and do more harm than good. They try to step outside the Western proscription against children as sexual to illuminate how and why this ideology succeeded. The two books are a worthwhile complement for anyone seeking a more informed view of the cultural forces at work around these divisive issues.

---

\*Mark McHarry is a consultant in the high-tech industry. He has written articles and reviews on gay and civil liberties topics for *Alternative Press Review*, *Bay Area Reporter*, *Gay Community News*, *PAN*, and *Z Magazine*, among others. He is grateful to Hubert Kennedy and Clair Norman for their help with this manuscript.

## REFERENCES

Anonymous. (1979, December / 1980, January). A Militant Young Dyke's Feminist Perspective on the Age of Consent Question. *Gay Youth Community News* 1/5. In Tsang (p. 128).

APA (1996, October 18). Kansas Law on Sexual Offenders Unconstitutional, APA Comments. *Psychiatric News*. Available at [www.psych.org](http://www.psych.org)

Best, J. (1990). *Threatened Children: Rhetoric and Concern about Child-Victims* (p. 160). Chicago: University of Chicago.

Califia, P. (1980, October 30). Man/Boy Love and the Lesbian/Gay Movement. *The Advocate*. In Tsang (p. 133).

Cochran, G. (1998, June 3-6). Perverted Justice. *San Francisco Weekly*. Available at: <http://www.sfweekly.com/archives/1998/060398/feature1-1.html> >

Curtis, K. (1999, February 27). Does treatment for predators work? (San Luis Obispo, Calif.) *Tribune*.

Donaldson, T. S. (2000, April 14). Continuing Antics in the Prediction of Sex Offense Recidivism. Available at: <http://qube.oldsaclaw.com/users/mjaye/> >

Doren, D. (1999, February). The Accuracy of Sex Offender Recidivism Risk Assessments. Paper presented at the XXIV International Congress on Law and Mental Health, Toronto. In Hanson & Thornton (1999).

Falk, A. (1999). Sex Offenders, Mental Illness and Criminal Responsibility: The Constitutional Boundaries of Civil Commitment after *Kansas v. Hendricks*. *American Journal of Law & Medicine*. Volume 25, Number 1: 117-47.

Greenhouse, L. (2001, January 23). Supreme Court Roundup; Justices to Weigh Issue of Child Pornography and Computer-Generated Images. *The New York Times*.

Hanson, K. (1997, April). The Development of a Brief Actuarial Risk Scale for Sexual Offense Recidivism.

Hanson, K. & Thornton, D. (1999). Static 99: Improving Actuarial Risk Assessments for Sex Offenders.

Isaac, K. (1998). *Kansas v. Hendricks: A Perilous Step Forward in the Fight Against Child Molestation*. *Houston Law Review*. Volume 35: 1295-1331, p. 1317.

*Kansas v. Hendricks*, 117 S.Ct. 2072, 138 L.Ed.2d 501 (1997)

Kelly, B. (1979, March 3). Speaking Out on "Women / Girl Love"—or, Lesbians *Do* "Do" It. *Gay Community News*.

Kennedy, H. (1999). *The Ideal Gay Man: The Story of Der Kreis*. New York: The Haworth Press; co-published simultaneously in *Journal of Homosexuality*, Volume 38, Numbers 1/2.

Lieb, R. & Matson, S. (1998). Sexual Predator Commitment Laws in the United States: 1998 Update. Olympia, Washington: Washington State Institute for Public Policy. Available at: < [http://www.wa.gov/wsipp/crime/pdf/sexcomm\\_98.pdf](http://www.wa.gov/wsipp/crime/pdf/sexcomm_98.pdf) >

Lotringer, S. & Moffett, M. (1980, Summer). Loving Men. *Semiotext(e) Special*, Intervention Series #2. In Tsang (p. 14).

Oosterhuis, H. (Ed.) & Kennedy, H. (Translator). (1991). *Homosexuality and Male Bonding in Pre-Nazi Germany: The Youth Movement, the Gay Movement, and Male Bonding Before Hitler's Rise: Original Transcripts from Der Eigene, the First Gay Journal in the World* (pp 2-7, 121). New York: The Haworth Press, 1991; also published as *Journal of Homosexuality*, Volume 22, Numbers 1/2.

Peres, J. (1997, June 24). High Court: Pedophiles Can Be Held After Prison. *Chicago Tribune*.

Rofes, E. (1998, November 13). Building a Movement for Sexual Freedom During a Moment of Sex Panic. Address to the Second Annual Summit to Resist Attacks on Gay Men's Sexual Civil Liberties, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Rubin, G. (1978, February). Sexual Politics, the New Right, and the Sexual Fringe. *Leaping Lesbian*. 2/2. In Tsang (p. 108).

Rubin, G. (1984). Thinking Sex: Notes for a Radical Theory of the Politics of Sexuality, in Vance,

C.S., (Ed.), *Pleasure and Danger—Exploring Female Sexuality*. Boston: Routledge & K. Paul; reprinted in Abelove, H., et al, (Eds.). (1993). *The Lesbian and Gay Studies Reader*. New York: Routledge.

Small, J. A. (1999). Who Are the People In Your Neighborhood? Due Process, Public Protection, and Sex Offender Notification Laws. 1466 *New York University Law Review*. Volume 74:1451, pp. 1465-1467.

Tsang, D. (Ed.) (1981). *The Age Taboo: Gay Male Sexuality, Power and Consent*. Boston: Alyson Publications, 1981.

---

[i] Quoted in Kennedy (1999), p. 187.

[ii] Kennedy (1999), p. 1

[iii] By 1965, the editor had completed his distancing of *Der Kreis*—and homosexuality—from boy-love. (Kennedy, p. 202).

[iv] "Pedagogical Eros" is no longer visible in the North American gay / lesbian press. There were no reviews of Dutch jurist and man/boy-love proponent Edward Brongersma's two-volume work *Loving Boys* (Elmhurst, NY: Global Academic Publishers, 1990), and scant attention to Joseph Geraci's anthology from the defunct *Paidika* magazine, *Dares To Speak: Historical And Contemporary Perspectives On Boy-Love* (London: Gay Men's Press, 1997).

NAMBLA is covered only rarely and then as a topic of controversy, such as in *XY* magazine's interview with spokesperson Bill Andriette (Michael Lowenthal, "The Boy-Lover Next Door," *XY* Number 6, February / March, 1997).

*XY* is aimed at a young readership and has covered age-of-consent issues critically. It is telling that aside from *XY*, in the 1990s the only less judgmental looks by the news media at sexual relationships between adults and minors came from non-gay sources—e.g., *Vanity Fair* (Jesse Kornbluth, "Exeter's Passion Play," December, 1992), *The New Republic* (Hanna Rosin, "Washington Diarist: Chickenhawk", May 8, 1995) and the Associated Press (Lisa Lipman, "UMASS professor advocates pederasty," November 26, 2000).

© 2002 The Haworth Press, *Journal of Homosexuality*, Volume 42, Number 4, 2002, pp. 185-192. Republished with permission.

Article copies available from The Haworth Document Delivery Service: 1-800-haworth. E-mail address: <[getinfo@haworthpressinc.com](mailto:getinfo@haworthpressinc.com)>

## 2. BERLIN: ETHICS

Tom O'Carroll

[Whiteboard belonging to this speech]

### The four principles

Frans's paper for the Paris conference led to discussion on IMO [*Ipce Meets Online*, the mailing List for Ipce members] as to whether it can ever be right these days to have sexual relations with a child. The worry is, of course, that even if a child participates with enthusiasm, he or she may later come to regret it. As a result of society's fierce condemnation of such contacts they may come to feel guilty over what happened or feel they have been victimized and damaged by them, especially if such thoughts are encouraged through counseling.

In this regard, Frans commended to IMO's attention an official Ipce statement on the Ipce website known as *the Four Principles*, which outline conditions under which a sexual relationship with a child could be considered ethically acceptable. Frans also posted a copy of his paper called *I didn't know how to deal with it*, which discusses these principles in the light of various negative reactions reported to him from young people following a sexually expressed relationship some years before - contacts which had been reported by reliable adult partners as consensual at the time.

In his own paper, Frans went so far as to say he believes that conditions are now so bad in society that it has become impossible to have a relationship in conformity with all these principles. As a result, he personally has decided he should not have sexual contacts with a child. Well, that is a decision for him and he is surely to be commended on his strength of character in his Stoical, or some might even say positively saintly, acceptance of reality. It is principled behaviour in the most literal sense.

But is it the last word on the subject? I hope we will all behave in a principled, ethical fashion, but does that mean that unlike other people the only correct life for a paedophile is that of a saint? That prescription would have been too hard for many of the saints themselves, including the great St Augustine, who famously asked God on the question of celibacy to make him good, but not just yet.

I feel a challenge can validly be made to the even more saintly approach of our very our own modern St Francis, or St Frans, but I should say straight away that it is not my intention to make a formal challenge to *the Four Principles* or to suggest they ought to be rejected. On the contrary I believe they are sound and valuable as far as they go. However, as I indicated in an IMO posting, I believe the ethical position they represent is conceived rather narrowly. We will

be able to dig deeper, I believe, if we cut into a broader patch of philosophical ground (and with less chance of the sides caving in on us!)

## About ethics

### [See the Whiteboard]

My starting point for this broader approach is essentially this book [indicate Peter Singer (ed) *Ethics*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1994] , which has not a single word in it about paedophilia but does suggest features we should be looking for and analyzing in any ethical proposition. So, forgive me if I start first with some very abstract points which I hope we can all apply later in the discussion, or at least begin to think about, with regard to paedophilia. These abstractions necessarily take us into a very deep labyrinth of thought, the passages and tunnels dug over more than two millennia since the days of Plato. I might well get lost in them. You might help me find a way out. But I would not even begin this hazardous exploration without being pretty sure there are great riches to be mined.

However, the essential concepts I feel it necessary to introduce are mercifully few in number. Just two.

- ☀ Firstly, if we want to know whether this or that behaviour is ethically sound we need a clear idea of what we want for society and the people in it, and indeed for animals, the environment and so forth. We need to be clear about what we think is good.
- ☀ Secondly, we need to assess whether particular actions are or are not consistent with our sense of what is good. By this stage things are already very tricky - we may have more trouble than we suppose in agreeing what is good, but the going gets even tougher when we try to judge the merit of particular actions.

The most important thing to be aware of when judging the merit of particular actions is that there is a great divide in ethics between those who

- ☀ (a) judge actions right or wrong according to the consequences of the action and
- ☀ (b) those who judge not by the consequences but whether the behaviour is in accord with a set of rules or principles of behaviour.

Those who judge acts by their consequences are now known as *consequentialists*. They used to be called *utilitarians* but that term became confusing because it referred to only one type of consequentialist, namely those who judge all acts by the net amount of pleasure or happiness they produce. Referring back to our first essential concept, because there is a variety of arguably good things to aim for besides happiness - the service of God, for instance, is another -



not all consequentialists can be called utilitarians. Broadly speaking, my own belief is that aiming for the greatest happiness of people in general is about the best we can do in terms of ultimate ethical goals. Apparently different goals, such as service to others, and the encouragement of virtues such as courage, honesty, artistic appreciation and so on are really only sub-sets, or aspects, of a happy society. So, I am a utilitarian, which also means I am a type of consequentialist. And I am a paedophile. Lots of big words!

Opponents of consequentialism support several different theories. One of these is natural law theory, the idea behind this being that we have, within our own nature, a guide to what is good for us. If we follow our own nature we will flourish. This thinking derives from figures such as Aristotle and St Thomas Aquinas but is also very modern - many people today think we should study our evolutionary genetic and behavioural development in order to discover the kinds of behaviour most "natural" to us. As developed by theologians, natural law theory, however, became very unempirical and indeed highly artificial and unnatural.

Of much more importance to us is an alternative natural law tradition that started with John Locke in the 17th century. This body of theory was based on rights that supposedly exist in a state of nature and are retained even in modern society. This view of rights had a major influence on the development of the American constitution and thereby on the whole idea of human rights. But why is the idea of rights so important? Why can't we just say we must each act in ways consistent with maximizing the sum total of happiness?

This question brings us up against a major problem, a major clash of moral sentiments.

### **Classic example**

The classic illustration of this is to imagine seven sailors in a lifeboat. They have enough water on board but they are starving. They have six strong oarsmen who calculate they can reach land before they die but only if they can keep their strength up by eating. The seventh sailor is a little cabin boy who isn't strong enough to row but would be very good to eat. The six rowers can eat him, and survive, or all seven will certainly die unless there is a very unlikely rescue. Now these happen to be very brutal, nasty sailors who would not be troubled by a bad conscience over eating the boy. If they reach land they will be very happy about it. Should they eat the boy? To do so would bring the maximum amount of happiness to the group, thus satisfying the declared social aim of utilitarianism. But many people would find this idea revolting and quickly conclude it would be better for all seven to die than to have six happy survivors. Such people would be human rights advocates who would wish to set out rules, or principles, defining minimum rights, such as the right to life, which it is simply wrong to set aside even in extreme circumstances. Those same people, however, might agree that war is sometimes justifiable even though entirely innocent parties are likely to lose their lives. These matters are not simple.

## Compromise is possible

Without going into the complexities, I state as my position that I think a compromise position is best. In a just war, as I believe the war against Hitler to have been, we may have to accept that it is not right to set the rights of individuals above the achievement of a social goal. This is a dangerous position. Stalin also believed that brutal means were justified to achieve an ultimately better society. Whether one is justified in riding roughshod over the rights of some individuals (or merely risking that this might happen) ultimately depends on making a judgment - as well informed as possible - about the likely outcome of one's actions. The defeat of Hitler was a realizable goal; the enforced achievement by Stalin of a communist ideal society was an altogether more distant and elusive proposition.

So, I believe in human rights. I believe in the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness - a doctrine set out by Jefferson in the US *Declaration of Independence* in a sentence which on the face of things neatly appears to marry a broadly consequentialist aim with natural rights principles. In my book ***Paedophilia: The Radical Case*** I also made use of rights theory with regards to children's rights, including the right to sexual expression, in the shape of John Rawls's theory of justice, which uses an updated version of the old natural rights idea in order to resolve the tensions and incompatibilities between consequentialist and rules-based thinking.

So much, then, by way of introduction to my general position and the very abstract ethical ideas I feel we can usefully apply. Now we can at last get down to the business of actually applying them to the ethics of adult-child sexual relations. I started by suggesting *the Four Principles* accepted as Ipce policy are rather too narrowly conceived in my view. Now we can begin to explore the basis of that claim.

## Back to the four principles

Looking at the principles again in the light of my introduction, we might first of all notice that they are indeed *principles*, or *rules*. They are not exactly a list of do's and don'ts. They are not a rigid code like the Ten Commandments, which one is expected to obey regardless of the consequences. There is considerable scope for individual interpretation. Indeed they appear to have been drawn up with consequences in mind, namely the potential bad outcomes for a youngster if his adult friend does not exercise sexual restraint. But in one very important respect they are not consequentialist in the way I have distinguished.

The consequentialist way of looking at things is to consider each case on its merits. All sets of rules and codes, and even broad principles, by contrast tend characteristically to do less than full justice to the complexities of the particular circumstances in which they are applied. This is a weakness of all rules-based ethical systems, just as failure to consider the rights of individuals is, as we have seen, a weakness of pure consequentialism in pursuit of a social goal such as the

greatest happiness for the greatest number. Only the very broadest of all principles, such as the so-called Golden Rule - "Do to others as you would want them to do to you" - or the Wiccan principle, "Do what you like as you like as long as it is harmless", may be said to escape this weakness.

Is this weakness a serious one in the case of Ipce's *Four Principles*? Yes it is, I believe, and I'll say why. First, though, it is necessary to draw attention to an absolutely fundamental question the *Four Principles* do not address. Going back to my first concept, what is it that *the Four Principles* do not explicitly tackle at all? There is no explicit statement of what social good, what desirable end, the principles are designed to promote. There is no stated goal that the principles are designed to bring about a generally happier state of affairs. No concern is expressed for the state of society nor is there any acknowledgement that anything is of any importance other than the possibility (admittedly an important possibility, but not the only one) of negative consequences of an adult-child relationship. *The principles are all about bad things to avoid rather than good things to achieve.*

It may be felt there is no need to be explicit in this context about what we want to achieve. We can do that in conference papers and website position statements. Why go into all that in a set of ethical principles wisely designed simply to avoid relationships that end in tears?

Well, let's look in detail at the principles, where I think we will find that

- ✿ (a) the lack of a positive goal-statement and
- ✿ (b) the weakness of rule-based ethics together give considerable problems.

### **Paul M's argument freedom**

Actually these problems have already been exposed to a considerable extent in two excellent IMO postings. Part of *Principle 3* states "Love and dedication must be unconditional. Sex is never allowed to be a bargaining tool." About this Paul M said: "What is this to do with 'freedom'? And what is wrong with bargaining anyway? And doesn't all this then conflict with #1 and #2? I.e. if the younger partner has the self-determination and initiative then that person is also who decides whether conditions and bargaining are allowed or not. (I have known young hustlers who did very well out of me, God bless them.)"

What Paul has exposed here is

- ✿ (a) an inconsistency arising from failure to make the desired goals of the ethical system explicit and
- ✿ (b) the fact that the rules (in common with all rules) fail to allow for the richness of particular circumstances.

Point (a) seems to me self-evident but point (b) needs explanation. Paul talks about "young hustlers". Now the word "hustlers" is vague enough to conjure up a variety of possible scenarios. I don't want to get personal or pin Paul down to anything specific. Paul, you may wish to comment further in due course, but for the moment I'd like to use the word to make my own point.

The Four Principles do not, to put it mildly, appear to have been framed with hustling in mind, however that word might be defined. The ethical vision appears, rather, to be somewhat blinkered, narrowly confined to settled friendships in which the adult assumes a quasi-parental sense of responsibility. In my view many kinds of contact - short-term hustler or long-term friend, or even long-term hustler or short-term friend - can be conducted ethically. However, the so-called "rules" of ethical conduct will differ significantly according to the circumstances. The degree of self-determination that it is appropriate for a child to have actually varies greatly, both with the age, experience and maturity of the child and with the nature of the child's relationship with the adult. Even in the case of an emotionally rather dependent youngster in a long-term friendship, however, the desirable principle of self-determination remains, as Paul pointed out, at odds with wording which appears to indicate a wish to wrap children in cotton wool, to "protect" them in ways all too characteristic of those who oppose any sexual expression for children.

### **Randy's argument about openness**

The second excellent IMO posting was from Randy, commenting on *Principle 4*, on *Openness*. He said: "It seems to me that if a child has consciously chosen a relationship with an adult then they would know that revealing some of the details of that relationship may get one or both of them in trouble. The mere fact that a child has chosen to ignore the indoctrination against these relationships indicates that they would willingly keep it a secret if necessary. There is obviously something about this adult that the child likes. They can derive strength and support from the adult and his/her friends and not necessarily feel that they were carrying a terrible burden."

Like Paul, Randy is here exposing an inconsistency: for an adult to decide on the child's behalf, as a matter of principle, that the child should not engage in an activity that needs to be kept secret is to impose a limit on that child's self-determination. Note that Randy, quite reasonably, says youngsters would "not necessarily" feel they were carrying a terrible burden. He is here acknowledging that in some circumstances secrets would not be a good idea. Once again, it all depends on particular circumstances and judgments about them. This is half-heartedly admitted even in the wording of *Principle 4*, which refers to "unreasonable" secrets, leaving open the possibility that some such secrets might be acceptable, depending on the circumstances. The *PS*, too, is a belated admission that particular circumstances are important.

Randy also made a further, very perceptive, observation. He wrote: "The real danger is if the relationship were discovered and reported. It has been said that *it is not the relationships that cause trauma but the reaction of the authorities*. I keep hoping that the children will remember the quality of the relationship despite what they are told. If this is not possible, it would be better to never have any kind of relationship with a child because even Platonic relationships can invoke suspicion and the child could be convinced that we have ulterior motives. So the question remains: do we deprive ourselves and the children of the potential benefits of a positive relationship or talk to them about the possible risks, let them make a choice, and then enjoy each other's company?"

Randy's comment here once again takes us back to what is lacking in the principles: any statement of a positive goal, the benefits, not just the pitfalls: what good are we seeking; what good can we do. In his discussion of *the Four Principles* in his paper entitled **I didn't know how to deal with it**, Frans sees the possibility of doing good in non-sexual contacts with youngsters. So do I. In the right circumstances. But Randy is on strong ground when he points out that even such contacts may not be very positive, or may even be downright negative in their impact if they are hedged about with suspicion. Nor is suspicion of the adult the only problem.

## Platonic love

The whole idea of Platonic love is in my view deeply suspect in itself. The phrase is generally taken to mean love which is too pure to be sullied with a bodily expression. Putting a high value on so-called *pure love* in this way inevitably reinforces the idea that sex is dirty and degrading, so actually leading us away from, not towards, the original goals of our ethical system, had we bothered to make such goals explicit. Incidentally, so far as I can tell from my limited researches, the idea of so-called *Platonic love* finds very little clear expression in the writings of Plato himself. The supposed anti-sexual element in Plato, derived from his theory of forms, was played up out of proportion by Mediaeval theologians who were trying to reconcile ancient philosophy with the strictures of the Christian church.

So, although a Platonic relationship may - with luck - appear "respectable" and be accepted in society, and may enable he who exercises the required saintly restraint to feel a good conscience, the messages such restraint sends out to the youngster are likely to be damagingly negative where sex is concerned.

In this regard, I would remind everyone of John Money's writings describing the often tragic consequences of love and lust being separated: tragic especially in terms of producing a guilty, furtive attitude to sexual desire, particularly to forms of sexual expression such as homosexuality and masturbation which do not fit the traditional, socially approved aim of reproduction within marriage. The problem is less acute these days, perhaps, than in Money's heyday. Nowadays, for adults, pretty well anything goes except paedophilia. But that seldom applies to schoolkids just discovering that they are gay. Their introduction to being gay is still

likely to be the taunts of the playground bullies. These youngsters especially can greatly benefit from at least someone in their surroundings giving them positive messages about their desires: the very last thing they need is to have their bodies kept at arm's length by terribly pure paragons of virtue who have apparently conquered physical desire. If even a paedophile won't touch them, what sort of a pariah will the gay youngster feel himself to be?

Incidentally, while what we have come to call *Platonic love* is plainly a poisoned chalice, the writings of Plato himself on the subject of love are still worth reading. Plato's *Symposium*, in particular, has an extended discussion on love and the proper relationship between a lover and a loved one, in a context highly relevant to us and to our consideration of what is "good", because the lovers in question are men and the loved ones are the youths they befriend. But the discussion needs to be read very critically. The character Pausanias, in his main speech, makes what may very well be the first recorded put-down of a paedophile by a gay in literature. Paedophilia and homosexuality are of course modern social constructions and some of the arguments in Plato about valid and non-valid sexual behaviour are clearly based on different social patterns to ours. Nevertheless, the put-down by Pausanias is very instructive for us. Here is the relevant part of what he says:

"...not every love, but only that which has a noble purpose, is noble and worthy of praise... any one may recognize the pure enthusiasts in the very character of their attachments. For they love not boys, but intelligent beings whose reason is beginning to be developed, much about the time at which their beards begin to grow. And in choosing young men to be their companions, they mean to be faithful to them, and pass their whole life in company with them, not to take them in their inexperience, and deceive them, and play the fool with them, or run away from one to another of them. But the love of young boys should be forbidden by law, because their future is uncertain; they may turn out good or bad, either in body or soul, and much noble enthusiasm may be thrown away upon them..."

Note the grounds on which Pausanias makes his put-down. We can easily agree with him that exploiting young boys' inexperience by deceiving them is wrong, but that is not his main point. His real worry is that the boys may turn out to be unworthy of a cultured and virtuous lover: they may be a waste of time. Now on this point it seems to me Pausanias may be getting somewhere.

*The Four Principles* of Ipce, and the solemn, self-denying stance that Frans feels he must draw from them are slightly at odds with what Pausanias is saying. *The Four Principles* are completely silent on the question of a particular boy's personality and character. It's as though all children are like Ming vases, precious, fragile, with no mind of their own but very likely to be dropped and smashed by a clumsy paedophile.

Pausanias feels men should only have young lovers who are worthy of them: not boys of weak

character concerned only with trivial things or whose minds are easily turned. I am not saying we should do the same. All kids need love and affection, especially perhaps some of the so-called weak or troubled kids at whom Pausanias would turn up his nose. But if we are really to respect kids as humans, as free moral agents, that does mean being critical of them, it does mean making judgments about what's good and bad in them -- just as some of them, it seems, are very ready to be critical of us. It is not "respecting" youngsters to treat them uniformly just as potential "victims".

## **Love in our society**

And if we do think in this way, where do we stop? Do we wait for a perfect society before physical contact is OK? How much risk is too much? What about the man-boy relationships described in Theo Sandfort's research of two decades ago? Those consenting relationships seemed beneficial to the youngsters at the time by rigorous scientific standards. But society has changed. Some of those boys may now say they regret what happened. Does this mean that all those years ago, in a more liberal climate, the men should have refrained from sex because of the risk that society might become more conservative?

And what about Randy's point? Even non-sexual closeness can end in tears and trauma. An old friend of mine, not a paedophile, told me many years back of such a case. It was when he was a student and had spent his long summer holiday with a family in a remote cottage. He and the young boy of the household spent a lot of time together. They both loved fishing and went out on long expeditions together. Nothing sexual in it at all. But the boy became attached to him in a way he had not anticipated. When the time came for parting the child was not just sad, he was inconsolably upset and tearful to an extent my friend found disturbing. Should he never have allowed that friendship to grow? Should he have shunned the boy from the start and told him to stay at home with his mother?

The logic of always avoiding potential harm would suggest exactly that. But what would the boy have thought of such a policy? I am reminded of the poet Alfred Tennyson, deep in profound grief over the death of his friend Arthur Henry Hallam. His view, famously, was that despite his grief and pain "It is better to have loved and lost than never to have loved at all".

In another interesting case, a woman came to a conclusion very close to the heart of the matter. Some of you will remember it as coming from the [\*\*interview with a woman named as Heidi\*\*](#), published in the Special Women's Issue of the journal Paidika. Heidi tells us she had been 13 when she had had a romantic friendship with one of her teachers. The pair were in love. They hugged and kissed and spent time together. There was no sex but the relationship was risky. Heidi said: "I needed someone to trust, someone who did not treat me as a child. It's easy to fall in love with someone who gives you that. She was also willing to take a big risk because of me. I was a minor, a girl, a student. It was all forbidden. Her taking a risk for me also made me trust her. It made her special. She thought I was important enough to take such a big risk."

However, in this case the grown-up eventually decided the risk was too great and put a stop to the affair, which is exactly what the ethics of caution would suggest as the correct, moral thing to do. But Heidi recalls in the clearest possible terms that what she found hurtful was the rejection. As an adult, she looked back saying she wished that more risk had been taken, not less. She wished the relationship had become fully sexual.

### **Up to new ethics?**

So do we steer clear of emotional involvement as well? On a consequentialist basis, one might propose a sliding scale of risk: the greater the risk of a bad ultimate outcome, the more one should refrain. The greater the hope of a good outcome, the more love and lust can be allowed to come together -- the more love both adult and child can express and enjoy. But is there ever a point at which we can absolutely say never? Or should do so? In particular cases, yes, of course. But not for all.

However, the consequentialist "sliding scale" approach leaves one open to arguments about the "slippery slope" to perdition. If there are no rules then too much is left to the individual to decide. Answer: moral rules are for the individual to enforce upon himself. An absolute standard of socially enforceable laws is available to ensure minimum standards are not breached. Also guidelines and codes of practice -- of which *the Four Principles* are an example -- are also a good thing in ensuring that people think carefully and they leave individuals with little excuse for falling short of socially acceptable standards.

But it is an illusion to suppose even these general standards are very fixed and solid. Society at large fails even the lifeboat test discussed earlier. I mentioned the deliberate sacrifice of innocent civilians in war. As recently as last month I see the government of Sri Lanka (which these days has a very vocal policy against so-called child abuse by Western visitors) was calling on its citizens to produce more babies, with the specific stated purpose of producing soldiers to fight in its civil war. Children, in other words, brought into the world specifically to be fed to machine-guns. But no doubt the Sri Lankan government sees the issue as a matter of life and death for the entire nation, and it is no easy matter to prove them wrong.

Parents, also, sometimes feel justified in exposing their children to considerable risk. What about the risk of bringing up a child as a Jew in a society where Jews are oppressed? Should the parents abandon their faith? Why privilege religion in this regard but not love? Note that the closer and longer we are in contact with a loved child (the more our investment is like that of a parent) the more entitled we may feel to "mould" the child -- to educate etc. Indeed the longer we are close the more this becomes inevitable. Thus we move away from Paul's model of free negotiation with an "equal" hustler. We can even turn the usual assumption about power imbalance on its head: it is the parent who has most power vis-à-vis the kid, not the sex tourist.

### **Negative emotions afterwards**



Let us turn to the negative emotions expressed by youngsters that Frans raises in his paper *I didn't know how to deal with it*. I wonder, were all these kids of a certain type? All "tough" or difficult kids, in contact a lot with social services? I am not saying avoid such youngsters. Far from it. Boy-lovers, especially, often seem to have an affinity with troubled youth: we are often able to offer kindness, help and useful guidance with such kids even though their parents, teachers and social services figures have failed to do so. This is very important. And let me say on a personal note that I know that in some such cases it may indeed be necessary to avoid sex with the kids in order to do two things:

- ☀ (a) If you are not having sex you cannot be bribed by it. Kids should certainly be free agents, free to come and go. Even parents should not be immune from kids "divorcing" them if they do a lousy job.
- ☀ (b) But some troubled kids are also in need of discipline, which in some circumstances very much means NOT bargaining over sex in the happy hustler manner we have talked about. In some cases the grown-up needs to be very grown up, very restrained. I have myself encountered this and deliberately refrained from sex in a relationship in order that a boy could see me taking a consistent, steady approach to my behaviour with him, an approach that enabled me - I hope - to earn his respect and enable me to influence his own behaviour for the better.

But not all kids are difficult. While I like boisterous fun with lively kids, I also find myself very much attracted to quiet, thoughtful, sensitive youngsters. Even at the age of nine or ten there are kids of this kind who know their own mind and, I believe, can be relied upon not to change it in the ways that Frans describes in his paper.

I would like to conclude by mentioning one such youngster, a boy whom I shall call David. David played an important part in the life of a friend of mine, who shares my tastes, whom I shall call Chris. Chris had known David from his very early years but the two inevitably saw much less of each other when Chris's work took him abroad. However, they wrote to each other, and at the age of 14, looking back to a long time earlier, David wrote this: "I am missing your cuddles and you feeling my body and making me happy. I have got a bigger one since you last saw me and far more hairs, but please don't tell dad what I said, that please is between you and me!!! Look forward to seeing you again my love!!!"

Chris felt it wise to destroy the quite long letter of which this was a part, something he found very hard to do, but the words I have read to you were recorded and kept in code. David is now at university, a law student, and I am very happy to say he shows no sign whatever of using his new skills to sue Chris for compensation! On the contrary, they remain on very friendly terms.

I would remark also on what you will already have noticed -- that David said "Please don't tell

my dad". He was content to have a secret. And why did he say this? Because in earlier years Chris had been perhaps a little bit too open with his father, too concerned to comply with *Principle 4* of our *Four Principles* long before this principle had been put in writing.

These principles, I suggest, while they are a wonderful aid to ethical thought, should not be regarded as a commandment to be broken on pain of going to hell. They are not tablets of stone. I say take a consequentialist view, not a rules-based view. Use your best judgment in any individual case.

For some among us the inclination may still be the path of abstinence in every case. Some may fear they have to stick to this rule with iron discipline as the only means to guarantee themselves against their own potential folly. OK, that's fine. Once again, it's a matter of assessing the perceived consequences for the individuals concerned. But what I would prefer not to see is for such decisions, like that of Frans, to be in any way considered as an Ipce policy. Frans himself has been at pains to say this is a decision *for himself* and it is for others to make up their own minds. However, I would ask Frans to ponder the implications in terms of his influence on others. I would say, Frans, that your stance makes a very good message when talking to academics and medical professionals such as those in Paris. It makes an excellent message also for any nosy police officers or child abuse industry people visiting the Ipce website. They must find themselves daunted by our respectability.

### **What to advise the young child-lovers?**

But is it such a good message to give to fellow child-lovers? Frans, you and I have plenty of grey hairs between us. We are old. We ought to be wise. Your message certainly seems to be very wise in its message of restraint and as such it is sure to have great influence, not least on younger child-lovers. We may expect to find younger people in growing numbers discovering Ipce's site and others, such as *Boy Links* and so on, sites whose policies may be subtly influenced by ours as we no doubt are by theirs. A number of us in this room, the grey-haired ones, may be able to follow your personal example, Frans, without too much personal difficulty. One is reminded of the novice priest who asks an elderly priest about the temptations of the flesh and how to avoid them. The priest replies, "Oh, don't worry, my boy, the first forty years are the worst. After that it gets a little easier."

Is that what we want to say to the young child-lover? It may make us look very wise and even feel very saintly to do so. But in making my judgment I go right back to the beginning of this argument. My philosophy is based on calculations of happiness. How, overall, can we maximize it for everyone within the constraints of an imperfect society? And when I say everyone, that includes not just children, to whom we have a great responsibility in our deliberations, but also to child-lovers as well, and even to some extent to their families, which is why we have an interest in the *Bologna project*, in writing to prisoners and so forth. Part of our mission, I suggest, is avoiding the suicides and the long agony of misery and despair that

leads to such tragedies. If we are to fulfill this part of our mission, I believe there is one part of our message we must not forget - and that is the message of hope.

It is a daunting thing to say to a young child-lover, perhaps still in his teens, that all he can reasonably look forward to is a life of constant yearning with no hope of fulfillment. Must we really tell this young man or woman - by the message of our own abstention - that in order to behave ethically in our society he must never, ever, hold a child in a way that brings love and desire together? Must we tell him that for his whole life he must take the fox to his breast and let it gnaw in the way of the Spartans - even those heroic figures, remember, famed for their discipline and fortitude, were also great boy-lovers. This negative way of thinking is like Kant's dull ethics of duty in which the only actions regarded as truly ethical are when we do burdensome things we'd really rather get out of if we could.

Better, I suggest, to offer hope. In practice, the young man or woman in our society will of course more often than not be wise to exercise restraint. In practice there may not be all that much difference between the path of total abstinence on the one hand, and the path of rejecting dangerous possibilities on a one-by-one basis, as they occur. But if we say to the young child-lover "Here are some principles, think about them, but make your own mind up" we do two things. We give him a tool to help his thinking but we also leave him with some hope for the future. Not a lot, but as much as we reasonably can. Such hope, I suggest, is utterly vital.

[\[Back to speech\]](#)

# Whiteboard

## belonging to Tom's speech

### **BASIS OF ETHICS: TWO ESSENTIAL PRINCIPLES**

- ✘ 1) GOOD: What kind of society/world/personal relations do we want? What do we think is "good", or "the good life"?
- ✘ 2) **DECIDING WHAT ACTIONS ARE GOOD:** Behaviour is good or bad to the extent that it is CONSISTENT with our idea of what is "good".

### **A BIG DIVIDE IN ETHICAL THINKING**

- ✘ 1) CONSEQUENTIALISM (including UTILITARIANISM): Judging actions right or wrong by the CONSEQUENCES of the action.
- ✘ 2) PRINCIPLES/RULES: Judging actions right or wrong by whether the behaviour is in accord with a set of rules or principles.



<b>NATURAL LAW THEORY</b>	<b>RIGHTS EXIST IN A STATE OF NATURE</b>
<p>Our own nature is a guide to what is right for us:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✘ · ARISTOTLE</li> <li>✘ · AQUINAS (Not really natural: unempirical)</li> <li>✘ · EVOLUTIONARY THEORY</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✘ · JOHN LOCKE</li> <li>✘ · UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION</li> <li>✘ · HUMAN RIGHTS THINKING</li> </ul>

[\[Back to speech\]](#)