

Pedophilia and the Gay Movement

Theo Sandfort
University of Utrecht

ABSTRACT. A history of literature and views existing within the COC (Cultural and Recreational Center), the major Dutch organizations of homosexual men and women, regarding pedophilia and its relationship to homosexuality are discussed, beginning with definite separation between the pedophile and homosexual identities and ending with an abolishment of oppression towards pedophilia, for which the COC is in part responsible. The article argues that the homosexual identity is by no means a "constant" but a fluid identity, based on societal views and conditions. By accepting pedophilia, the COC hopefully will broaden the idea of the gay identity.

Homosexuality and pedophilia are relatively incompatible social phenomena. In the Netherlands homosexuals and pedophiles are organized in separate movements with divergent goals, and the gay movement in particular has often been negative in its attitudes toward pedophilia and pedophiles.¹

Despite this long-standing antipathy, in 1980 the most important organization of homosexual men and women in the Netherlands, the Cultural and Recreational Center (COC),² adopted the position that the liberation of pedophilia must be viewed as a gay issue. In order to trace the development of the COC's attitude toward pedophilia,³ a content analysis was carried out on the vari-

Theo Sandfort is a Research Associate at the Department of Clinical Psychology at the State University of Utrecht. The author would like to thank Walter Everaerd and Lex van Naerssen for their comments on an earlier version of this article, and Michael Dallas for the translation of the article. Reprint requests may be addressed to the author, Department of Clinical Psychology, State University Utrecht, P.O. Box 80140, 3508 TC Utrecht, The Netherlands.

ous periodicals published by this organization from its founding in 1946 until 1981.⁴

Based on the findings of this study, the post World War II years can be roughly divided into 4 periods, although it must be noted that both positive and negative views were being voiced in all periods. In the first period, 1946-1958, pedophilia cannot be said to have existed as a category independent of homosexuality; and pedophiles, although controversial at times, constituted an important part of the COC. The second period, 1959-1963, was marked by growing estrangement between homosexuality and pedophilia; the two came to be viewed as separate categories, a development which appears to have been influenced largely by the aspirations of homosexuals for societal acceptance. Following a virtual purge of pedophile elements from the organization, a third period, 1964-1974, ensued, characterized by vehement rejection of pedophilia by the COC. And finally, in a fourth period from 1975 to the mid-1980s, pedophilia received increasingly positive attention, which resulted in an official policy statement by the COC calling for the liberation of child sexuality and pedophilia.

THE PAEDOPHILE⁵ AND OTHER HOMOSEXUALS, 1946-1958

The early magazines of the COC were frequently embellished with illustrations of young boys. Numerous photographs and reproductions of paintings or sculptures showed youths in varying poses, naked or clothed, their facial hair and sometimes even pubic hair absent. The pictures were suggestively romantic and altogether unrealistic. Sexual behavior was almost never hinted at openly, but this was also true of illustrations involving adults. Only rarely could a picture be found showing a naked man and a naked boy together. After 1955, pictures of boys appeared with decreasing frequency.

Illustrations such as these sometimes stood alone, as on the magazine cover; more often, however, they accompanied stories or poems in which boys played a leading role. Poems by well-known Dutch poets such as Jacob Israël de Haan, Louis Couperus, and Willem de Mérode were printed, poems which often bore such suggestive titles as "Sleeping Youth," "Dying Youth," "Business Boy," and "Portrait of a Florentine Youth." In many poems, the puerile body was glorified and the poet's own desires toward the boy sung, although almost always platonically. In a rare poem sexual desires also played a role.

Boys were also a frequent subject of published short stories and novel excerpts, as well as of books reviewed in the magazine. Eroticism, both between boys themselves and between boys and older men, formed an important theme. Sometimes it was clearly sensual, but seldom was it openly sexual. Stories were often set in other times or other cultures, as was revealed by titles such as "Michelangelo's Young Friends" and "Arabian Nights." During 1946 a series of articles by Arent van Sant-horst⁶ was published about homo-erotic elements in boys' books.

The French writers André Gide and Roger Peyrefitte, referred to as "kindred spirits," received regular attention, with particular emphasis on their devotion to youths. The pedo-erotic novels *Costa Brava* and *Vervolgde minderheid* (Persecuted Minority) by the Dutch writer Servatius⁷ which portrayed amorous relationships between men and boys of 12 and 15 years of age, were also reviewed. These as well as other books on paedophile homosexuality were proclaimed as books "in our domain" and were frequently promoted. The fact that they were available through the COC, however, evoked protests from some readers.

Considerable attention during this initial period was also devoted to "Greek Love." Stories set in Greek and Roman times, such as the legend of the Greek boy Antinous, lover of the Roman emperor Hadrian, appeared regularly. There was a review of Plato's *Symposium*, as well as of a book on Ovid that depicted how Orpheus taught the men of Thrace the art of loving boys,

showing them “that such love affairs will revive the strength of their younger years, the innocence of youth, and the flowers of spring.”

Various attempts were made to arrive at a clear description of the essence of Greek Love, or “paedophilia,” but these yielded contradictory results. At first, paedophilia was viewed as an escape from the overwhelming polarity of the male-female relationship. Later, however, paedophilia became the pursuit of the very polarity inherent in the age difference between a man and a boy. At other times, the chief emphasis was placed on the platonic nature of paedophile relationships. “Sacred paedophilia,” it was warned, should in no way be confused with “profane pederasty,” the former being concerned not only with the beauty of the youth’s body but also with that of his soul. Such contradictions suggested that the purpose of these essays was not so much to describe Greek Love objectively as to create an idealistic image of it.

Additional contributions discussed how the homosexual should conduct himself toward his “young friend,” especially stressing his enormous responsibility. “If he is aware that the boy does not have a homo-erotic disposition—and this will quickly be evident—then he must under no circumstances try to reshape him in that direction.” Moreover, “the knowledge that relationships with youths are so transitory should not entice him into such a frenzy that he starts up an intimate relationship with a new boy every day.”

Paedophiles were clearly considered an important group among homosexuals during these years 1946 to 1958. It was argued that the manifestations of homosexual friendship extended from “the paedophile relationship to lasting (permanent) cohabitation by two partners”; marriage, therefore, did not constitute an adequate model for “our relationships.” In articles dealing with the treatment of paedophile offenders by probation officers, men who sought sexual contact with boys younger than 16 were often, though not consistently, referred to as “homo-

sexuals.” Some writers spoke of the important role that “paedophiles gifted with leadership abilities” played in the COC.

Seldom did an article define more specifically what was understood by the term “a homosexual.” One such attempt was made in 1949 by one of the founders of the COC. He pointed out that three more or less related groups of homosexuals could be distinguished: inverts, paedophiles, and normal homosexuals. Inverts were seen as a biological variation; they were completely feminine and passive, often bearing female nicknames and occupying female professions. Their ideal was the *real* man. The ideal of the paedophiles, or “homo-eroticists, homo-idealists, or platonists,” was centered on the youthfulness and the physical appearance of the love object. Sexuality was not their most prominent concern, however. As born pedagogues, they found gratification in the fruits of their educational efforts rather than in the reciprocal love of the child. “Normal homosexuals” were “neither avowed inverts, nor avowed paedophiles.” Their relationships with lovers were based on faithfulness and love rather than on age or appearance. Because paedophiles were, of the three types, the most immune to women, they would therefore come closest to being true homosexuals.

The diversity of interest in boys revealed by the COC magazines in this period could not be called objective, for one of its functions was obvious: to titillate the erotic desires of the adult male homosexual readers.⁸ It would seem plausible to conclude that the homosexual identity manifesting itself in these magazines during the 1950s was so broad or so undefined that it by no means excluded erotic feelings toward boys. In any case, within the male membership of the organization erotic desires seemed to be present not only for other men of the same age but also for boys of significantly younger age. Within the COC at this time, these paedophiles were viewed not as a separate category of persons, but first and foremost as homosexuals; this was evident, for example, in the above-mentioned scheme classifying different types of homosexuals. Until the late 1950s no assertions

apparently were made in the magazines suggesting that paedophilia might be a social entity independent of homosexuality.

Nonetheless, the presence of paedophile homosexuals within the COC was not taken for granted by all members. From the very beginning, disparaging voices could also be heard. A notice appearing in 1949, for example, called upon members to “protect and refrain from harassing the immature youth.”⁹ Such negative attitudes were becoming stronger toward the end of the period, and could be seen as an attempt by some homosexuals to distance themselves from paedophile homosexuality.

One 1954 article distinguished two forms of “homophilia”: “paedophile” and “mixed” homophilia. The former pertains to “affection towards the inwardly immature on the part of persons deeming themselves more mature,” whereas the latter form concerns “love which essentially seeks a closeness rooted in equality.” Compared to the scheme discussed above, here the paedophile was judged more negatively, indeed almost as pathological. The element “youth” was said to figure more prominently in the infatuations of the paedophile than the element “the right person.” He refused to recognize the femininity in himself and was consequently incapable of relating to women in any way. “During the homo-erotic phase, he became fixated on comradesly love, so that the boy now fulfills for him, as it were, the role of the girl, supported in part by a male-worshipping society.” The author went on to advocate a society in which paedophiles could “move on into relations more human than are possible with young people.”

During the period 1946 to 1958, there was a growing tendency to pathologize paedophilia, while at the same time attempts by outsiders similarly to pathologize the likewise deviant peer-oriented homosexual preference were being strongly resisted. Paedophilia was described by some writers as a perversion and a form of homosexuality founded in a developmental disorder. Some warned against the danger of “latent and unconscious homosexuals in the youth movement, in schools, and in scout-

ing.” Similar contentions were being voiced by many mental health authorities, who beginning in early 1960s campaigned outside the COC for the acceptance of homosexuality between consenting adults.

Speculations over the numerical relationships between the various kinds of sexual preferences drew varying conclusions. One article, for instance, asserted that paedophilia referred to a love relationship between an adult and a child, “and this is usually a homosexual relationship.” Other articles, however, noted that it had by no means been proven “that the frequency of love for the young (paedophilia) is greater among homosexuals than among heterophiles.” The “misconception that all homosexuals should be attracted to the youthful or the pubescent” was brought about by a small number of homosexuals who achieved notoriety by breaking the law, thereby coming into contact with social workers. It’s obvious that speculations such as these were based on strategic considerations. The assumption was implicit that, should there prove to be just as much heterosexual as homosexual pedophilia, then homosexuals did not need to account for homosexual pedophilia in any special way.

Both the positive and the negative attention given paedophile homosexuality in the COC magazine provoked heated reactions, and this apparently became a trying problem for the editors. In a postscript following one such reaction in 1958, they announced their decision to close, “at least for the time being, this interesting debate on such a subject about which so little is known.”

THE SEVERANCE OF PEDOPHILIA FROM HOMOSEXUALITY, 1959-1963

One year after announcing an end to its publication of articles on paedophilia, the COC magazine commenced publication of a whole new series of articles on pedophilia by Brunoz.¹⁰ From that point on, the older Dutch spelling “paedophilie” was re-

placed by the more modern form “pedofilie.”¹¹ “Pedofilie” was presented in this series as the “most normal deviation,” being located somewhere between the heterosexual norm and the homosexual deviation from that norm. According to these articles what captivated the pedophile was “smooth, hairless skin, gentle curvatures, freshness, the slender figure, ruddy cheeks, etc.” The “true homophile, the typical man-loving male” would never be attracted to such a boyish image. The articles by Brunoz were later collected and brought out by the COC in pamphlet form.

As would be expected, the articles evoked numerous protests from readers, and it was found particularly objectionable that the COC should publish such a brochure, for it fostered the prejudice that homosexuals were pedophiles. Sex contacts between young persons and adults were considered excesses, and pedophiles should restrain themselves “heroically” in their sexual behavior. When the editors persisted in defending the publication, one reader wrote that the COC was an organization “of and for homosexuals, and there cannot and must not be room within it for other deviant lifestyles.”

The series by Brunoz was interesting in that pedophilia was apparently viewed as a phenomenon largely independent of homosexuality and, at most, only loosely related to it. This was probably a reflection of the situation within the COC, where by this time pedophiles had come to be more and more isolated as a result of the negative attention they had received. Pedophile homosexuals stood in the way of societal acceptance of homosexuality because they confirm the bias that homosexuals seduced children. On the other hand, the rift appeared also to have been induced by the isolated pedophiles themselves as a strategic measure. An alternative notion of pedophilia, independent of homosexuality, was constructed, which resulted in two separate categories of people. Only in this manner could pedophiles retain a positive self-image. In addition, by this time it had become possible to build a pedophile liberation movement outside

the realm of the COC, an organization in which there seemed to be no place for pedophiles in the future.

A further indication that pedophilia and homosexuality were being increasingly defined as separate and independent categories could be found in the preliminary announcement for a symposium to be held in 1960 by the International Committee for Sexual Equality.¹² The theme of the symposium was to be "Pedophilia versus homosexuality," and the distinction between the two concepts was thoroughly elaborated in the accompanying commentary. In the end, for reasons which remained unclear, the symposium was not held. Articles appearing in the COC magazine around this time reinforced the distinction, arguing that "the psychologies of these differing types must also be very different."

One of the foremost issues in the early Dutch homosexual civil rights movement was the campaign for the repeal of Article 248-bis of the Netherlands Penal Code.¹³ Under this Article homosexual contacts between adults and young people from 16 to 21 years of age were a criminal offense. Simultaneously with the emergence of the distinction between pedophilia and homosexuality, the argumentation for the repeal of Article 248-bis was also transformed. Initially it had been argued that the article discriminated against homosexuals, and particularly against the pedophiles among them. The Article was considered to measure by two standards because heterosexual adults were permitted to have sex with young persons 16 years of age and older. Later however, the campaign increasingly came to center around the argument that the Article impeded the development of young homosexuals by forcing them into sexual abstention.

During the 1960s, the COC became more active in providing assistance and support to young homosexuals, a policy which met with a good deal of opposition from many within the organization, on the grounds that it might increase the temptation for some members to break the law, thereby giving the COC a bad name. It was not until 1970, one year before the repeal of

248-bis, that young people 16 years and older were permitted to become members. The decision to allow this was defended by the COC as follows: Adult homosexuals no longer need to be protected from temptation, for they are old and wise enough to resist it on their own.

***DISSOCIATION FROM PEDOPHILIA
AND OTHER NONCONFORMIST
HOMOSEXUAL BEHAVIOR, 1964-1974***

Around 1964 an important policy change took place within the COC, marked by increased emphasis on gaining societal acceptance of homosexuality. The magazine of the organization implemented this change, linking up to current developments in society and giving more attention to homosexual women. At the same time, two persons who had regularly written about pedophilia disappeared from the editorial staff without explanation.

The divorce of homosexuality from pedophilia was virtually complete by this time within the COC, but two important prejudices pertaining to homosexuality still lived on in society: it was still believed that homosexuals seduce young people and that through this seduction young people become homosexuals.

The COC magazine waged a constant campaign from many angles against the idea that young people become homosexual by seduction. When the seduction theory is once again propagated in its pages by an external “expert” in 1966,¹⁴ the editors distanced themselves from this standpoint in a subsequent issue.

The dangers posed by seduction played a prominent role in the adoption of Article 248-bis in 1911, but in the sixties a national advisory council report¹⁵ advocating the repeal of the article expressed considerable doubts as to the validity of the seduction theory: “If a young person who has experienced a homosexual approach later proves to be a homosexual, it must be assumed that this person was already emotionally amenable to such an ap-

proach and had, as it were, been waiting for it to occur. The experience merely exerts a shaping influence on an existing homosexual orientation.”¹⁶ Certain cases of successful seduction, according to the report, did not lead to permanent homosexual identification, whereas in other cases young people reacted to an approach with a flat refusal, sometimes accompanied by either violence or a friendly admonition. The COC magazine quoted approvingly from this official report. After the repeal of Article 248-bis in 1971, the theme of seduction temporarily disappeared from the limelight, only to resurface in the late 1970s as a result of the much-publicized anti-gay campaign in the United States led by Anita Bryant.

With the effective elimination of pedophiles within the ranks of the COC, it became easier to counteract the prejudice that homosexuals seduced young people, especially as it existed within the educational system. Whenever homosexual teachers were fired or refused posts in schools, protests in the COC magazine were rife and were consistently accompanied by assurances that homosexual teachers had no sexual feelings towards young boys. After all, heterosexual teachers wouldn't harbor such feelings either. It was unclear, however, whether teachers indeed did not experience such feelings, or whether they did not allow themselves to experience them because of pressure from both society in general and from the homosexual movement. One teacher all but admitted these feelings in a special issue of the magazine on homosexuality and teaching when he wrote that he knew the names of all the boys in his class, but not of all the girls. “Because they are often intellectually as well as physically well-stocked, it is usually the boys that write on my blackboards.” The position of homosexuals in the teaching profession was an issue that received continual attention. In addition, lectures and newspaper reports suggesting that homosexuals seduce young people were publicized and repudiated as “affirming prejudice,” and any association of homosexuality with criminality was indignantly disclaimed.

In contrast, the editors took no stand against comparable lectures and articles over pedophilia and pedosexuality in the period between 1964 and 1974. Some negative news reports were quoted without comment, which suggested editorial endorsement, and approval was likewise given to a portrayal of pedophiles as “sexually disturbed persons, who in putting their disturbed inclinations into practice ruin others for life.” Pedophiles were people who tampered with young children. Warnings against child-molesters were cited: “Keep an eye on the friends of your 10-year-old son. . . . And never trust the youth leader or athletic instructor who wants to take him jogging in the woods or give him extra football training on his own.” Sexuality with minors was rejected by the COC as absolutely unacceptable. In reply to a reader who asked whether the COC could not do something about the crimes of vice that threatened to destroy the hard-won goodwill toward homosexuals, the editors replied that it went without saying “that we also gag from murderers and men who molest children, whether they are office clerks who abuse little boys or schoolteachers who do it with little girls.”

Informative articles on homosexuality published in this period emphasized strongly the distinction between it and pedophilia. Pedophiles “actually feel more comfortable with a woman than an (adult) male lover.” Their coveted ideal was always marriage and not homophile friendship. “This again points out that there are essential differences between pedophiles and homosexuals.” The clear distinction between homosexuals and pedophiles that supposedly came to light in Schofield’s book¹⁷ on the sociological aspects of homosexuality was referred to as a “remarkable discovery.”

The dissociation of homosexuality from homosexual pedophilia cannot be viewed independently of the striving among many homosexuals in the 1960s to be seen as normal. In this drive to win societal acceptance, the homosexual identity most often put forward was that of the “well-adjusted homosexual differing from others only in choice of partner.”¹⁸ In addition, a

campaign was waged against expressions of homosexuality which deviated from this image, such as camp and leather. Cross-dressing was warned against ostensibly because of local ordinances forbidding it and butch behavior became taboo for lesbians.¹⁹

In the late 1960s, spurred by feminism and student protests, the gay movement broadened its scope. The COC, however, still continued to propagate the image of the conventional homosexual desiring a lasting relationship with a partner of the same age. Within the context of the sexual revolution, attention was given in the magazine to other forms of sexuality such as transvestitism and incest, but this met with considerable disfavor among readers. A survey revealed great differences of opinion “over articles that have little or nothing to do with homosexuality, but which do manifestly break other taboos.” Criticism of established structures was nevertheless stepped up and extended to areas other than sexuality. One result of this increased social consciousness was the COC’s endorsement of certain political parties in the 1972 elections. Although expressly not intending to concern itself with everything, the COC called for solidarity with others who deviated from the norm. Its policies aimed at a “genuinely integrated, diversified society.” In this context attention was also given to the position of young people, and a new conception of child sexuality was advocated, one which proposed that not only gays and straights, women and men, but also children and adults, including parents, should have equal rights and social status. The COC policy statement for 1974 criticized the patronizing of children; authoritarian structures both in the family and in school should be replaced by democratic practices. Such concern with child-rearing was at no time stronger in the COC magazine than it was in the early 1970s.

With regard to pedophilia, the meaning of this interest in youth emancipation remained unclear. Editorials toward the end of this period insisted that the COC did not conform to existing prejudices toward pedophilia, pointing out that child molestation

and pedophilia could not be considered as one and the same thing. Yet the editors continued to view pedophilia as a problem, arguing that by their nature pedophile relationships were based on dependency. In 1974 the editors announced that a special publication would be devoted to relationships of dependency, but such never appeared.

All in all it was clear that pedophilia was not seen as an alternative of equal merit to homosexuality. The editors continued to deny any assertion suggesting a link between homosexuality and pedophilia, insisting that pedophilia was an unconnected phenomenon and pointing out that pedophiles could also be heterosexual or bisexual. A major confrontation over the subject took place in 1974 following a nationwide broadcast on sexuality between children and adults aired by one of the two Dutch television networks. In this program pedophiles were interviewed who two years earlier had formed their own pressure group outside the COC, under the auspices of The Netherlands Society for Sexual Reform (NVSH).²⁰ According to the COC, the program treated the question one-sidedly in favor of the interests of pedophiles, virtually ignoring the dependent position of children in relation to adults. The COC was also “extremely critical” of the fact that only relationships between men and boys were discussed in the program, thereby implying a connection between pedophilia and homosexuality. The existence of female and heterosexual pedophiles was overlooked. Furthermore, the pedophile group was upbraided for lacking a critical view of society. The COC protested to the NVSH, accusing that organization of “placing reflection over such delicate human relationships into the hands of persons unqualified for the task.”

The reaction of the COC disregarded the fact that this incipient movement of pedophiles was still cautiously coming out of the bushes,²¹ and was so to speak, in an infantile stage of development in contrast to the COC. It was therefore not surprising that the NVSH did not yet possess a broadly-founded viewpoint on pedophilia. The COC likewise failed to recognize in its criti-

cism that the pedophile group consisted mainly of men with a homosexual preference.

TOWARD SOLIDARITY WITH CHILDREN AND PEDOPHILES, 1975-1981

In the course of the 1970s, nevertheless various signs became visible which suggested an increasingly favorable attitude toward pedophilia within the COC. Announcements of lectures on the subject organized by the NVSH cropped up regularly in the calendar of events for local COC chapters. A consciousness-raising group as well as consultation services for pedophiles were advertised. Books on pedophilia and youth sexuality were cited more frequently, and when reviewed by the COC they received positive critiques. Convictions resulting from consenting pedosexual contacts were criticized, and a favorable review was published of an NVSH report recommending the abolition of ages of consent for sex. Attention was given to prosecutions of foreign newspapers such as *Gay News* and *The Body Politic* for publishing articles on pedophilia, and to an article in a Dutch paper criticizing biases toward it.

In 1977 the COC produced a special issue on pedophilia which contained a non-judgmental portrayal of a man-boy love affair, as well as articles on pedophile women and police attitudes toward pedophilia. In yet another article, the COC's own attitude was criticized: "Undoubtedly, many homosexuals have been inclined to pass the Old Maid of discrimination on to the pedophiles."²² In fact, however, the article went on, pedophiles were subjected to the same sort of discrimination as homosexuals. "A general human trait, diffused in greater or lesser proportions through the whole of society, is universally suppressed and ascribed only to one small group. This group becomes earmarked by that single trait, whereas sexual preference is only one aspect of a person, just like height, sex, left-handedness,

skin color, and so on.’’²² The writer argued that the COC could be a good deal more active toward combating the intense discrimination against pedophiles. He expressed the hope ‘‘that we will once see the day when people will make no more of a fuss about pedophilia than they now do about left-handedness, birth-control devices, or the danger of getting spinal consumption by masturbation.’’²²

The COC’s growing amicability toward pedophilia appeared to have been stimulated to a great extent by the self-organization of pedophiles and their subsequent emergence into the public eye, which was in turn facilitated by the fact that sexual liberation during this period was generally considered an important societal value. After the distinction between heterosexual and homosexuals regarding age of consent had been eliminated in 1971, the age limit itself came under attack by pedophiles and other groups, and the resulting debate was carried on not only within organizations like the NVSH and the COC, but also in wider circles.

An additional factor prompting the COC’s more favorable treatment of pedophilia was the increased opposition among gays to the conformist homosexual-idea of the 1960s. The practice of cultivating public sympathy and understanding for the fellow man or woman ‘‘who happens to be gay’’ became tantamount to the denigration of gays. The idea of self-acceptance was transformed into an imperative to come out into the open, confronting society with gay lifestyles.¹⁸ Radical gay groups outside the COC formed the vanguard in this change of strategy, but the COC gradually followed their example in the course of the 1970s. The principal concern lay in individuals opting for a gay identity, determining for themselves ‘‘what’’ they are, and shaping their own homosexuality, instead of trying to live up to the expectations of society. This viewpoint created room for other sexual forms such as pedophilia, transvestitism, and sadomasochism, which the gay movement had, for opportunistic reasons, formerly disdained.

However, this increased support for pedophilia provoked denouncement from thus far unexpected circles—including lesbian feminists. “In a society that sees women as the possession of men,” they wrote, “nothing is more exciting than to possess an object that has never before been possessed.” This attack formed one of the few instances in the late 1970s in which negative voices were heard within the COC regarding pedophilia.

As a result of the changing attitudes toward pedophilia, in 1980 the COC convoked a nation-wide conference for the purpose of working out a preliminary position on pedophilia to be voted on by the annual congress of the organization.²³ Adopting a position had become necessary, in part, because of discussions over the issue within the International Gay Association. In the circular announcing the conference, it was pointed out that the debate over pedophilia had long been held off by the COC. The organization’s earlier stance condemning pedophilia was criticized, although it was conceded that that position had probably facilitated increased acceptance of homosexuality by society.

Criticism of the “moral code of compulsory heterosexuality” played an important role in the discussions during the conference. The dominant social code allowed for only one form of sexuality: between one man and one woman, lifelong, within a narrowly circumscribed role division based on male power. Both child-rearing methods and the education system were held responsible for sustaining heterosexual morality, which enforced the oppression of homosexuality, pedophilia, and child sexuality. On the basis of this analysis, the COC congress later resolved that “the struggle for the liberation of gay men and women (must) also strive for a radical change in notions regarding the sexuality of children and sexual relations between minors and adults. . . . Successful gay liberation must include pedo-liberation, or we will have achieved nothing.”

The congress further held that mutually consenting contacts between children and adults were not harmful for those concerned. Any damage that did occur “results exclusively from

existing societal condemnation of such contacts, which finds expression not only in the attitudes of parents and other persons responsible for children, but above all in the continuing liability to prosecution and the resulting interrogations and other procedures, convictions, and the fear of them.' According to the congress ages of consent should therefore be abolished. On the other hand, protection should be afforded to children and adults alike against sexual violence, both mental and physical. Violence and other constraints should be deterred, not sexuality. In addition to adopting these standpoints, the congress also resolved to participate in activities directed at the revision of public morality legislation, to integrate these standpoints into its educational and publicity activities, and to support the development of informative materials on pedophilia and child sexuality.

CONCLUSION: TOWARD A NEW GAY IDENTITY?

The future will have to tell whether the COC, by assuming standpoints like those of 1980, as a gay organization can contribute to ending oppression of pedophilia, an oppression which the COC itself has partly helped to foster. But this change of course could moreover have implications for homosexuals themselves. When the first COC magazine appeared in 1946, few models existed for people to identify with when becoming aware of their homosexual desires. The COC magazine provided a positive image of homosexuality, and this presumably played a determining role for the readers in learning to shape their homosexual desires and in acquiring a homosexual identity. As this article has attempted to show, that homosexual identity is far from a historical constant; rather, its content is dependent on societal conditions and is also influenced by the gay movement. Due to the growing visibility of homosexuality, such identification models for persons with homosexual feelings have meanwhile con-

siderably increased, both in number and availability. Consequently, the role of COC publications in helping homosexuals form their personal identities has probably diminished. Nevertheless, by acknowledging the affinity between homosexuality and pedophilia, the COC has quite possibly made it easier for homosexual adults to become more sensitive to erotic desires of younger members of their sex, thereby broadening gay identity.

NOTES

1. Negative reactions from the gay movement have not been confined to the Netherlands, but are also commonplace in other countries such as Great Britain and the United States. See for example Reeves, T. (1983, June). "Man-Boy Scenes in the United States," Paper presented at the conference *Among Men, Among Women*, University of Amsterdam. In addition to portraying his own process of coming out as a boy lover, Reeves described in this paper the founding of the North American Man-Boy Love Association, NAMBLA, and the negative reactions to it from the left and from gay organizations. The international journal for man-boy love, *PAN*, which is published in the Netherlands, regularly reports on clashes between gay groups and pedophiles in countries throughout the world.

2. See Tielman, R., "The Dutch gay emancipation movement," elsewhere in this issue.

3. The spelling, and more importantly, the meaning of the concept pedophilia did not remain consistent during the period studied. Initially, for example, the term referred only to sexuality and, in particular, to love between men and boys, heterosexual and lesbian pedophilia did not seem to exist. Although it is not the intention of this article to trace the history of the concept of pedophilia, differences in meaning will sometimes be pointed out or will become evident in certain contexts. As will be made clear, the variations in intended meaning originated in part due to political considerations. One major change occurred with respect to the maximum age of the younger partner, which determined whether relationships were considered pedophile. In the Dutch literature on pedophilia, the maximum age employed at this writing is 15 years, on the grounds that only sexual contacts with persons 15 and younger are punishable by law. The research materials used for this article revealed, however, that in the 1940s and 1950s sexual attraction to boys of older age was also referred to as pedophilia. When pedophilia referred to older boys the term "ephebophilia" was also sporadically used. The lowering of the age limit was presumably influenced by the decriminalization in 1971 of homosexual contacts between adults and persons 16 years and older. (Cf. Salden, M. The Dutch penal law and homosexual conduct, elsewhere in this issue.)

4. Since its founding, the COC has published periodicals with varying titles; in some periods two periodicals were published simultaneously, one aiming at the members only, and the other at a wider audience. At all times, however, the number of copies printed slightly outnumbered the number of COC-members at the time (Tielman, R., personal correspondence).

DIRECTORY OF COC PERIODICALS

<i>Title</i>	<i>Target Group</i>	<i>Period</i>	<i>Frequency</i>
<i>Levensrecht</i> (Right to Live)	Members	1946-49	Approx. Monthly
<i>Vriendschap</i> (Friendship)	Members	1949-64	Monthly
<i>Dialoog</i> (Dialogue)	Members and Other Interested Parties	1965-68	Bi-monthly
<i>De Schakel</i> (The Link)	Members	1965-67	Monthly
<i>De Schakelkrant</i> (The Link Newsletter)	Members	1967-69	Monthly
<i>Informatie</i> <i>Bulletin Dialoog</i>	Members and Other Interested Parties	1968-72	Bi-monthly
<i>Seq</i>	Members	1969-71	Monthly
<i>Sik</i>	Active Members	1970-71	Approx. Monthly
<i>Sec</i>	Members	1971-73	Every 4 Weeks
<i>Sek</i>	Members and Other Interested Parties	1973-Present	Every 4 Weeks

All issues of these periodicals through 1980 were used for the content analysis. Publications of local chapters, as well as other potentially fruitful sources such as minutes of meetings, had to be omitted from the study for practical reasons. In the material, relevant texts were sought by means of catchwords and phrases such as *pedophilia*, *pedophile*, *children*, *boy*, *youth*, *youngster*, *young people*, *girl*, *child*, *sexuality*, *emancipation*, and *definition of homosexuality*. Illustrations were also observed. All quotations cited in this article are derived from periodicals listed above.

5. The use of the more traditional spellings "paedophilia" and "paedophile" in this section reflects comparable Dutch usage in the early publications. In these, the archaic Dutch spellings *paedophilie* and *paedophiel* are consistently maintained instead of the now standard spellings *pedoflie* and *pedofiel*, hinting that pedophilia is a practice rooted in classical antiquity. The corresponding English spellings are used here, where appropriate.

6. Arent van Santhorst was the pseudonym used by Jaap van Leeuwen, one of the founders of the COC. Until the early 1960s most people writing in the COC publications did so under pseudonyms.

7. Servatius was the pseudonym of Frits Bernard, an internationally known psychologist. *Costa Brava* was published in English translation in *Gay Sunshine Journal*,

no. 47 (1982). *Vervolgde minderheid* has been published in German under the title *Verfolgte Minderheit* by Foerster-Verlag, Berlin.

8. The titillation did not, however, occur openly, but was camouflaged and legitimized by transposing the actions to other eras or other cultures and by packaging it artistically. The illustrations must be viewed in the context of the immediate post-World War II period, when the depiction of nudity and sexuality in publications was taboo. But the editors undoubtedly practiced self-censorship as well. Initially, the activities and publications of the fledgling COC were closely shadowed by the police. Tamboer, K. (1972). "Justitiedossier." *Dialog*, 1:1. The series referred to here about homo-erotic elements in boys-books had to be discontinued following objections by the public prosecutor.

Precisely which things are experienced as erotically exciting are greatly dependent on when and where they are published. The attention given to young boys in the early COC publications was probably experienced as more exciting at that time than it would be now.

In order to avoid legal difficulties, the COC at first did not permit persons under 21 years of age to join. The membership in these years was, moreover, predominantly male.

9. Anonymous (1949), *Beschermt de jeugd!* (Protect the youth!) *Vriendschap* (Friendship), 4, (4), 13.

10. Bruno was the pseudonym of Edward Brongersma, who from 1972 onward also published on pedophilia under his own name. He has made, and continues to make, important contributions to the emancipation of pedophilia.

11. See note 5.

12. The International Committee for Sexual Equality was founded in the Netherlands in order to bring about international cooperation between homophile organizations. Due to the lack of strength of the other participating organizations, the Committee ceased existence within a few years.

13. See Salden, M., op. cit.

14. The "expert" was the criminologist Professor Pompe, writing in a special issue of the magazine devoted to Article 248-bis. The issue was entitled, strangely enough, indecent assault against minors. The other contributions opposed the seduction theory and called for the repeal of the Article.

15. This report was prepared by the National Health Council, an official advisory council to the Netherlands government concerning issues of mental and physical public health.

16. Anonymous, 1971, *Advies Gezondheidsraad inzake 248bis*. (Advice of the Health Council related to 248bis.) *Informatie Bulletin Dialog* (Information Bulletin Dialogue), 4, (3), 82-84.

17. Schofield, M. (1965). *Social aspects of homosexuality*. London: Longman. In this study, in which pedophiles were referred to as "child molesters," Schofield compared, among other things, men who were imprisoned for homosexual contacts with other adults (21 years and older) with men imprisoned for sexual contacts with boys under 16. Besides the fact that he found no significant differences in their backgrounds, his findings could, moreover, in no way be generalized to all homosexuals and all pedophiles, because of his overly selective sample.

18. Tielman, R. (1982). *Homoseksualiteit in Nederland* (Homosexuality in The Netherlands). Meppel: Boom.

19. Onstenk, A. (1983). *Van brede schouders tot hoge hakken: Veranderende*

beeldvorming over lesbische vrouwen in de periode 1939-1965. (From broad shoulders to high heels: Changing images of lesbian women in the period 1939-1965.) Amsterdam: SUA (Student Press Amsterdam).

20. Like the COC, the NVSH was founded in 1946 as the post-war continuation of the Nieuw Malthusiaanse Bond (New Malthusian League), which had been active predominantly in promoting birth-control education. The principal aim of the present-day NVSH is "the emancipation of individuals and community in a sexual perspective." Initially, the NVSH was rather heterosexually oriented.

21. Just as gays came out of the closets, pedophiles come out of the bushes in rain-coats with candy. An important event in this connection was the public congress *Pedophilia and Society*, organized by pedophiles in 1977 in cooperation with the Dutch National Center for Public Mental Health.

22. Tielman, R. (1977), Niemand is heilig. (Nobody is saintly.) *COC-Sek*, 7, (6), 9-10.

23. The COC congress is the highest policy-making body in that organization. It convenes yearly to evaluate the plans and the functioning of the executive committee.