

*Child Protection and the Discursive  
Construction of the Pedophile:*

*Genealogical Investigations*

**Robert D. Teixeira**

A thesis submitted in conformity with the requirements  
for the degree of Master of Arts  
Department of Sociology and Equity Studies in Education  
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the  
University of Toronto  
Toronto, Ontario  
Canada

© Copyright by Robert D. Teixeira, 2004



Library and  
Archives Canada

Bibliothèque et  
Archives Canada

Published Heritage  
Branch

Direction du  
Patrimoine de l'édition

395 Wellington Street  
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4  
Canada

395, rue Wellington  
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4  
Canada

*Your file* *Votre référence*

*ISBN: 0-612-95591-5*

*Our file* *Notre référence*

*ISBN: 0-612-95591-5*

The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing the Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

---

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

**Canada**

# ABSTRACT

---

## **Child Protection and the Discursive Construction of the Pedophile: Genealogical Investigations**

Robert D. Teixeira

Master of Arts Degree  
September, 2004

Department of Sociology and Equity Studies in Education  
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto

In this thesis, I make use of genealogy to investigate the social construction of a moral panic surrounding the sexual abuse of children. The focus of my work is the discursive construction of the “pedophile.” I wish to investigate how the figure of the pedophile serves as a catalyst and engine for multiple social effects that impact on our understanding of issues surrounding child protection, sexual abuse, families, policing, and human sexuality, to name a few. I will focus on the emergence and operation of discourses of the pedophile as a “constitutive outside” to dominant discourses of the social and the family. Representations of the abject subject that is the pedophile also serve as a nodal point for social anxieties which become concentrated and telescoped onto particular social actors. This thesis is an attempt to make some space for critical examinations of a set of social and discursive practices that assemble an image of the pedophile and the threat it signifies. I hope this thesis will serve as a way to expose the ideological work behind our culture’s maintenance of this figure, and to point to some of the effects that particular configurations of knowledge about pedophilia authorize with respect to the management of this phenomena.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

---

This thesis has been in gestation for many years. Even before taking up residence as a part-time Masters student, I have accumulated many debts for the concerted social, political and intellectual work that constitutes this document.

Foremost, I would like to whole-heartedly thank my supervisor, Dr. Kari Dehli. Her incisive guidance and unflagging dedication to students' work is testament to her determination to create truly progressive pedagogical engagements for her students. I benefited tremendously from the challenging courses she taught in the Department of Sociology and Equity Studies in Education at OISE/UT.

Next, I would like to thank Dr. Sheryl Nestel, my second reader. Sheryl has been tremendous in her support and encouragement for my work, believing in me and helping me through some trying times as I was adjusting to the demands of graduate studies. Discussions with her before and during preparation of this thesis, which was spurred on by her excellent course, "Marginality and the Politics of Resistance," have proven invaluable.

I have been very lucky to have wonderful friends who have been very supportive and encouraged me in the pursuit of my studies. Alan O'Connor and Robin Isaacs (*nom de guerre*, Robynski), whom I have known for close to 15 years, were and remain important political mentors. I am most fortunate to have forged intimate friendships with them and they continue to be important allies. My brother Richard Teixeira has challenged me and my thinking on the topic for years. I owe him a continual debt for incisive engagements with political and social theory, pushing me to clarify and develop

my ideas. I would like to thank Allan W. Paul, a dedicated art teacher whom I shared my life with for eight years. He patiently listened and supported me and my critical thinking, and helped temper my more hasty and extreme thinking when this thesis was just an inchoate jumble of ideas. Dwayne Shaw, my current lover, friend and compatriot, has been a tremendous support, offering his seemingly unlimited reserve of patience and understanding. His supremely sane, balanced and spirited view of life gently infuses itself into my own work and my life, making both better than they otherwise would be. Journalist and poet, Sheila O’Hearn, has been a beacon of patience, support and guidance for me, never failing to push me to imagine possibilities in times of difficulties and flagging confidence.

I want to thank all the great folks I met during my time facilitating a course called, “Radical Perspectives on Sexuality” as part of the Anarchist Free University. Meeting such articulate and thoughtful folks who were just as engaged with thinking about sexuality as I was has been tremendously inspiring. They have helped me realize that critical thinking on the topic of pedophilia is more pervasive than I previously imagined.

Still other friends and colleagues (new and old) have been generally supportive of me, sharing ideas, articles, and books and providing me with intellectual leads and uncovering connections, these are, (in no particular order): Alan Yoshioka, Eric Mykhalovskiy, Wayne Winton, Louise Bak, Bill Brown, the late Robert Trow (1948-2002), James Dubro, Nathaniel Paul, Barry Green, Luis Jacob, Robert Johnson, Robindra Sidhu, Martin Duchesne, and Domenico Callà.

Finally, I'd like to acknowledge my dear late parents, Maria Liliana Raposo (1931-1984) and David Sousa Teixeira (1926-1989), as important primary influences, having benefited from the valuable stores of their emotional, social and cultural capital. Through the example of their life and ultimately, their untimely demise, I have forged myself into the person that now takes up residence under my skin. Although they might have found the thesis I have chosen to produce as problematic, as the son of working-class Portuguese immigrants, I know they would had been supremely thrilled to know I have had the opportunity to produce it.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

**ABSTRACT / ii**

**ACKNOWLEDGMENTS / iii**

**INTRODUCTION / 1**

**CHAPTER ONE**

*Towards a Genealogy of Pedophilia / 17*

**CHAPTER TWO**

*Laboratories of Desire: Pedophilia and the Governmentality  
of Psychiatric Knowledge / 58*

**CHAPTER THREE**

*Discourses of Innocence and Protection: The Social and Moral  
Regulation of Children and Youth / 96*

**CHAPTER FOUR**

*Troubling Subject, Troubling Theory / 125*

**CONCLUSION / 155**

**BIBLIOGRAPHY / 168**

## INTRODUCTION

---

“Weeding out the child molester.” The case of a Big Brother who sexually abused a boy two decades ago illustrates the importance of maintaining a rigorous process to screen for pedophiles.

--Henry Hess, *The Globe & Mail*, 20 November 1993

“Pedophile, 50 sent to prison indefinitely.” He could quite easily return to a predatory lifestyle if released.

--Philip Mascoll, *The Toronto Star*, 23 June 1994

They could be anywhere. They could be anyone. In Canada alone, they may number in the hundreds of thousands. And they lust after children. Pedophiles often work as teachers, choirmasters, clergy and volunteers in order to be close to their young victim.

--Heather Ibbotson, *The Toronto Star*, 20 October 1994

“Pedophile may strike again, police warn.” Toronto police are warning parents to be on the lookout for a pedophile who was released from jail yesterday.

--Andrew Mitrovica, *The Globe & Mail*, 4 December 1999

“Former B.C. Judge admits to sex assaults against 4 teen girls.” The four victims are aboriginal women. At the time of the assaults, they were all under 18 and one was 12 ...[t]he 61-year-old retired judge stunned a crowded courtroom by pleading guilty to three counts of buying sex from minors, one count of sexual assault causing bodily harm and one count of breach of trust relating to the duties of his office.

--Jane Armstrong, *The Globe & Mail*, 4 May 2004

To many the whole subject of pedophilia is an open and shut case. Those who harm children, especially, it seems in a sexual manner, deserve all the punishment they get. There is nothing left to be done, no moral issues attached to an unruly subject who is deemed unable to govern themselves. The protection of children takes precedence over the subtleties of jurisprudence and scientific inquiry on the abject subject of pedophilia. As such, there is very little room for critical thinking, no layers of subtlety and certainly no place for opposition or dissent in a culture which has declared the pursuit of pedophiles and the abuse of children a permanent state of emergency.

Then, as is often the case in a political state of emergency, dialogue shuts down, coercion increases and dissenters are jailed. This scenario would not be too far afield in describing the current state of affairs involving contemporary Western culture's dealings with child sexuality and sex offenders. "We have," to quote U.S. sexuality scholar Gayle Rubin, "become dangerously crazy about sexuality" (Rubin, 1984: 267).

There is an increasing sexual panic afoot which surrounds these lurid cases of sexual predators that are ubiquitous in the media. The effects of this sexual panic are manifold, producing rigid social polarities and regulating social responses. The panic over children's sexuality and its corollary, the hysteria over pedophilia, are fused

together, producing multiple effects. Yet continuing critical examination of the sources and effects of this sexual panic is badly needed. Those who have called attention to the panic surrounding children's sexuality and have pointed to our culture's obtuse dealings with the sexuality of the young have, just for holding critical or dissenting views, often been accused of being "pedophile apologists" or covert pedophiles themselves. This thesis is an attempt to unpack these confounded subjects, and to try to make sense of their complex entanglements beneath the roar of public outrage. It is an attempt to turn down the volume on our habitual reactions, in order to see what other sounds we can discover, what other layers we have yet to uncover and to discuss.

The press screams red with the blood of innocents with every new revelation of sexual molestation. (I thought I'd try out a bit of sensational language myself). Emboldened by sensational media reports, vigilante citizen groups seem to know no limits to repressive measures, rooting out from communities sexual offenders who have been released after serving their jail time. Sensational press reports are *de rigueur*, it seems, when dealing with this issue. Witness the opening statement from Heather Ibbotson writing for the *Toronto Star* in October 1994, "They could be anywhere. They could be anyone. In Canada alone, they may number in the hundreds of thousands. And they lust after children." The quaint storytelling aspect of this opening salvo is only reiterated throughout as the article is a confused *mélange* of conflicting facts and statistics devoid of context. Another clue to a slapdash journalistic effort is her incorrect translation of the term, "pedophilia," as "child" and "abnormal fondness." Rather, the etymology of "pedophilia" reveals its derivation from Greek roots for "child" and "love."

Around the time of the “Child Porn Probe” in London, Ontario in 1993-95, editors of the *London Free Press* were asked why they continued to report on a “child porn” case after it was established that no one was being charged under the child pornography law. The editor basically admitted that articles that announce “Child Porn” and “Pedophile Rings” sell more papers (Greyson, 1995).

The above selected quotations from various newspaper articles, although dealing with disparate cases, display a monotone of sensational reporting. Some of the writing evokes news stories that we tend to associate with earlier days. Even though the horror the stories attempt to evoke seems novel, the style seems to be one that critical observers are too familiar with, evocative of nostalgic simplicity and a return to an impossible dreamy landscape of consolatory consensus morality. Yet the trends in the reporting of pedophilia, although bearing the hallmarks of uniformity, betray a disturbing difference. Apparently, not all pedophiles are created equal, nor are they represented with consistency. It is quite apparent, even from the small and non-representative selection that I have chosen as my epigraphs, that there is a marked difference, for instance, between how offenders against boys and those against girls are depicted. Offenders against girls are infrequently labeled pedophile, and when they are, it is evoked as an inconvenient appurtenance. Offenders against boys almost never escape from the ascription of that morbid appellation. As I will show, these distinctions are not confined solely to the province of lazy reporters and the media’s drive for profit; they also inhere within the methodologies and assumptions of medical science that take the pedophile as their subject, being constitutive of both popular and scientific discourse.

My thesis is an attempt to excavate why this is so. It is an attempt to answer the question as to why pedophilia, understood in specific ways, has become a prominent concern for the overdeveloped West. At the same time, this acute concern does not surface in the same way in other countries, and in other locales, fails to manifest at all. It is curious that this fact has failed to register more deeply. It is also striking that the discourse of pedophilia betrays stark gender hierarchies, and these divisions inhere deeply within how the issue comes to be configured in popular and scientific discourse.

The first step in my intrepid project will be to attempt to situate the emergence of the pedophile in an historical context. We have not always been subjected to the appearance of this figure in popular discourse. Indeed, not just twenty years ago, it was quite rare to encounter media coverage of pedophilia (Sonenschein, 1999; Jenkins, 1992). There has been an undeniable acceleration in the West of the attention the figure of the pedophile exerts on our collective consciousness. Thus, in Chapter One, I will attempt to map out possible avenues that have been taken in the turbulent production of the discourse of the pedophile. I will show how the “sexually dangerous other” has emerged and been discursively figured in the past. As I will show, eerily similar attention had been given to individuals deemed sexually deviant or dangerous in the late nineteenth century. Also, attention was focused on these individuals in the years leading up to World War II, with an acute eruption in the immediate post-war years, 1948-1960. That these figures were largely coded as homosexual, is integral to the manner that the problem of pedophilia has been socially constructed and policed. As I will suggest, the discourse of pedophilia also participates, albeit in a more coded form, in patterns of heteronormative, gendered, racialized and classed social hierarchies.

Chapter Two will look closely at how the pedophile is produced within scientific discourse, specifically in the discipline of psychiatry. The fields of assessment, diagnosis and treatment of sex offenders and those labeled pedophiles has been paid scant critical attention. The prevailing popular view legitimates any medical solution for the eradication of the offender's sexual desire, amplifying the role that psychiatry plays in finding solutions to social problems. Yet, what this perspective ignores is the politics surrounding psychiatric practices that promote a particular production of knowledge about human sexuality, configured within a regime of normalization. These are practices which are designed to alter the sex offender's affective behaviour, radically modify their desire, suppress or redirect their sexual impulses, and socialize them to "normative" standards of behaviour. When these measures fail, we authorize chemical castration or bury them in prisons under "indefinite sentencing" laws. My analysis will also take into account how practices of medicine and juridical discourses are mutually constitutive, in the detection, surveillance and policing of pedophilia. The pedophile appears in connection with a massive shift in Western countries that is generally marked by the erosion of the welfare state, signaling radically new directions for social welfare provision. Practices which combine a new aggressive form of medico-policing, an emergence of a new administrative-medical alignment of power and a new "mutation" in scientific rationality, figure centrally in the intense social drama the pedophile represents.

Chapter Three will attempt to uncover the discursive links between the modern conception of the child and the social construction of the pedophile. Surely, the presence of the figure of the pedophile is intimately conjoined with the figure of the child. It would not be possible to imagine the pedophile without bringing the figure of the child into

play. The specific configuration in which pedophilia is invoked functions, I will argue, as a form of moral regulation. Notions of the family and the child under threat are mobilized, producing practices of normalization. That the presence of the child in the discourse is taken for granted, and that assumptions about her are mobilized, is a major component of the social effects that the pedophile discourse produces. I will discuss how hierarchies and demarcations maintained and reproduced through hegemonic discourses of the family, socially construct and help to fortify and reify an image of the “dangerous outsider.” By engaging feminist perspectives on incest, I hope to show how the pedophile emerges as a constitutive “outside” to the systems of exclusions, denials and exculpatory practices that dominant discourses of the child and the family accomplish.

Chapter Four is an attempt to consider what happens when the subject of the pedophile is critically produced within contemporary social theory. Specifically, I will turn my attention to the tensions that exist between Foucauldian thought and feminism as these are set out in Linda’s Alcoff’s substantive engagement with Foucault on the topic of pedophilia. These critical examinations that exist in the “Alcoff-Foucault” debate are ones that inhere more generally between feminist exploration of the subject in post-structuralist theory and in Foucauldian thought. There is no easy resolution to these complex issues, and this chapter is an attempt to set out some of the important contours of larger debates which remain critically alive and largely unconcluded within contemporary social theory.

In this thesis I suggest that contemporary perceptions and modes of governing pedophilia are continuous with other social phenomena. Thus, the existence of pedophilia as a social problem can be understood in broader context. It is not merely a

matter of isolated deviance and pathology. My goal is to see how the concept of pedophilia can be disturbed from its (un)stable moorings, in order to allow new perspectives to emerge. This approach wrests the conceptualizations of pedophilia from their over-determined axes as individualizing pathology toward an approach which views the pedophile as a cultural figure and a category of knowledge production, embedded in a set of hegemonic discourses.

I will examine the phenomenon of pedophilia through a Foucauldian lens. Foucault's work is important to my thesis since it represents an important shift in how sexuality studies have been taken up by feminists, queer scholars and others. Centrally, Foucault shifts the focus of inquiry from uncovering essential desire and its "repression," where sexuality is produced as a regime of truth about the individual, toward an examination of how multiple discourses produce and organize the way we come to know sexuality and identity. Foucault asks how truth regimes govern our understanding of the intersection of sexuality and the social. My analysis is also influenced by recent work within feminism, post-structuralism, and post-colonial theory, as these allow new optics in the constitution of Western subjectivity and social discourses. While an important topic, my thesis does not attempt an exhaustive analysis of the extensive feminist work on the family. These perspectives have been important for locating the family as a site of material, gender, and sexual exploitation, elaborating and applying various strands of thought such as socialist-feminist, Marxist and cultural feminist analyses. The main focus of this thesis is the emergence and operation of discourses of the pedophile as a "constitutive outside" to dominant discourses of the social and the family. While pedophile discourses participate in stark gender hierarchies, I contend that feminist

critiques of the family are not the most effective strategies to destabilize pedophilia in the way I seek to do. This is because I seek to destabilize the category pedophilia, while most feminist critiques of the family take a materialist approach, where pedophilia is taken for granted as a category. I argue that new modes of domination involving the social organization of knowledge and identities that are not reducible to the way the family is organized by economic forces in the late-capitalist era, are crucial to the way the problem of pedophilia is produced and managed within scientific, juridical and popular discourses. Additionally, although contemporary critical psychoanalytic work on sexuality and the dynamics of the family would be important perspectives to engage, these important bodies of thought would take me beyond the scope of what is reasonably possible in a thesis of this length. My focus, to repeat, is on the discursive organization, operation and effects of pedophilia, rather than on the material experience and psychic “take-up” of it by those who are inscribed by this category. I look forward to work by others who engage the topic of pedophilia within the ambit of critical (feminist and queer) psychoanalysis.

Now, for the part that you have been waiting for: my personal interest in the topic. I have been interested in a project that critically investigates the phenomena of pedophilia for a long time. It is daunting to think that this topic has been swirling around in my head for close to a decade, going back to my first years as an undergraduate student. During that time I was assiduously compiling information and reading histories of the gay and lesbian liberation movement, attempting to educate myself on a rich history of community building, social protest, legal/medical challenges and local solidarity. Material which invoked the social and political issues surrounding intergenerational sex

and the sexuality of children and youth, was not infrequently encountered. In addition, my readings of the social and political histories of gay men and lesbians, including a spate of biographies that I delved into, revealed the phenomenon of intergenerational sex and relationships as more commonly encountered than I had previously thought.

My thinking on the topic became more focused and urgent with the inauguration of Canada's new Child Pornography Law in August 1993. This law enabled a particularly intense period of arrests, sensational media coverage and general repression, but also produced potent opposition and dissent. I was active in this initial phase of events surrounding the Child Porn Law, which occurred from 1993-1995. A quick overview of the major events of the period will illustrate how this period served as a political and social catalyst for myself and many others who were engaging in critical thinking and dissent surrounding the issues of "child pornography," teen prostitution and pedophilia.

During May and June of 1993 the Standing Committee on Justice and the Solicitor General began talks on Bill C-128, an act to amend the Canadian Criminal Code to prohibit child pornography and institute sentences for production, distribution and mere possession. Tom Wappell, then Ontario MP with a sordid history of homophobic and anti-queer public speech, figured prominently in the discussion, pushing for a ban on written material that "promotes pedophilia." He continually raised the specter of the *NAMBLA Bulletin*, promoting the perspective during the proceedings that these publications which he linked to the gay and lesbian community generally, are a primary cause of threat to children (Standing Committee, Issue 105, 1993; Persky & Dixon, 2001: 88-9). Some have criticized the haste with which this major piece of legislation was rushed through during the final days of the conservative government; the Bill was

introduced May 13 and passed on June 15. On 1 August 1993, the new “Child Pornography Law” (Section 163.1) of the Canadian Criminal Code came into effect. This law prohibits pictorial or written representations of sexual acts involving anyone who is or appears to be under 18 years of age. The law sets out prohibitions on representation by proscribing “explicit sexual activity,” or depiction whereby “the dominant characteristic of which ... for a sexual purpose, of a sexual organ or the anal region” (C.C.C. s. 163.1(2)) of any person who is or *appears* to be under 18 years of age. The law imposes a harsh maximum penalty of five years in prison for people found in possession of or distributing what is broadly defined as child pornography. Production of child pornography, in visual, written, and even auditory forms of representation of anyone under 18 or appearing to be under 18, carries a 10-year maximum penalty.

On 8 November 1993 London, Ontario police raided two homes after coming into possession of a bag of 40 videotapes found by a teenage boy fishing in a nearby river. According to court documents, the bag of tapes contained “Hollywood movies ... legal commercial gay pornography, and some were homemade sex tapes of mostly teenage males and ... one boy who was eleven years old” (Couture, 1995: 16).<sup>1</sup> Police will charge Gary Gramlick and Edward Jewell with sex and pornography related offenses. Over the following months, police view videotapes, identify the young men in them, question them and proceed to arrest and charge the older men who paid for sexual services. Eventually, forty-five men were charged, with a total of 371 charges laid. These series of events snowballed into what became known in the media as a “Child Porn Ring”

---

<sup>1</sup> It is interesting to note that the *Toronto Star* ran a front-page story in the Saturday Special which began to stoke the flames of a large child porn operation in Toronto two months before the events in London occurred. See John Duncanson, “Metro a child porn centre: police say” *The Toronto Star*, 18 September 1993, pp. A1, A28.

in London, Ontario, used politically by then London Police Chief Julian Fantino, in May 1994 when police raided the home of Buryl Wilson and seize more than 800 videotapes. Mr. Wilson was never charged on the basis of any of the tapes, (indeed it was later revealed that most were Hollywood films, National Geographic specials and shows taped from television), yet London police used the occasion to press for Provincial funding for the creation of Project Guardian, a joint-forces investigation with a Province-wide mandate.

In December 1993 an odd confluence of events occurred. Myself and local artist, Luis Jacob, planned to see the first solo show by 26-year old Toronto artist, Eli Langer. Langer's work then had been generating a lot of interest. Indeed, the day we had decided to go see the show instead brought the frightening revelation that it had been raided by the police and that Langer's paintings had been confiscated.<sup>2</sup> On December 16, 1993 Toronto Police seized five paintings and 35 drawings by Eli Langer from the Mercer Union gallery after a review in the *Globe & Mail* by Kate Taylor ("Show Breaks Sex Taboo," 14 December 1993) implied that the sex acts depicted in the work may have contravened the law. The police claimed they were acting on complaints by two individuals, one of whom had not seen the show but merely read the review. Charges laid against Langer and gallery director, Sharon Brooks were later dropped, but the art work was impounded pending forfeiture proceedings.

On January 14, 1994, Matthew McGowan, a then 22-year-old Toronto sex worker and activist for S.W.A.T. (Sex Workers Alliance of Toronto) turned himself in to police,

---

<sup>2</sup> For more on the Langer case consult Elaine Carol, "The Chill Continues—Artists After Bill C-128," *Fuse Magazine* (Fall 1995). See also Elaine Carol, "More Chilling Tales: A Series of Memory Sketches" and Mary Louise Adams, "On Children, Innocence, and Definitions of Sex," both in Lorraine Johnson, 1997. See also Cossman et al, 1997.

in connection with charges stemming from the production of a video depicting sex with his 14-year-old boyfriend and another 14-year-old friend. McGowan was charged with making obscene material, held in jail, suffered an assault while in custody, and was eventually granted bail. The tape shows the three playing sexually, where they negotiate verbally about consent, including discussions about safer sex. Everyone involved in the video was of legal age of consent which is fourteen years of age.<sup>3</sup>

This intense period of policing, in which gay men, sex workers, youth, artists and other cultural workers found themselves caught in the net of over-broad definitions and aggressive policing of so-called child pornography, produced a broad coalition of opposition. Below are some major highlights of these critical, activist and cultural oppositional responses.

On 17 January 1994, a coalition, formed to support victims of the “Youth Porn Law,” organized a demonstration, 200 strong, which marched to Old City Hall courthouse from the Ontario College of Art. Marty Bennett, an OCAD student at the time, documented the event on video.

On 4 March 1994, The Centre for Public Law and Public Policy and the Institute for Feminist Legal Studies at Osgoode Hall, York University held a public forum entitled, “Feminism, Censorship and the Moral Panic of the 1990s: Canada’s New Child Pornography Law.” Speakers included Brenda Cossman, Thelma McCormack, Clare Barclay, Lisa Steele, Becki Ross, Lise Gotell, Shannon Bell and S.W.A.T. (Sex Workers Alliance of Toronto).

---

<sup>3</sup> For more on McGowan’s case consult Bell, 1995 and Shannon Bell, “On ne peut pas voir l’image [the image cannot be seen]” in Cossman et al, 1997. McGowan recounts his harrowing experiences with Toronto police and his investigation by psychiatrists at the Clarke Institute while undergoing penile plethysmography testing to determine if he was a pedophile.

On 12 March 1994, a rally was held at Queen's Park to protest what activists now dubbed the "Youth Porn Law." Matthew McGowan and Eli Langer spoke at this rally, protesting the charges brought against them. This demonstration was organized by the "Repeal the Youth Porn Law" (RYPL) coalition which brought together members from various communities concerned over the moral panic generated by this new law. Other speakers at this rally, which was endorsed by 38 arts and community groups, included: Gary Kinsman, Andrew Sorfleet, Becki Ross, Tim McCaskell, Arif Noorani, Nancy Nicol, and Lynne Fernie. In order to increase public awareness, the RYPL coalition, on 29 June 1994, sponsored a community forum at the 519 Church Street Community Centre in Toronto entitled, "Censored Sexualities: Youth, Queers, Sex Workers & Art." Panelists included Dan Brodsky, Elaine Carol, Eric Dow, Matthew McGowan, Nancy Nicol and Andrew Sorfleet.

Finally, I wish to acknowledge the important work by some pioneering gay and lesbian activists and writers affiliated with the Canadian gay liberation newspaper, *The Body Politic*. The critical journalism, essays and brave individuals involved in this crucial publication have laid some important groundwork for my own investigations. Work by such writers as Chris Bearchell, Jim Monk, Gerald Hannon, Christine Donald, Tim McCaskell, the late Alex Wilson (1953-1993), Ian Young, Mariana Valverde, Paul Trollope, Rick Bébout, and Jearld Moldenhauer have paved the way for critical discussions about children and youth sexuality, censorship and moral panics surrounding prostitution, pornography and pedophilia.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> For an excellent collection of articles from the *Body Politic* see, Ed Jackson and Stan Persky, *Flaunting it! A Decade of Gay Journalism from The Body Politic*. Toronto: Pink Triangle Press, 1982.

Writing this thesis has also had an effect on me personally. I have had a sense that taking a critical perspective on the topic at this historical moment, will necessarily be couched in a defensive tone. I have, at times, seemed to be hedging my arguments, avoided pinning down my thoughts in more definitive accounts. Not always wanting to put my foot down, as it were, to commit myself to an analysis which could become potentially perilous. It is as if I always had a resistant reader perched atop my shoulder, exclaiming, “What is it that you are saying exactly?” or “Do you really want to say that?”

During a student conference at OISE in March 2004, at which I presented an early draft of what is now Chapter Two, one interlocutor, after having commented favourably on the use of Foucault for my critical project, asked me where does one draw the line with children and sex. “Isn’t it morally necessary,” he asks (I paraphrase), “to draw the line at some age? You certainly cannot be saying that having sex with children at whatever age is alright. There has to be a line drawn at some point—a moral line that one does not cross.” Framed in this way, it becomes almost impossible to put forward a coherent argument that escapes censure. It is a mode of inquiry that leads only to the guillotine. Indeed the blades are being sharpened as soon as the question is being formulated. It is toward the question of an absolute morality framed within the protective custody of the image of the child upon which, it seems, many questions pertaining to pedophilia gravitate. It is difficult, indeed potentially perilous, to wriggle free of this interpretive frame. One is rarely given permission to bracket such questions, to stave them off, at least temporarily, so that other questions can be asked, and other aspects of the problem can be explored.

This thesis then, is an attempt to circumvent the executioner's questions. (This is a metaphor, not intended as an attack on the aforementioned interlocutor). It has been an opportunity to explore the complex and troubling waters of an issue which has been mobilized for more than its express purpose of protecting children. A protection, nevertheless, which is also an ambivalent response to a set of social problems which encompass our society's frequently obtuse dealings with the social provision and guardianship of the young.

## CHAPTER ONE

---

### Towards a Genealogy of Pedophilia

#### Methodological Considerations

In this chapter I attempt to show how socially produced subjects have histories. In the case of the pedophile, a history of a medically orchestrated subject which is forced to speak, to be spoken about. It is in the actions that are authorized by particular discursive productions that I have set out to critically interrogate what social effects are produced by the discursive production of pedophilia. I will attempt to explore how pedophilia has been put into discourse in contemporary terms. This subject of knowledge known as “pedophilia” has historical antecedents and, moreover, the channels through which we come to know pedophilia in expert and popular discourse are, from the start, highly regulated.

It is clear the concept of the “pedophile,” although not entirely new, has acquired a cultural signifiatory presence in the West that is unprecedented. Its former residence as an obscure, quasi-scientific term that haunts dusty volumes of sexology and medical journals, has become unmoored. The term pedophilia has gained a power to shock, astonish and mobilize individuals. It has become a sort of stock trade term, it has developed a wide currency; it is invoked in the most quotidian spaces, the word as a signifier has become something we see in print, on television and in other media outlets. How has a previously ignored and specialized concept gained so much popular presence

in a relatively short period of time? As an illustration, imagine the term *klismaphilia*,<sup>1</sup> taking on greater presence within media and expert discourse and a whole system of surveillance emerging, pronouncing on its cause, its cure, its prevalence and how to protect our families and children from its practitioners. Philip Jenkins has commented that the term, *pedophile* was “an extremely rare word in Britain before the 1970s” (Jenkins, 1992: 73). Jenkins mentions that the term can be dated with some precision, emerging in popular discourse in Britain around debates that occurred in the years 1977-1978 (73). Moreover, Jenkins has noted a shift in discourse in Britain about the pedophile from the 1970s to contemporary times. He outlines a shift in popular discourse which considered such individuals initially as rather lonely and “pathetic child molesters” to one where a more threatening stereotype brought pedophilia “within the larger ambit of sexual violence in general, and serial murder in particular” (71).

Foucault’s approach to the study of discourse, is helpful in untying the relationship of medical and psychiatric knowledge production and practices constitutive of subject bodies. Analysis of discourse allows us to see how knowledge and power are constitutive of each other. Fields of knowledge emerge through social, political and institutional contest, where a field of certain utterances are enabled as others are excluded, knitting together institutional bases and qualified interlocutors into a set mode of intelligible statements which make claims for truth. Foucault writes, “there is no power relation without the correlative constitution of a field of knowledge, nor any

---

<sup>1</sup> Klismaphilia is a term described by John Money as: “a paraphilia of the fetishistic/talismanic type in which sexueroic arousal and facilitation or attainment of orgasm are responsive to and dependent upon being given an enema by the partner (from the Greek, *klusma*, enema + *philia*.)” John Money, “Pedophilia, New Phylism Theory, and Paraphilic Lovemaps.” in Jay R. Feierman, ed. 1990. *Pedophilia: Biosocial Dimensions*. New York: Springer-Verlag., p. 460. The medical language kind of takes all the erotic frisson out of kink!

knowledge that does not presuppose and constitutive at the same time power relations” (Foucault, 1979: 27). The common parlance of “knowledge-power” was never intended by Foucault to ossify into a simple formula. Rather, it is the beginning point of investigations into the social, institutional, and discursive arrangements of this relationship.<sup>2</sup> The study of discourse helps us to see how authority relating to objects of knowledge, like pedophilia, is constructed, throwing into relief the possible avenues for re-staging questions about pedophilia. An effort to re-stage pedophilia, as in other efforts which utilize a Foucauldian analysis of the medicalization of homosexuality (Terry, 1999; Rosario, 1997), radically recasts the notional scripts of a dominant discursive production of objects; in this case, unsettling the congealed discursive agglomerations which have over-determined a set of epistemic practices that form a subset of the “peripheral sexualities.”

I will employ a genealogical method of historical investigation. I have come to use Foucault’s formulations as a method of doing historical sociology, primarily since it is a way of diagnosing the present. The activities and ways of knowing that accompany events which invoke the pedophile have become more numerous in recent years. These events have invoked pedophilia in a variety of fashions but always, it seems, with a repeated tedium, as if the truth needs to be struck home by some kind of forceful repetition, a mode of speech which, arguably, insulates itself against more deliberative modes of inquiry.

---

<sup>2</sup> Foucault was posed this question by Gérard Raulet in an interview, to which he responded: “[b]ut you have to understand when I read—and I know it was being attributed to me—the thesis “knowledge is power” or “power is knowledge,” I begin to laugh, since studying their relation is precisely my problem. If they were identical, I would not have to study them and I would be spared a lot of fatigue as a result. The very fact that I pose the question of their relation proves clearly that I do not identify them.” Foucault, “Structuralism and post-structuralism” in James D. Faubion, ed. *Aesthetics, Method, and Epistemology: Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984, Volume 2*. New York: The New Press, 1998, p. 455.

A genealogical historical analysis, as set out by Foucault, attempts to write a strategic and an effective history. It is strategic in the sense that genealogy attempts to uncover the dynamic power relations that have guided the formation of seemingly necessary social constructions. It points to the conditions of possibility or the points of emergence in historical moments in the formation of the notions that comprise discourse. It is an effective history to the extent that these strategically mobilized discursive elements of the past inform contemporary discursive productions, enabling a critical trajectory from the standpoint of the present. This is a historiographical account that refuses any sedimentation into a monument. It is critical through and through; it moves, it lives, and it never rests on its laurels.

Genealogy is a method for uncovering the differential processes implicated in the process of critical social construction. A genealogy respects differences and discontinuities in the turbulent production of subjects; it provides a way of accounting for contradictions, tensions, divisions and heterogeneous elements. A genealogy is thus co-extensive with an examination of the micro-physics of power, operating at times at the smallest of sites or in what may seem like insignificant details of ordinary practices. The analytics of power espoused by Foucault are not, for the most part, monolithic, and they are implicated in the heterogeneity of the social relations in question, and the proliferation of contradictions and divisions of which they are constitutive. In addition, as Todd May reminds us, “[t]he power of institutions ... depend, at least in part, on smaller, more capillary relations of power. The local operation of power does not preclude its concentration at certain points, but it does serve as a reminder that the concentration of power should not be mistaken for its source” (May, 1993: 4).

A genealogy “surfaces” history as a practice, as Foucault scholar, Mitchell Dean explains, “[a] practice undertaken in a particular present and for particular reasons linked to that present. A particular set of actions brought to bear on a particular material” (Dean, 1994: 15). Announcing the importance of specificity and the importance of difference, Foucault writes that genealogy identifies “[t]he accidents, the minute deviations—or conversely, the complete reversals—the errors, the false appraisals, and the faulty calculations that gave birth to those things which continue to exist and have value for us; it is to discover that truth or being lies not at the root of what we know and that we are but the exteriority of accidents” (Foucault, 1998: 374).

A genealogical analysis is a powerful tool; as an analytic strategy it eschews grand theories and *a priori* interpretations. Its focus on the multitudinous stream of data in the form of documents, speech, practices, devices, technologies, and so on, suggests questions and new frameworks for investigations which build slowly and studiously from the mass of accumulated data. In the realm of the investigation of pedophilia in expert discourse, this process for investigation functions to uncover and ameliorate taken-for-granted assumptions and emotive bias in much of the current literature.

The science which underwrites and authorizes a particular version of the “pedophile” continues to have value for us. It has import because it is of a species which is not foreign to the way other objects have been constituted through a multiplicity of discursive practices. Genealogical investigation, following Foucault, is “[t]he union of erudite knowledges and local memories which uncover a historical knowledge of struggles and to make use of this knowledge tactically today” (Foucault, 1980: 83). With this in mind, I will attempt to excavate a trajectory of the disciplinary scientific discursive

practices which have a major import on the categories, exclusions, denials and general configuration in which the pedophile is invoked in contemporary discourse. That which follows will trace a general arc over roughly eighty years of history (from 1880-1960), beginning in the mid-to-late nineteenth century in the West, in order to outline the continuities, deletions, evasions, novelties, and disruptions which will offer insight into how the pedophile is invoked in contemporary discourse.

The aim of a “history of the present” (Dean, 1994), in which I am engaging, prevents anachronistic understandings of the past that attempt to make the present a necessary outcome of a continuous past. In so doing, it makes intelligible the latent possibilities of the present; yet it does so by eschewing rational unified schemes of emancipatory meta-narratives of progress. Most importantly, it seeks to avoid telling a seamless narrative about the way things have come to be. Traditional historical narratives participate in a teleological conception of history which posit what exists as an inevitable outcome of a series of events and personalities of the past, usually with the focus on grand events and powerful individuals. Marxist historians have attempted to redress the balance of the grand histories by paying attention to local, marginalized or unauthorized histories. There has been much important work in feminist, gay and lesbian and working-class histories which examines the effects of power on those whose voices, experiences and perspectives have been suppressed or marginalized in official histories. To be sure, important work, inflected by Marxist methodology, has been done which has helped unearth stories, narratives, and local knowledges and specific modes of self-fashioning neglected by dominant narratives. However, other models for understanding the regulation of the social and of the self are needed, particularly modes of seeing that can

attend to the complex ways of social regulation and the production of subjectivity which supercede a method of analysis which privileges the mode of production as analytical frame or univocal systems of difference. In this thesis I work toward a nuanced, and specific historical approach; an approach which can lay aside the premise that history is some grand unfolding which is catalyzed by a central or privileged source, be that the mode of production, the masses or the king. It is my contention that affiliated modes of critical inquiry performed by gay and lesbian historical and critical scholarship have enabled critical sexuality studies which make my investigations here possible and necessary.

### **Setting the Stage: The Emergence of Nineteenth Century Medicalizing Discourse**

Histories of the medicalization of sexual danger that formulated homosexuality in discourse in the nineteenth century have more than a passing family resemblance to how the pedophile is produced in contemporary discourse. In order to begin an investigation into the emergence of the “pedophile” in the present it is necessary, therefore, to sketch out how the “homosexual” was invoked and produced in the machinations of science and medicine in the nineteenth century in the West.

During this time Western nation-states were consolidating their power in world-wide geopolitical contests for supremacy; a system of colonial conquest and plunder which stretches back to the European renaissance. The disorganizing social relations of colonialism in the peripheral economies served to establish social relations in center economies which could accommodate the extension of liberal democratic rights, such as the enlargement of male suffrage for the working-classes (female suffrage was excluded).

The rise in population management brought science and medicine into service. The valorizing discourse of science as a “neutral” knowledge-generating process is linked to the hegemony of Western capitalism and a specific notion of progress that this entails. Men of science (and they were almost exclusively white bourgeois men) were busy classifying and ordering human phenomena, including racial characteristics, for the purpose of identifying and correcting “degeneracy” in the social body. The rise of classifying schemes were brought into service as attention was paid to sexual and racial difference. Men of science, including physicians, “alienists” (a term denoting the embryonic psychiatric profession), were vying for dominance and mastery through scrutiny of sexual and racial difference.

Sander Gilman (1985) has pointed to the connections between a racialized science which attempts to legitimate the social, economic and cultural domination of white bourgeois Europeans, and the advancement of a concept of sexual “primitiveness” or perversity. Both concepts rely on a teleological construct of hierarchical development, that would impute modern European nations and the men who lead them with superiority by virtue of their presumed higher levels of rationality, morality, cultural refinement and technology. The schemes of racial taxonomies that underscored and legitimated the colonizing impulse occurred in conjunction with the taxonomy of sexual difference, as Jennifer Terry has argued “[t]hrough techniques of clinical surveillance and diagnosis, homosexual bodies, as they were imagined by physicians, were objects to be measured, zones to be mapped, and texts to be interpreted” (Terry, 1999: 41). The rise and intensification of colonial exploits accompanied the multiform practices of a “colonizing gaze” of medicine occurring in tandem throughout the mid-to-late nineteenth century.

These practices also seemed to share a common scopic regime, as Jennifer Terry indicates, “[b]oth the surfaces of perverse bodies and their dark interiors contained the secrets of abnormal desire. The phantasmatic homosexual body, like savage bodies, become a text of telltale signs by which to measure moral character and the effects of civilization” (Terry, 1999: 41).

Foucault has made links between the organizing principles of the “technologies of sexuality” with those of racializing science within a European context. He elucidates the links between the erosion of a feudal organizing principle of heredity and property, the “alliance of blood,” with the emergence of new “administration of bodies and the calculated management of life” (Foucault, 1990: 140), embedded in the taxonomies of a new regime of “sexual” knowledge. This signaled, following Foucault, a shift in the application of power, a power which he describes as “situated and exercised at the level of life, the species, the race, and the large-scale phenomena of population” (Foucault, 137).

Ann Laura Stoler (1995), locates and extends Foucault’s analysis onto the terrain of European colonial relations. She argues that the production of a distinct European bourgeois identity, as set out by Foucault in the *History of Sexuality*, was prefigured in racial constructs when the domain of analysis is extended to include an imperial European history which predates the nineteenth century. While not denying that the nineteenth century brought a new set of organizing principles for racial and sexual taxonomies, she contends that the construction of bourgeois sensibilities, although they varied among different national contexts, nevertheless, “defined their unique characteristics through a language of difference that drew on images of racial purity and

sexual virtue” (Stoler, 1995: 10). Stoler’s important challenges to Foucault’s thought in the context of colonial relations has been able to draw out more clearly how the embedded social practices of racialized and sexual science have been produced through a dialectic between metropole and colony. Stoler describes how multiple discourses on systems of colonial governance mobilized “notions of degeneracy in which technologies of sex are most fully realized around issues of race ... were directed at multiple targets and had wider applications” (Stoler, 32) than those that can be located solely within European metropolises. These discourses and techniques sought to demarcate, divide, rationalize and systematize both individuals and populations that “set designated eligibility for citizenship, class membership, and gendered assignments of race” (32).

### **Richard von Krafft-Ebing and the Primitive Pervert: Constituting a Racialized Field of Evolutionary Sexology**

We can begin to delineate a process of the racialized pathology of sexual difference by examining the increasing attention to the bodies of the “other” in nineteenth century medicine in the work of one of its progenitors, Richard von Krafft-Ebing.

Richard von Krafft-Ebing (1840-1902), author of the nineteenth century tome of psychopathology, *Psychopathia sexualis*, has been described retrospectively as the founder of a scientific sexology. He was one of the most prominent psychiatrists of his time. An influential medical practitioner, his text *Psychopathia sexualis*, originally published in 1886 went through numerous editions until 1924 and was translated into several languages. Krafft-Ebing was practicing psychiatry during a time when it was a devalued profession with little more status than a prison warden—a profession from which it was hardly distinguishable in the state-run asylums of the period which housed

mainly the desperate poor and disabled. As his career progressed he became a forensic psychiatrist, evaluating criminal cases. Krafft-Ebing was concerned to secure a better footing and greater legitimacy for psychiatry by allying itself to campaigns for social purity and moral regulation. Hitherto, doctors who practiced psychiatry were allowed to do so only in the asylum, however changes in the governance of populations provided the rationale which gave an impetus for psychiatrists and those studying criminals and the insane to advance the cause of medicine by articulating it to the emerging practices in the area of social engineering or population management.

It was by attaching itself to criminal law that psychiatrists attempted to enlarge their scope of practice and link its investigations to the concern for public hygiene. Beginning in the early part of the nineteenth century, extreme cases of “unexplainable” murder were used by the experts to argue for the existence of an inherently insane and criminal subject, under the diagnosis of “monomania,” a condition for which there is no other recourse but the ministrations of psychiatry. Foucault outlines the emergence of a “dangerous individual” in nineteenth century law and psychiatry, in order to explain how forensic anthropologists and psychiatrists maneuvered themselves into a place where their expertise would not only be indispensable, but moreover, would be at the center of judicial decisions. This inaugurated a shift from the focus on “correction” of the “dangerous individual” to one which emphasizes the concept of “degeneration” and the protection of society: “[t]he notion of degeneration made it possible to link the most insignificant criminals to a peril of pathological dimensions for society, and, eventually, for the whole human species. The whole field of infractions could be held together in terms of danger and thus of protection to be provided” (Foucault, 2000a: 194-95).

Signs of pathology were obsessively collected and pooled in data banks of recognizable “stigmata” which “included both the congenital signs of atavism and cultural manifestations of uncivilized tendencies, such as the number of criminals who sported tattoos, and decorated their bodies in the manner of ‘primitive’ peoples” (Kemp & Wallace, 2000: 140). Evolutionary models adapted from Darwin’s theories and from the work of early anthropologists like Cesare Lombroso (1835-1909), who pioneered a regime of scopic studies to link criminal behaviour with the constitutional features of the human body, were employed in order to create a taxonomy of constitutional degeneracy or congenital pathology. Krafft-Ebing attempted to discover a taxonomy of physical stigmata which would indicate a corresponding underlying nervous disorder or “degenerescence.” To this end he claimed to find skull dimensions, postures, gestures and mannerisms that set homosexuals apart from others. A state of social engineering of populations that coincided with a regime of early nineteenth century sexology operated as integral to campaigns for social purity and hygiene.

Krafft-Ebing had amassed a large quantity of case histories, initially from extreme cases found in the criminal courts, apparently sensational cases of lust murder and necrophilia. But he also included in his case histories information gathered from numerous letters and written expositions of the lives and sexual experiences of homosexual men and women themselves. It was primarily middle-class and wealthy men who wrote letters to Krafft-Ebing, detailing their sexual histories in an attempt to make sense of their sexuality, appealing to the power of an “objective and neutral” science in the hope of finding respite from the prevailing discourse of sin and the harsh penalties of the law.

As a symptom of the relations between doctor and patient, it is interesting to see how some homosexual men interdicted with the medical science of psychiatrists like Krafft-Ebing, pursuing multifarious narrative modes that variously engaged scientific, confessional and aesthetic forms of sexual self-fashioning. Some wrote long narratives of their sexual lives and other aspects of themselves using the discourse of evolutionary biology and theories of degeneracy. But also present are countervailing discourses from a nascent homosexual rights movement, primarily in Germany. Many of these men referred to themselves as “Urnings,” a term introduced in 1864 by a Hannoverian lawyer, administrator and activist named Karl Heinrich Ulrichs (1825-1895). Essentially his theories reflected a gender binarism which understood homosexuality as gender inversion— “a female soul trapped in a man’s body” and vice versa—a set of ideas which together constituted a naturalist “third sex” theory of homosexuality. Ulrich’s life and work is important, as he represents one of the first self-declared homosexuals who vigorously and publicly advocated for the social and civil rights of homosexuals.<sup>3</sup>

In Krafft-Ebing’s work, not only do we get a rich picture of contradictory ways of narrating the self with respect to an emerging form of understanding of sexuality as forming the foundation for selfhood, but we see a window into a developing and substantial subculture on the European continent of homosexual men and women at that time. Harry Oosterhuis furnishes us with such examples whereby primarily upper-class homosexual men engaging with Krafft-Ebing’s work attempted to redraw the boundaries of what is permissible in a narrative of the sexual self. In so doing, they were drawing on

---

<sup>3</sup> For more on Ulrichs consult: Hubert Kennedy, “Karl Heinrich Ulrichs, First Theorist of Homosexuality” in Vernon A. Rosario, ed., *Science and Homosexualities*, New York: Routledge, 1997. For more information about the early homosexual rights movement in Germany see John Lauritsen & David Thorstad, *The Early Homosexual Rights Movement (1864-1935)*, New York: Times Change Press, 1974.

multiple and contradictory discourses. Oosterhuis concludes that, “Krafft-Ebing’s [studies on] sexual pathology reflected the anxieties and the inconsistencies around sexuality in *fin-de-siècle* culture, especially the bourgeois preoccupation with its dangers and pleasures” (Oosterhuis, 1997: 85).<sup>4</sup>

And it is precisely this preoccupation which begs the question as to the configuration of sexuality along binary axes. These binaries exist in the degenerationist theory which was appropriated by Krafft-Ebing in his taxonomy of perversion and illness. Krafft-Ebing drew on French alienist Benedict Auguste Morel’s (1809-1873) theories of hereditary mental illness and their nature to worsen over generations to set out a concept of perversion as an innate characterological weakness, congenital deviation or defectiveness. He posited a distinction between sickly perversion and immoral perversity, which assumed that a pathological drive was found in the former only. This distinction was simultaneously based on and productive of the degree of responsibility for immoral acts imputed to the individual; to the degree to which they possessed an ability to exercise will. Two kinds of homosexual patients thus emerge from this classification: those whose behaviour is predicated on an innate pathological drive and whose essential constitution is more or less intact (often assessed by their conformity to culturally mandated gender behaviour and comportment), and those whose behaviour is often seen as having developed in “unfavourable conditions” and thus potentially redeemable. In practice, these distinctions operated along class lines, where middle-class homosexuals were generally viewed as having engaged in acts that reflected a weakness of the will. The poor or disenfranchised homosexuals, on the other hand, were more often seen as

---

<sup>4</sup> See also Harry Oosterhuis, *Homosexuality and Male Bonding in pre-Nazi Germany*, New York: The Haworth Press, 1991.

defective and as having a “disease of the will,” whereby their behaviour is judged intractable and tied to “primitive” instincts which they were unable to control. Jennifer Terry writes, “[S]uch pronouncements legitimized the incarceration of the poor and socially disenfranchised homosexuals in state asylums, thus effectively subjugating them to punishment under the guise of medical supervision” (Terry, 1999: 49).

Medical and psychiatric practices in the late nineteenth century recapitulated the larger social concerns which animated state intervention into the poor and working classes of the time. There were concerns over the influence that “desultory” class mixing produced the fear that the genetic pool and energies of the bourgeoisie were threatened by the social fraternization brought about by sexual and social liaisons with the working-class milieu. At a time when capitalist accumulation, imperial rule and the exhortation to produce wealth was at its apogee in North American and Western European countries (during the first “take-off” phase of Western industrial capitalism), this threat was produced as a concern over the productive health of the nation, refracted through productive mobilizations of notions of “population,” health and illness. Foucault, writing about the emergence of a “biopower” which bent its organizing practices into greater areas of social life focused on “the species of the body, the body imbued with the mechanisms of life and serving as the basis of the biological processes: propagation, births and mortality, the level of health, life expectancy and longevity, with all the conditions that can cause these to vary. Their supervision,” Foucault continues, “was effected through an entire series of interventions and *regulatory controls: a biopolitics of the population*” (Foucault, 1990: 139 emphasis in original). Social Darwinist theories legitimated the divisions and putative differences between classes as tied to biological

specialization, producing and reproducing the discursive and material hierarchies of race, class and sex as reflecting a presumed natural order of things. Jonathan Ned Katz, in an important work, reminds us that in the emergence of the social and medical inscriptions of human sexual desire, the construction of heterosexuality was also being produced as a response to the social regulation of differently practiced forms of heterosexual desire that deviated from strict monogamous procreation—practices which mainly fell under the purview of moral regulation by religious authorities. Katz outlines the way that the inscription of heterosexuality within medical discourse emerges at roughly the same time and as a consequence to the emergence of homosexuality within professional discourse. Katz has, no doubt, contributed much to our understanding of the social construction and regulation of sexual desire. However, it is also significant that in Krafft-Ebing's tome, which he cites as a "founding text of heterosexuality" (Katz, 1996: 28), the weight of a scientific scopic regime and its embedded practices rest elsewhere, such as "[h]eterosexuals are of less explicit interest to this doctor than the nonprocreative perverts who are his focus" (Katz, 1996: 28-9).

Jennifer Terry (1999) outlines how researchers often gloss over the patient's own narrative account of sexual histories with a reductive analysis of pathology. There are examples in which the patient counters the doctor's assessment of the situation; alternately there are times when the patient him or herself would employ an understanding of themselves using the categories and theories of their medical contemporaries.<sup>5</sup> This is an example of the deployment of sexuality as "spirals of

---

<sup>5</sup> At the same time as an expanding field of medicine and psychiatry bent its medicalizing gaze on homosexuality, contemporaneous investigations led in other directions which derived their impetus from more philosophical and aesthetic concerns. Histories of aristocratic, upper-class and an educated elite strata of homosexual men and women participated in subcultures which defined homosexuality with reference to

pleasure” in the medical scopic regime which variant bodies were subject to the lens of scrutiny where doctor and patient participated to elicit narratives deployed as truth. These practices became the base for a clinical codification of the inducement to speak, combining confession with examination. These practices, multiplied over innumerable “transfer points” together agglomerated into a paradigm which fixed two general schemes of the deployment of sexuality in the nineteenth century: the isolation of a “sex instinct” that was capable of anomalies, and the science of correction of these anomalies which inaugurated an era of eugenics (Foucault, 1990: 117-18).

---

historical manifestations from ancient Greece and the European renaissance. For example, a revived Greek aesthetics of “boy-love,” which extolled the love between men and youth existed around the English painter Henry Scott Tuke (1858-1929). Oscar Wilde and his circle were part of an Oxford movement which looked toward the writings of Walter Pater (1839-1894) and Johann Joachim Winckelmann (1717-1768) in art history and aesthetics and a revival of Hellenism. A circle of minor English poets, calling themselves the “Uranians” also extolled the beauty of boys in their verse. For detailed treatments of these literary and aesthetic counter-discursive movements for framing homosexuality in the late nineteenth century consult: Richard Dellamora, ed. 1999. *Victorian Sexual Dissidence*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; Timothy d’Arch Smith. 1970. *Love in Earnest: Some Notes on the Lives and Writings of English ‘Uranian’ Poets from 1889 to 1930*. London: Routledge; Brian Reade, ed. 1970. *Sexual Heretics: Male Homosexuality in English Literature from 1850-1900*. New York: Coward-McCann Inc.; Linda Dowling. 1994. *Hellenism and Homosexuality in Victorian Oxford*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. It is my contention that histories of cross-generational patterns of homosexuality are often obscured, suppressed or evaded by contemporary gay and lesbian historiography. Yet, models for homosexuality which looked backward to ancient Greece were commonly encountered in the period, at least amongst the class of the university educated. However, a similar pattern of cross-generational homosexuality is also to be found among subcultures of the working classes, in cultures of seamen, bohemians and the prison population—see Jeffrey Weeks. 1991. “Inverts, perverts and mary-annes: male prostitution and the regulation of homosexuality in England in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries” *Against Nature*. London: Rivers Oram Press. Alan Sheridan, André Gide’s (1869-1951) recent biographer, has produced a sensitive, nuanced and nonjudgmental treatment of Gide’s complex sexuality, a sexuality which can be described, at least in part, as pederastic: Alan Sheridan. 1998. *André Gide: A Life in the Present*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. Sensitive, complex and sympathetic biographies of queer historical figures whose sexuality may at times have included consensual relations with young people are scarce. I know of at least one that is in production. Tom Reeves is writing a book on the twentieth century educational reformer, writer and anarchist, Paul Goodman (1911-1972). Among Goodman’s many publications are two classics of the 1960s New Left, *Growing Up Absurd* and *Compulsory Mis-education*; he also published an early gay liberation essay in 1969 entitled, “The Politics of Being Queer.” Reeves is concentrating on Goodman’s involvement with the U.S. chapter of the War Resisters’ League but he will not shy away from including information on Goodman’s penchant for adolescent males. According to Reeves, Goodman has been a neglected figure on the Left and he attributes this to his outspokenness on sexual matters and of his intergenerational erotic inclinations (Reeves, *personal communication* 2003).

We can begin to uncover the social and discursive links between a racialized science which produced and reinforced Western white superiority and a medical gaze which seeks to produce and regulate the “normal” sexual being by casting a special lens of investigation on sexual variance. The then emerging disciplines of comparative anatomy and anthropology produced non-European peoples as resistant to civilization, and their cultural and social arrangements were perceived as inherently inferior to dominant white European modes. The complex and contradictory ways that a discursive framework was produced which simultaneously defined and imputed higher levels of rationality, morality, technology and cultural refinement as an autochthonous achievement of Western culture, was then reified as a tautological standard from which to view non-European cultures as inherently lacking the capacities for such cultural advancement without systematic intervention. This systematic intervention took the form of the twin ideologies and material practices of Western colonialism of the period, under the “civilizing” banner of “commerce” and Christianity.<sup>6</sup>

Ann Laura Stoler’s reconfigurations of Foucauldian thought interrogates the social relations of racism, sexuality, class and gender, counterpoising and complicating European social relations with the fact of empire. Stoler’s arguments rest on two basic contentions, both drawing from and extending Foucauldian thought along the axes of colonial relations. First, she argues that Europe’s eighteenth and nineteenth century discourses on sexuality cannot be charted in Europe alone. These discourses were

---

<sup>6</sup> For a good single-volume overview of European colonization of Africa see: Thomas Pakenham, *The Scramble for Africa, 1870-1912*, (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1990). For more critical studies consult: Ania Loomba, *Colonialism/Post-colonialism*, (London: Routledge, 1998); Ronald Hyman, *Empire and Sexuality: The British Experience* (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1990); Vron Ware, *Beyond the Pale: White Women, Racism and History* (London: Verso, 1992); and Robert Young, *White Mythologies: Writing History and the West* (London: Routledge, 1990).

refracted through the discourses of empire and its exigencies. Foucault has set out four great organizing principles existing as complex discursive technologies of sexuality which forms both productive knowledge about sex and serve as anchorage points for social regulation. These figures, productive of discourses of regulation and intervention are, the masturbating child, the “hysterical woman,” the Malthusian couple, and the perverse adult. Stoler asks whether these figures which organized productive relations between Europe and its colonies cannot be understood “without a racially erotic counterpoint, without reference to the libidinal energies of the savage, the primitive, the colonized—reference points of difference, critique, and desire?” (Stoler, 1995: 6-7). Moreover, she adds that “[T]he sexual discourse of empire and of the biopolitical state in Europe were mutually constitutive: their ‘targets’ were broadly imperial, their regimes of power synthetically bound” (7). Secondly, Stoler argues that discourses of sexuality do more than define the distinctions of the bourgeois self—they also “mapped the moral parameters of European nations” (7). The emergence and amplification of the “dangerous individual” in nineteenth century European medical science and the production of the homosexual as taxonomies of difference, which I have briefly traced, clearly does utilize racialized science in its determinations of “others” marked as different, marginal and cast as morally inferior to a European white bourgeois hegemony. That these distinctions call upon and are productive of multiple discourses of difference is highlighted by Stoler when she writes, “[E]uropean bourgeois orders produced a multiplicity of discourses that turned on the dangers of ‘internal enemies,’ of class, sexual and racial origin” (Stoler, 10).

**Figures of the Child in Nineteenth Century Discourse: Interlocking Discourses on Progress and Corruption**

Our conception of the “pedophile” is predicated on how we come to know the child. The contemporary contestations over the significance and meaning of children, and of the discourse around childhood, bears directly on how we come to understand the pedophile as a sexually dangerous person. By tracing the emergence of modern notions of childhood, I hope to uncover the contested terrain in which the child came to be configured as a figure under threat. Two events where the sexuality of the child is discursively produced serve as key moments for the construction of children as “innocent” and as residing in an unadulterated state of “nature.” This is a discursive state of affairs which, due to its relative instability, is especially sensitive to identify perturbations to its modes of rationality, marking them as threats. These two events which I elaborate below are the “white slavery” panic in Europe, directed primarily at young girls in the late nineteenth century and the anti-masturbation campaigns of the same period, centered in British and European contexts.

The figure of the child begins to loom large in the mid to late nineteenth century. It is instructive to examine a point of emergence of the child as a figure of developmental and pedagogic discursive regimes. In this state of affairs, any deviations function recursively as threats to a mandated developmental trajectory. As Sander Gilman (1985) has noted, the first forays into scientific interest into sexuality was the identification of corruption in the child. I wish to document how in the nineteenth century, the emergence of a problematic of the developing child is coterminous with the scientific interest in psychopathology and sexual “degenerescence” in the bodies of adults, as I have outlined

above. In addition, the analytics attendant on the body of the child are heavily underpinned by cultural assumptions about the child as a discursive site of potentialities burdened by Western teleological concepts of progress.

A history of the configuration of childhood in the West spans conceptions ranging from “innocent embodiment of singular virtues” (salvation) to the child as inherently evil, primeval or fallen (corruption). Here the child is perceived to be in a state of “original sin,” with vigorous training prescribed for its elimination. Rousseau is usually referenced as the person to whom the idea of a new child of innocence was inaugurated. Rousseau’s figure of the child contrasts with the “fallen” child as she is conceived as close to nature and tutored through experience—its social and moral development is seen largely as self-generative and “natural.” This figuration, as some commentators have pointed out, is produced in parallel to related practices which inhere in the paternal-colonial figure of the “noble savage” (Castañeda, 2002; Gittins, 1998; Stoler, 1995; Stainton-Rogers, 1992). It is in the campaigns for the intervention into the “conduct” and training of children where we can draw parallel developments within medicine and science to construct knowledge around “sex variants” and the medical interest in children’s bodies and proper sexual and social development.

Claudia Castañeda (2002) has outlined how the figure of the child is represented as the human evolution from savagery to civilization in which progress is implied, subtended by a colonial order of things. Using the work of Charles Darwin, Herbert Spencer and others, Castañeda has shown how the figure of the child appears across disparate sites, involving pedagogy, science, and evolutionary biology and ties the racial, the sexual and imperatives of reproduction into a putative culture of civilization and

European ascendancy. Using passages from Darwin and Spencer's works on education, she ties the imperial aspirations of European nations to a logic whereby the foundation for a discourse of universal childhood recapitulates the parent-child logic of imperialist expansion and is anchored through the binaries of savage/civilized. A record of human history is recapitulated in the developing child-body. This evolutionary science made comparative analogies to the facial, cranial and physiological attributes of African men and women and compared them to embryological studies of fetuses in order to lay claim to a differential scale of evolutionary development among "races." These studies were embedded with assumptions about progress and cultural attainment, whereby nosological categories emerged from a scheme of classification about what constitutes the normal and the pathological.

In addition, popular and scientific cultural ideas of children and childhood, which embraced both a highly sentimentalized construction of childhood purity as well as a sense of the child as the "father to the man," situated a strong developmentalist conception of childhood and linked this with the progress of nation-states. Social practices in European metropolises were underwritten, enhanced and extended by parallel developments in the colonies, as Stoler argues, pointing to "imperial-wide discourses that linked children's health programs to racial survival, [and] tied increased campaigns for domestic hygiene to colonial expansion" (35). These linked practices between the domestic and pedagogic training of children in the colonies and the European metropole, framed the domestic relations at "home" with that of national-imperial aspirations, and organized age, gender, and race social relations such that "child-rearing was [produced as] an imperial and class duty, cast[ing] white women as bearers of a more racist imperial

order and the custodians of their desire-driven immoral men” (35). The child, as produced within related developments in pedagogic and domestic discourse was brought under increasing scientific scrutiny, programs for her moral and pedagogic training were instituted and deviations from this regime were pursued assiduously. Gilman writes, “[c]learly the earliest popular or pseudomedical interest in sexuality was in sexuality as a manifestation of corruption in the child” (Gilman, 1985: 192).

### **Producing the Sexual Child: The Tropes of Pathology and Sexual Danger in Campaigns Against Juvenile Prostitution and Masturbation**

Without going into detail about the history of childhood in the West, a topic which is beyond the scope of this thesis, it is helpful nonetheless to point out how the phenomenon of Western childhood emerges within the late seventeenth and eighteenth century, with its flowering in the nineteenth. Philippe Ariès (1962) and Lawrence Stone (1977) have made important contributions to history of European childhood by pointing to its socially contingent character—that is how the shifting and changing practices between children and adults are envisioned and linked to society at large. They conclude, generally, that there is a dearth of culturally and socially inscribed characteristics of the child prior to the seventeenth century. Other commentators on Ariès’ thesis have suggested that the emergence of child-specific clothing, for instance, only appeared as late as the 1920s (Kincaid, 1992: 63).

James Kincaid has outlined the complex and contradictory ways in which the figure of the child is enmeshed within discourses of progress and development and their inverse, corruptibility and perversion, especially within the crucible of the Victorian era.

These discursive strategies would inevitably collide with other strategies for visibility and representation, producing jarring inconsistencies, hypocritical statements and political expediencies. I will draw on three examples to illustrate how children were represented in the late nineteenth century. These are examples which we will undoubtedly find both too familiar and in some particulars quite strange from our own late twentieth and early twenty-first century perspectives. These three examples are the mobilization of concern around juvenile prostitution in London in 1885, court records drawn from cases of sex between men and boys in early twentieth century Ontario, and British campaigns against child and adult masturbation.

### **Children and the Production of Peril Through “Self-abuse”**

The policing of masturbation utilizing concepts of sin and sickness in late Victorian society has amassed a considerable body of commentary. Parents were increasingly targeted in campaigns in which the pedagogical training of the young paralleled campaigns within educational institutions. Campaigns directed toward the governing of family relations reflected values of a progressivist science of medicine which advocated a variety of regulatory practices attendant on children's bodies. Foucault states that the intensity of the campaign to eradicate children's “onanism” or masturbation, wouldn't exist if the practice was not framed as an intense cause for concern among parents, doctors and educators. The campaign for curtailment of the vice of “self-abuse” offered various prescriptions for its cure and mechanisms for corrective techniques. What Foucault terms the “pedagogization of children's sex” was an attempt to define children as “preliminary sexual beings, [where] parents, families, educators,

doctors, and eventually psychologists, would have to take charge, in a continuous way, of this perilous, dangerous and endangered sexual potential” (Foucault, 1990: 104).

The concern over masturbation was geared toward social and moral self-regulation which targeted primarily the middle-classes. During this time, self-appointed experts who claimed vicarious titles of medical professionals wrote treatises on venereal diseases, masturbation and prostitution. These efforts at persuasion were framed in terms of a sense of danger to oneself and motivated out of a sense of purity and strength of the individual will as, it was claimed, befits a male. Lesley Hall and Roy Porter (1995) provide a comprehensive overview of the historical development of remedies for sexually transmitted disease and cures for “self-abuse.” These practices flourished as profit-generating endeavors, in part because sexually transmitted disease was largely outside the purview of most doctors who thought their attention to such matters would sully their reputation.<sup>7</sup> Devices which produced an electric shock in order to wake the person who was having an erection, or that employed spikes which exerted painful pressure on the erect penis, were sold by charlatans and opportunistic practitioners. Such devices were primarily marketed to and bought by males. William Acton and James Copland were regarded as authorities on the matters of sexual disorders and published volumes on the topic, maneuvering to take advantage of the sexual anxiety which led people to resort to such measures (Hall & Porter, 144-45). Such measures, as Hall and Porter outline, were largely self-administered, as many men sought aid to relieve themselves of an extreme

---

<sup>7</sup> Remnants of this attitude persists to this day, as medical practitioners continue to be uninformed on matters of sexual health and sexually transmitted disease treatment. This is evidenced in the lack of funding for research and the scant attention paid to the topic of sexual health in medical schools. My ten years’ experience as a sexual health counsellor in a sexual health clinic confirm the widespread level of ignorance, misinformation and prejudice that accompanies the realm of sexual health and sexually transmitted disease prevention and treatment in general family physician practices.

sense of guilt and horror over involuntary seminal emissions and masturbation (Hall & Porter, 139).

How was a threat toward children produced by the discourse of masturbation? And how were these regulatory practices differentially targeted toward boys and girls? Kincaid suggests that an injunction to self-correction and self-regulation by abstaining from masturbation was ambivalently produced such that it was interminably enforced and neglected by medical and pedagogical authorities. The brunt of the force was applied to boys, he cautions us from taking a too uniform view of the “Victorian masturbation panic” as “[w]e find difference all over the place” (Kincaid, 1992: 165, 167). Noting that Victorian medical and pedagogical discourses on the subject were many and varied (and absent when one would expect to find it), the varied practices for careful vigilance on the part of parents, educators and clerics are well documented. Nonetheless, an epidemic of “[p]reoccupation among medical men and some of the clergy,” Kincaid notes, seems to have stretched from the “1870s until perhaps the Great War” (Kincaid, 164). Masturbation was figured as a prelude to disease and degeneracy. Masturbation, especially in the child, was considered an antediluvian vice—as a remnant of an evolutionary past with filiations to monkeys and baboons. In short, it was viewed as a practice not properly befitting the human species. Evolutionary “taint” was the diagnosis attached to a practice which was feared to be endemic and transmissible. As such, this discourse links up with broader concerns over population health and national strength, mobilizing the family as a link to male supremacy in the national-political domain. Images of the “sapping of strength” and “dissolution” recur in discourse surrounding the prohibition of masturbation targeted to both child and adult males.

### **Juvenile Prostitution and the Sensation of “The Maiden Tribute of Modern Babylon”**

Late Victorian London offers us a paradigmatic example of a moral panic witnessed in the campaign against juvenile prostitution. The article, “The Maiden Tribute of Modern Babylon,” published in July 1885 in four installments in the *Pall Mall Gazette* and penned by W. T. Stead, the paper’s editor, has been described as “[o]ne of the most successful pieces of scandal journalism of the nineteenth century” (Walkowitz, 1992: 81). It was at the centre of a host of social and political effects, setting off a firestorm which mobilized a diverse range of actors in a nexus of social and political positions. In *City of Dreadful Delight: Narratives of Sexual Danger in Late-Victorian England*, historian Judith Walkowitz, devotes two chapters to an analysis of the article and its social effects. The “Maiden Tribute” galvanized social purity campaigns which had been in motion from various quarters: feminists, radical workingmen’s associations and middle-class non-conformists. The article gave further impetus to these movements and aided them in honing their activism by mobilizing incipient class antagonisms and feminist social agitation.

Narratives of sexual danger often took on powerful symbolic and melodramatic forms: the image of the working-class girl raped both physically and figuratively by aristocratic men—engorged on a life of excess and debauchery—is particularly powerful as a psychosexual image of capitalist exploiters. The textual strategies employed by Stead, as Walkowitz explains, drew heavily on the Gothic tale and the melodrama, literary and theatrical forms popular with a wide segment of the reading public in the

nineteenth century. Stead's narrative casts young girls as the victims of men's uncontrollable lust, yet he reserves his most egregious blame for the "den-mothers" and female brothel-keepers for the procuring of young girls for the trade. Feminist activists and working-class organizations seized on the opportunities offered by the stark imagery of exploitation, casting their activism largely in the discursive modes of female victimization and class exploitation. Delimiting the cultural frame within which political and social action and discourse occurred, Walkowitz notes, "melodrama offered a powerful cultural response for female political expression, but it set limits on what could be said, particularly in relation to female agency and desire" (Walkowitz, 93).

Political and social effects were many. The furor over the article was a catalyst for pushing through legislation which had previously been stalled, creating a discourse of national concern. The Criminal Law Amendment Act of 1885 raised the age of consent for girls from 13 to 16 years of age. It also gave police greater power to prosecute street prostitutes and brothel-keepers. The debates over the age of consent legislation also served to highlight the threat this produced to privileged men who were unwilling to endanger the traditional access they had to working-class female sexuality (Walkowitz, 103-104). Additionally, the Act also made "indecent" acts between consenting male adults illegal, thus forming the basis of legal proceedings against male homosexuals until 1967 in England (Walkowitz, 1992: 82; see also Weeks, 1985).

Heavily freighted discourses of class antagonism, produced, in part, by actual conditions of poverty and working conditions, refracted the available discourses of the young female prostitute along class lines. We can witness, in Walkowitz's account, the way the young working females were produced ambivalently as both a source of pleasure

(as produced through Stead's own figuring of the desirable child prostitute), and as a site of sexual exploitation and danger,

### **Regulating Sex Between Men and Boys in Early Twentieth Century Ontario**

Shifting our focus to Canada during roughly the same time period, a study by Steven Maynard (1997) on sex between men and boys in southern Ontario from 1890 to 1935, reveals differences in how the sexuality of the young, particularly males, was produced and how sexual danger was configured. Maynard studied case files of criminal prosecutions in early twentieth-century Ontario involving sexual relations between men and boys/young males. Maynard is careful in the way he frames his historical investigations, pointing to the difficulties in gleaning accurate information about a subject from the use of court records. Hitherto, he suggests, the modes of analysis by many historians have been to "read against the grain" (Maynard, 1997: 198), in order to excavate in some "primordial form" a sense of the "homosexual" awaiting to be discovered in such documents. Maynard, however, shifts the focus, employing more caution in order to "[a]nalyse the discursive operations of historical texts to deconstruct how categories such as the 'homosexual' are produced in the first place" (Maynard, 198). Maynard instead employs strategies of narratology in order to access what "stories" individuals accessed and how they made sense of their own experience. This mode of investigation, he suggests, produces the historical data reflexively as discursive modes which delimit what is sayable, structuring the subject's ability to represent experience and surfacing the material nexus which discursive practices are embedded.

The boys' stories, as produced through Maynard's reading of the court documents, ranged from accounts of opportunistic fun, sex for money or other benefits, while some sought companionship, support, and friendship. Still others were victims of varying degrees of coercion and manipulation. In those cases, where men and boys were prosecuted for "buggery" and "gross indecency," consent was not a defense, as homosexuality itself was a crime. In cases where the boy was not charged with a sexual offense, he became a witness for the prosecution, often reluctantly.

Commonly, the boy was tried as an accomplice in a "sexual crime." Maynard's study presents the way the law socially structures how elements of the particular "criminal act" are related to the choices that the subject has at his disposal for interpreting his behaviour to the courts. For instance, since consent was not a defense, the particular strategies of prosecution tended to socially construct the young male subjects as desiring subjects who had, nevertheless, been led astray, or had fallen under "immoral" influences by his older partners. The young males were also produced as a subject who accessed agency in the events under examination. Maynard writes:

What is striking about the history of sexual relations between boys and men in early twentieth-century Ontario is the absence of the homosexual psychopath. Police constables, moral reformers, truancy officers, and sex advice givers made little or no attempt to construct the men with whom boys had sex as a particular sexual villain, nor did they describe their sexual relations as particularly dangerous. They regulated sexual relations between boys and men not to protect innocent victims from abuse and exploitation by homosexual psychopaths, but to prevent 'frivolous boys' from being 'led astray' by 'fallen men' (Maynard, 234-35).

What emerges is the fact that an integrated figure representing sexual danger directed exclusively toward the child is generally absent in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. It is clear that discourses surrounding the innocence of children and

sexuality have changed; it is these changes that mark out the limits and boundaries of what is expressible in the discursive construction of the pedophile. In the two historical examples cited above, what emerges as a salient feature are the differential ways that boys and girls were produced as victims. Gendered understandings of class produced the young female prostitute, in the nineteenth century, as an ambivalent victim: her sexuality was produced as “available” at the same time as she was produced as a site of exploitation. These ambivalent figures of sexual availability and exploitation enabled various discourses of feminist and working-class agitation, as well as middle-class social purity movements. In the case of boys, as figured through Maynard’s study, we see, not so much a discourse of victim as such, but a discourse of moral dissolution in a subject who is understood as having more agency, and thus more “responsibility” for his moral “turpitude.” Maynard suggests that in the early twentieth century, in contrast to our own era which is marked by widespread cultural anxieties, “the moral economy of many working-class boys and their families sustained a more expansive, nuanced understanding of both the dangers and the possibilities of sexual relations between boys and men” (235).

### **Sexual Psychopathy and the Rise of Psychiatric Power, 1920-1960.**

The years from 1920 to 1960 signaled a shift in the social regulation of sexuality. It is during this period that we detect, especially in the context of North America, a significant amplification of the discourse around sexual danger in the deployment of the “sexual psychopath.” It is here that we witness the discursive production of the sexually dangerous person and the pathological deviant, coupled with a heightened concern for protection of the young. This general shift can be summarized as a “[s]ignificant

departure from the nineteenth-century emphasis on maintaining female purity and a movement toward a modern concern about controlling male violence” (Freedman, 1989: 200). Further, it was with the institution of new laws designating the sexual psychopath that we see the sexual victimization of children emerging as a subject of popular concern for the first time.

These discursive changes occurred in the context of massive post-war economic and social upheavals in major cities, the setting where the mobilization against sex crimes occurred. I will give a brief outline of these social changes. In many major American and Canadian cities, populations of working-class, bohemian, and black cultures created highly visible inner-city night-life which offered pleasure and sexuality outside of the conventions of marriage and domestic relations. Establishments catering to the pursuit of a variety of pleasures, entertainment, and a greater fluidity for social intercourse allowed for vibrant cultures to emerge, affording a greater diversity of social and sexual interaction across race, class and gender (D’Emilio and Freedman, 1988). Massive social changes were occurring with the advent of the Great Depression, changes to the role of women, inaugurated by women’s emancipatory movements, the gaining of the franchise through militant suffrage, and the expansion of economic opportunities. Freedman writes, “This new image of aggressive male sexual deviance that emerged from the psychiatric and political response to sex crimes provided a focus for a complex redefinition of sexual boundaries in modern America” (Freedman, 200). Response to the sexual psychopath helped legitimize less violent, but previously taboo sexual acts, while it stigmatized unmanly, rather than unwomanly behaviour as the most serious threat to sexual and social order.

Freedman (1989) delineates two phases of the emergence of the panic over the sexual psychopath in America, roughly occurring from 1937-1940, taking a hiatus during the war years, then experiencing a virulent recrudescence from 1949-1955. In 1937 FBI director J. Edgar Hoover, declared a “war on the sex criminal,” thus inaugurating official state response to a wave of panic fueled by media, and reinforcing and inflaming popular fears.

The transformation of the psychopath into a violent male sexual criminal occurred gradually as a result of three convergent trends. First, expert attention to the social disorganizations that were occurring in American society during the depression drew attention to the problem of male deviance. As unemployment ballooned, and the social mobility of the poor and working class become more pronounced, a growing number of men were forced to relocate in order to eke out a living in the cities. These new mobile and socially desperate classes of men become an object of concern for the middle-class professions. Secondly, this expert attention included the expansion of psychiatry into the courts and prisons, a presence they acquired beyond their earlier base in state mental hospitals. Finally, the 1930s saw the growth of the social-scientific study of sex, partly as an attempt to curb what some observers saw as a proliferation of sexual deviation. These ideas also spurred investigations into the ways science could aid in the normal adjustment of heterosexual marriage, understood as problems of sexual satisfaction and couple harmony (Bullough, 1994; Terry, 1999).

The sexual psychopath laws do not necessarily specify criminal acts, nor do they differentiate between violent and non-violent, or consensual and non-consensual behaviour; rather, as Freedman points out, “[t]hey targeted a kind of personality, or an

identity, that could be discovered only by trained psychiatrists” (Freedman, 209). These laws were framed as a protection for women and children, casting male sexuality as particularly malevolent, and were largely the result, Freedman contends, “of men’s political efforts with little or no feminist involvement” (Freedman, 208). The initial laws, passed within the peak of concern, committed offenders to psychiatric institutions for indeterminate sentences. The postwar laws however, passed between 1949-1953, remedied some of these abuses to due process by requiring a criminal conviction. Released sex offenders were, however, required to register with local police even if their convictions were set aside or expunged (Freedman, 222).

Expert discourse produced through psychiatric and medical practices helped to constitute the new category of the sexual psychopath. One way the psychiatric profession had accomplished this was the enormous boost to its prestige following the role it played in World War II as a screening service for the millions of people mobilized for military service. Psychiatrists taking part in official commissions of inquiry on the problem of “sex deviates” pointed to their special skill in detection and diagnosis of the sex offender. Judges, police officers, psychiatrists, clergy, and others who had positions on commissions of inquiry often spoke of the need to enhance the provision of psychiatric services in order to detect a sexually deviated person before they become more dangerous. These commissions were themselves very significant sites for the production of new strategies of knowledge/power relations that would map out new productive relations of sexual visibility, producing subjects that would inhere within these policed frames. These commissions were also pivotal for finding new strategies to develop order

and social regulation, and they were tactically positioned to enlist opinion, expert advice, elaborate research schemes and develop experimental treatments.<sup>8</sup>

This idea of prophylactic intervention was largely underwritten by the way the problem was framed by professionals and promoted by media to play into the popular fears about “sexual abnormality.” George Chauncey (1993) outlines the way that outrage provoked by media coverage over isolated and spectacular murders of children was used to undergird a whole constellation of sexual and gender difference along a continuum which, in turn, was framed within a concern to sustain a definition of the “normal” person embedded within “normal” family relations. A broad definition of sexual deviance which lumped together extramarital sex, consensual sadomasochism, voyeurism (peeping in windows), gender nonconformity, homosexuality, public sex, rape, and the murder of children, was used to define mental disorder and psychopathy. The coherence of this broad definition of sexual deviance was debated by some psychiatrists, sociologists and civil libertarians. They advocated the idea that sex offenders can be divided into a more numerous group of sexual nonconformists whose actions did not result in immediate harm, and into a more limited and dangerous group whose actions constituted rape or the violation of children. A second group of psychiatrists, who were more aligned with police and court officials, and who “[w]ere generally more influential in the debates of the 1940s and 1950s, regarded it as much more likely that a ‘minor deviate’ would ‘degenerate’ to more dangerous forms of deviance,” stating that what may seem like benign sexual nonconformity was actually “a symptom of a deeper pathology that would ultimately lead them to harm others” (Chauncey, 169). These activities were linked together in a causal chain that can be described, following Gayle Rubin, as a “domino-

---

<sup>8</sup> I am indebted to Kari Dehli for these important observations.

theory of sexual peril” (Rubin, 1984: 282)—an idea borrowed from the Cold War fear of the proliferation of Communist states, which suggests in this context, that relatively benign or low-grade sexual variations would, under the right conditions, lead to more serious pathology and subsequent crimes.

One of the more prominent and influential psychiatrists at this time was Benjamin Karpman, a prolific and strident proponent of the psychosexual interpretation of psychopathic behaviour. Relying on a crude simplification of Freudian psychoanalysis and behaviourism, he attributed criminal behaviour to arrested sexual development, believing that the typical sexual psychopath was “[a]ll instinct and impulse ... always on the go for sexual satisfaction ... [having] insatiable and uncontrollable desires” (Karpman quoted in Freedman, 205). In an era when adult homosexual behaviour was *de facto* criminalized, the sexual psychopath laws became potent weapons in the repression of homosexual behaviour. Individuals caught in its web of surveillance and stepped-up police harassment could be charged with offenses such as gross indecency or lewd conduct, charges which often had nothing to do with a minor or with coercion. These individuals could be faced with indeterminate sentencing and possible institutionalization for life if the psychiatrist diagnosed them to be “dangerously psychopathic,” only to be released when they were deemed no longer a threat.<sup>9</sup> These escalating forms of diagnoses and sentencing occurred in a context where moral and social regulation of homosexuality was intensified and a plethora of laws and practices aimed a curbing

---

<sup>9</sup> This assessment was often determined by the patient’s conformity to a heterosexual identity. It was commonly known among the gay subculture at the time that it was the admission of “turning straight” which often afforded the beleaguered homosexual’s exit from institutionalization. During a time when there was a sharp increase in police repression and a wave of arrests of gay and lesbian establishments in major cities throughout the US and Canada, gay men were aware of the game required of them by the state: “They hold you there,” one cellmate warned, in an apparent reference to the state’s new indeterminate sentencing law, “until the unlikely event that you turn straight” (Chauncey, 1993:177).

homosexuality was instituted over a relatively short period of time. John D'Emilio outlines the incredible breadth of measures taken to police homosexuality:

An executive order barred [homosexuals] from all federal jobs, and dismissals from government service rose sharply. The military intensified its purges of gay men and lesbians. The post office tampered with their mail, the FBI initiated widespread surveillance of homosexual meeting places and activities, and urban police forces stepped up their harassment (D'Emilio, 1989: 229).

Regulating the normal was powerfully evident when we examine the basis for the psychopathology promulgated by Karpman and others: "Abnormal sex behaviour, be it in the adult or child derives from the unwholesome family and social atmosphere in which the child develops. The fault lies with the parents" (Karpman quoted in Chauncey, 172). Many psychiatrists acquired a role of guidance for parents in the proper method of raising children. Particularly mothers were brought under the lens of scrutiny, and special attention was paid to the quality of their influence, particularly over their sons.

The postwar social landscape had afforded women the experience of greater employment in the factories left vacant by men who went off to European battlefields. After the war, campaigns directed toward channeling women back into the roles of mother and homemaker were "married" with the attempt to regulate the "kind" of children that families, particularly women, were deemed responsible for creating. Experts were promulgating the proper rearing of children. Parents and mothers were strongly induced to heed the call, and many embraced these discourses of regulation out of fear and a desire to become "good mothers."

These normalizing practices aimed to lever responsibility solely onto mothers and mobilize the family to enforce gender conformity, with an aim to produce adults who were to be insulated from sexual/gender variance. These strategies were enacted as a

stated prophylactic against homosexuality. Helped by these potent gendered discourses of maternal responsibility, sexual danger becomes identified with the public realm rather than the private realm. The reorganization of households within the expansion of suburban development in the postwar era, often meant that families increasingly lived in areas where they did not know one another and where they were separated from other family members. The sense of vulnerabilities created by this state of affairs amplified the fears of strangers and stranger abduction of children. The discursive amplification of the private/public divide in the immediate postwar years was a dual strategy for domesticating female labour, as well as escalating the social basis for families as atomized units of consumption with clearly demarcated boundaries around gender roles (Adams, 1997; Gözl, 1993; Kinsman, 1987).

Thus, the prevention and policing of homosexuality and the social and moral regulation of mothering and family organization reinforced one another. Annalee Gözl (1993) points to how the social and moral regulation of domesticity in Canada as a Cold War strategy can be traced to a definite institutional-legal moment:

The Canadian Citizenship Act of 1946 was literally 'born' amidst a patriotic flourish of familial discourse. As both the symbol and substance of Canada's greater sense of status and nationhood after the Second World War, familial metaphors were invoked not only to capture Canada's ongoing ties with and membership in the 'British family of nations,' but also to define the sense of familial unity that was to become inscribed in the notion of a distinct Canadian citizenship (Gözl, 29).

These discourses of shared values and common goals among a "unitary" and mythic Canadian citizenry helped to construct an image of the nation itself as a large family. The extension of the discourse of the family as coterminous with concepts of a paternal nationalism which ruling elites helped to establish as an agenda for national unity in

Canada, lent a coordinated articulation to the campaigns directed toward detection and control of homosexuality. Gary Kinsman, in an article on the anti-homosexual security campaigns in Canada, notes that, “[t]here were struggles within the security regime between a broader framework for the anti-homosexual campaign and a narrower security framework. While in general the narrower security frame won out by 1963 ... there was also the development of research on the detection of homosexuals as part of the security campaign” (Kinsman, 1995: 160). While a more integrated effort seems to have occurred in Canada, both American and Canadian experiences of the homosexual panic in the 1950s share some general attributes. There was a definite link between anti-Communist and anti-homosexual campaigns. Both prevailing discourses constructed homosexuality as a threat to national security due to conceptions of a “weak character,” and a purported “moral dissolution” which created easy prey for blackmailers and Soviet spies. These articulations sponsored an idea of the homosexual as a drain on the masculine vigor of national identity at a time when fears of the proliferation of communist subversion was at its peak (Kinsman, 1995; D’Emilio, 1989).

The social regulation of homosexuality in Canada, as summarized by Kinsman, occurred along three main axes. First, the active purging of homosexuals from the civil service, the military and the RCMP; secondly, changes in the immigration act which excluded homosexuals from entering Canada; and lastly, and more relevant for my purposes here, the creation of the Criminal Sexual Psychopath (CSP) legislation (Kinsman, 1993: 15). During the war mobilization, if men were labeled by military authorities as “homosexual,” or more likely as “psychopathic personalities,” they could be discharged from the military. This process actively engaged and extended the

authority of psychiatry from military contexts and into civilian contexts after the war. This diagnosis implied that these men were emotionally unstable and were unable to discern right from wrong, more often targeting men who lived outside familial contexts and sanctioned heterosexual relationships. Thus the new sexual psychopath laws often served as a code for homosexuality (Kinsman, 1993; Chauncey, 1993; Freedman, 1989; D'Emilio, 1989; Rubin, 1984).

There are both continuities and discontinuities between the medicalization of sexual danger in the past, particularly in the immediate postwar era, and today's discursive productions of pedophilia. I have taken you on a journey of the past, inflected with questions that I pose in the present, in order to draw out strategic questions, and descriptions of how the past and present are articulated. What a genealogical analysis offers is a way to make sense of our apparent "common sense" constructions of the dangers, the definitions, and the science of the problem of pedophilia. Consequently how we come to "know" pedophilia influences what questions we ask, what we choose to emphasize as important, and effects the actions we are willing to take or authorize in order to ameliorate the problem. It is erroneous and too simplistic to simply denounce the decisions taken and the assumptions made about the "treatment" of the "problem" of homosexuals in the past as mistakes made in an unenlightened era—to simply mark ourselves out to be much more progressive, wiser and enlightened about homosexuality today. To be sure, there are still those individuals, for instance, who espouse extremely retrograde discursive constructions of homosexuality. One doesn't have to look far in order to see evidence of that (see my Introduction). It doesn't take much in order to uncover them—to be sure there are periodic outbreaks of discursive intensities more

reminiscent of the past that are much too difficult to ignore. Moreover, the discourse of pedophilia today bears similarities to how the creation of a dangerous sexual individual was created in the late nineteenth century, and especially after World War II with the inauguration of the “sexual psychopath,” a forerunner to the “pedophile.” Our contemporary era bears witness to an undeniable amplification in the discourse of the pedophile, with heightened concern over the protection of children. No doubt the shifting gender and sexual relations that have been spurred on by the feminist and queer liberation movements have produced sharper cultural anxieties about the complex and multiple meanings that arise among the intersection of gender, age and sexual orientation. These anxieties become articulated with cultural debates about how children and young people are to be enrolled in the tensions over the production of sexual knowledge, and are refracted through gender, race, class and sexual orientation. The modern family, also produced within these challenges to its hegemony, becomes a site of “social defense” and a rear-guard action to protect itself from the incursions of “difference.” We can surmise that the amplification of the danger the pedophile represents, is in part, one manifestation of that defensive action.

In Chapter three I will turn to the construction of the modern family and the discourse of childhood. I will attempt to trace how the contemporary panic over pedophilia also anchors strong normalizing agendas and practices around the constitution of the family, gender and parental prerogatives. Before I turn to that, I will continue my focus on the genealogy of the figure of the pedophile by exploring how he is produced in contemporary scientific discourse.

## CHAPTER TWO

---

### **Laboratories of Desire: Pedophilia and the Governmentality of Psychiatric Knowledge**

We have become accustomed to thinking that we know who the pedophile is and what he signifies. The past two decades or so in the West has increasingly cemented that certainty. Its utility as an idea, as a term of reference, an object of scrutiny and as emotional vitriol is taken for granted. The certainty by which this subject is enunciated masks a socially orchestrated ignorance posing as certifiable scientific knowledge. The concept of pedophilia seems to function by announcing itself in a preemptive manner. Its monumentality is the hidden work that is being accomplished at each moment that it appears through the multiple registers of image, speech, text, emotions and social practices. Usually we cannot imagine anything other than this monolith. And for many, the subject of pedophilia is certainly *felt* as a monolithic entity. James Kincaid speaks of a kind of knowledge which is better described as “knowingness,” a social pact that “authorizes us to treat our ignorance as wisdom and to make that ignorance the basis for action” (Kincaid, 1992: 3). Gunter Schmidt calls this the “child molester discourse” (Schmidt, 2002: 473), with its penchant for gross generalizations, moral absolutism and arch emotional tone, and wishes to demarcate this form of speech from a more reasoned

and considered scientific discourse situated in a modern context of broadly-based social consensus.

While I can concur with Schmidt that the moral absolutism of the “child molester” discourse does a disservice to a project of science, which attempts, at least nominally, to move beyond such moral agendas, I am going to attempt to show how this distinction, founded on a particular conception of science, is a false one. In what follows I will interrogate how heteronormative practices in the production of knowledge are embedded in the current scientific discourse on pedophilia, and how that knowledge production partakes in specific alignments and fractures that exist alongside, and are mutually implicated with larger issues of governance and epistemological practices in expert discourse.

Socially orchestrated subjects have histories. Official and public actions are authorized by particular discourses on pedophilia, producing social effects through current practices of psychiatry and medicine. I will attempt to explore how we have come to know the subject of pedophilia, through a nexus of scientific knowledge in contemporary terms. That this subject of knowledge and the practices associated with its configuration has historical antecedents, as I explored in Chapter one, is obscured by the modality of discourse through which the pedophile is currently invoked.

I will again use Foucault’s method of genealogy in this chapter. Here I will draw from this approach in order to examine the constitution of the pedophile in medical science. Pedophilia is largely something that is spoken about, by individuals who are clearly understood not to *be* the thing spoken about. The ramparts for this division are studiously maintained. It is rare, indeed, in public discourses, to understand pedophilia

from the position of the “native” informant. This distinction is important and it signals important arrangements of institutional power in the process of formulating a subject or entity known as pedophilia. Yet this distinction, albeit important, is subsumed by a larger question which lies at the heart of the project of genealogy: the examination of the conditions that define the discursive space in which speaking subjects exist. I will attend to how the aforementioned division comes to be established and how it operates to constitute the space in which “pedophilia” comes to be known. The subject of pedophilia is a vast one, and so I have chosen to restrict my investigations along the lines of its invocation in specific clinical and psychiatric literature. I will analyze two articles, both representative contributions to the professional psychiatric knowledge on the diagnosis and treatment of the “malady” known in the literature as pedophilia. My purpose is to develop interpretative strategies that can be brought to bear upon the professional literature and to link these practices with broader issues of management and governance.

I will organize my investigations around two scientific articles. They are both substantive review articles which document the major clinical and research issues around the assessment, diagnosis and treatment of pedophilia in North America. The area of research on pedophilia and sex offenders has been increasingly investigated by psychiatry since the 1980s in the two jurisdictions from which my articles are located, Ontario and New York State. These locales have become preeminent sites for research on pedophilia, producing a plethora of experts on the subject and international conferences (Krivacska & Money, 1994; Feierman, 1990). The two articles that I have chosen for my detailed analysis are produced by preeminent figures in the field during their respective times. I chose these two articles in an effort to develop an analytical perspective on the

differences and continuities that can be inferred from their respective discursive positioning—one at the beginning of the intensification of concern around pedophilia, which arguably can be dated to 1977-78 in both North America and Britain (see Jenkins, 1992: 73), compared with a more considerable scientific presence at the beginning of the twenty-first century.

The first article by Vernon L. Quinsey, a leading researcher in the Mental Health Centre in Penetanguishene, Ontario, was published in 1977 by the *Canadian Psychological Review*. The second article by Lisa J. Cohen and Igor I. Galynker, both researchers at the Beth Israel Medical Centre in New York, was published in 2002 by the *Journal of Psychiatric Practice*. These two articles are separated by twenty-five years and the differing histories of institutional practices in two different countries. My aim is to contrast and compare the diagnostic and evaluative procedures implicit in their professional psychiatric practices. I will turn first to drawing out the epistemological practices that inhere within their major methodological design, and then attempt to synthesize these strategies to issues of broader social provision and issues of governance.

### **The Strange Arts of Science: Assessing the Risk, Diagnosing the Future**

The year 1977 is generally considered to be a pivotal one in the literature on lesbian and gay political and social history in North America. It is the year that witnessed an increasing call for the legal protection of children, enshrined and specifically inflected through the recrudescence of a moral panic of “child pornography.” This legislation was produced within a complex nexus of issues involving hegemonic discourses of prostitution, young people, homosexuality and religiously inflected statements of

salvation and sin. Both Canada and the U.S. witnessed parallel cases of public frenzy over the imperiled figure of the child; it was a year in which fundamentalist christian activist Anita Bryant whipped up national media frenzy in the U. S. proselytizing about a morbid and diabolical link between the social advancement of homosexuality as a global threat to children (Califia, 1980, 1995; Califia & Rubin, 1981). Bryant's counterpart in Britain was Mary Whitehouse, an activist who had been fighting against "permissive broadcasting standards since the mid-1960s with limited success" (Jenkins, 1992: 73). By forging close ties with the U. S. movement against child pornography, Whitehouse was more successful in galvanizing the public around the existence of a "vast" child pornography industry, and attracting the attention and support of both "traditional enemies of permissiveness and from the radical new right of the Conservative Party, including Margaret Thatcher" (Jenkins, 73-4).

In the Canadian context, the summer of 1977 was witness to a horrible crime which also fomented extreme reaction. In Toronto, the murder of a 12-year-old boy, Emanuel Jaques, on Yonge Street gave further impetus for conservative social reformers and politicians to push through with protean plans to "clean up Yonge Street" by attacking licensed sex trade establishments and street prostitution. In addition, the sexual aspect of the murder was used to vociferously attack the social and political gains made by gays and lesbians in the city (Brock, 1998; Kinsman, 1987; A Space, 1985). These strong streams of official and popular discourse wedded the global concern for children as linked to the social advancement of queers. The gay and lesbian community in Toronto had been engaging in community-building, political organizing and had developed a vibrant culture in the downtown area (Warner, 2002). These events served to set the stage

for right-wing reaction from a growing conservative insurgency to the gains that the gay and lesbian community had made in a relatively short period of time. A startling example of judicial homophobia occurred in early 1978, during the sentencing of the three men found guilty of murdering Jacques, the presiding judge stated, “[t]here are those who would seek legal protection for homosexuals in the Human Rights Code. You make me wonder if they are misguided. I wonder if there shouldn’t be legislation to protect the people you seek to entice” (Warner, 2002: 137). Four years earlier, in 1973, the American Psychological Association, at a meeting of the Task Force on Nomenclature and Statistics, had voted to delete homosexuality as a mental disorder from the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM II-1968), after a concerted campaign waged by gay and lesbian activists and health care workers. It is against this backdrop I want to situate Quinsey’s article on the assessment and treatment of pedophilia. What was the state of research into pedophilia in 1977? Quinsey provides a window into that with his 1977 article published in the *Canadian Psychological Review*.

I wish to begin my analysis by first pointing to a footnote that Quinsey includes in the introductory paragraph of his article. It reads, “[I]t is tempting to say that a person suffers from ‘pedophilia’ when he is labeled a pedophile even though no evidence of such a disease entity is available. The term ‘child molester’ has the advantage of being somewhat descriptive of the behaviour that is of concern in relation to the person being so designated” (Quinsey, 1977: 204). This caveat is revealing since it applies a criteria of observable behaviour in the researcher’s lens as a diagnostic tool. While this circumvents the notion of discovering a fixed “desire,” it traduces the ability for investigators to discover what the “content” of molestation actually means, leaving much to the

imagination in what is an emotionally laden term. In any case, the designation of “pedophile” seems to have less currency in the literature at that time. The working definition of pedophilia in expert discourse in 1977 was supplied by the DSM II (1968) as a “sexual deviation” and it was listed under a group of nonpsychotic mental disorders. The previous designation of pedophilia as a form of sociopathy (DSM I-1952), defined as a contravention of social mores, was dropped from the 1968 edition.

Quinsey’s article is concerned with mapping out the state of research on pedophilia at that time, ranging over major topics of interest for research into the phenomenon. Three major areas of research are discussed by Quinsey, these are: classification schemes, levels of dangerousness, and treatment regimes.

First, child molesters were frequently coded into types, and a system of classification was devised, which highlighted the gender of the victim, sexual preference structure of the offender, and whether the offense could be described as incestuous or non-familial. In the research Quinsey reviews, there was a marked tendency to determine the recidivism rates based on the sexual preference of the offender, and whether it can be classified as incest or a non-familial offense. Based on research conducted in the 1960s, Quinsey reports that,

It is of interest that homosexual offenders differ from heterosexual child molesters referred to an out-patient clinic not only in being more likely to recidivate but also in the age of their victims. The peak age range of male victims was 14-15 years of age, whereas that of the females was 8-10 years. Homosexual child molesters were less likely to have close relationships with their victims (Quinsey, 206).

It is a common trope in the scientific literature to find links among the age of the victim, recidivism rates, and sexual preference to a classification of familial and non-familial offenses. Also interesting to note is the disparity of ages between the victims of

heterosexual and homosexual offenders; this age category is encountered in other research literature, including research conducted in non-clinical samples (Wilson & Cox, 1983; Abel, et al, 1984; Ames, et al, 1990; Bernard, 1985; Gebhard, 1977; Kilpatrick, 1987; Leahy, 1991, 1992; Money & Weinrich, 1983; Sandfort, 1984, 1981).

Secondly, classification schemes were also beginning to be devised into the degree of “dangerousness” that a particular offender poses. Quinsey outlines three criteria in the literature for distinguishing between the “levels of dangerousness” of offenders. *Level 1* risk was characterized by an individual who had had sexual contact with a physically mature person, or committed an offence against an immature person as an incidental part of a pattern of antisocial conduct, usually in incest contexts. A *Level 2* risk was given to “situational” offenders who were primarily attracted to adults, and who offended against boys. A risk of *Level 3* was assigned to individuals who prefer immature persons and had established patterns of sexual contact with children and who had persistently arranged proximity to children (Quinsey, 2008).

These classificatory schemes are based on what has been available through research data, the methods of research sample selection that are employed, and the framework for amassing information from the offenders and their legal or medical handlers. Curiously enough, there is very little by way of explanation in the literature I engaged as to how these classificatory schemes were devised. There is a dearth of analysis on why, for instance, offenders against boys are generally seen as higher risk. Further, there is a gross decontextualization of the “bare facts” proffered through a study’s findings. One of the most salient and revealing subtexts to these classificatory schemes is the heteronormative operations of power embedded in the models of

assessment. Quinsey, for example, states rather conclusively that, “[i]ncestuous child molesters are a special case of situational offenders whose offenses are related to family dynamics and opportunism rather than inappropriate sexual preferences” (207).

These studies reviewed by Quinsey attempt to demarcate two kinds of offenders, coded through and ostensibly figured upon the offender’s “proximity” to the normalized and dominant configurations of familial and sexual orientation attributes. What is the status of the knowledge produced upon an unstable bifurcation between “situational” and “congenital” offenders? What is this division accomplishing? What happens when studies which make claims to a rigorous science attempt to draw mutually exclusive boundaries across heterogeneous phenomena? How are statements such as these supportable if not by an unstable and unacknowledged move whereby, to quote sex researcher Paul Okami, “[s]ome current sex research appears to serve less a social inquiry than a social advocacy function” (Okami, 1997: 559). Quinsey concludes his discussion of dangerousness by stating that the “prediction of dangerousness is not only vague and unreliable” but, “[w]hether or not child molesters are considered as a group to be dangerous depends largely upon which definition is adopted” (Quinsey, 210), reminding us that “physical damage to children in sexual encounters with adults is quite rare” (207). It is important to note the latent debate as to how “dangerousness” comes to be figured in cases of pedophilia. During this period of which Quinsey is writing, there is a recognition, it seems, that the approach be more circumspect, respecting the difference between instances of coercion, rape and physical bodily harm, and those where contravention of social mores seems to take precedence as the standard bearer of threat and consequent harm.

Difference is marked as being under the lens of scientific scrutiny. Yet, that difference which researchers attempt to account for obscures the historically marked differences existing within social relations marked by asymmetrical power arrangements in gender, family and other institutional contexts. Congenital markers of pathology are relegated more frequently to offenders with sexual preferences for molesting boys (read: same-sex offenders). A man who exists within the context of the dominant heterosexual family structure is absolved of the suspicion of congenital illness; his behaviour, normalised within existing familial structures, is explained (away?) differently. The quest to identify a foundation for pathological desire so dominates the research agenda that, as Quinsey writes, in the absence of an objective measure of sexual preference, “[i]t is tempting to ‘find’ a frustrating event that ‘caused’ the offence in any man whose sexual and social adjustment appeared adequate until the offence” (Quinsey, 2007). Such gross bifurcations in offender types only serve to distance us away from discovering how children’s vulnerabilities to abuse, mistreatment, sexual or otherwise are constructed within families and other institutions. The concern to identify a pathological subject obscures the broader context, particularly the way sexual coercion or abuse becomes rooted in institutional relations of asymmetrical power. The ability for a hegemonic set of scientific practices organized around specific regimes of knowledge production to systematically occlude investigation into structural and institutional analyses of power, functions as a set of legitimating discourses for existing and entrenched social relations of the patriarchal and heteronormative family. The risk categorization producing the three types of pedophiles calls into question the way notions of risk are defined and utilized. While offenders who have “persistently arranged proximity to children” (208) are seen

as a higher risk, the perpetrator within the family is relegated to a lower risk threshold. This contradiction remains completely unexplored within the literature that I have consulted. I think this contradiction can remain suppressed as a result, in part, of the foundational moves in medical science which privilege the uncovering of “hidden motors” of pathology for the pedophile’s desire. A pedophile who can be assessed as a “true” pedophile is viewed as a higher risk. This concern will become more pronounced in the scientific literature twenty-five years later.

The third and final area of research explored by Quinsey is the topic of treatments and implications for research that these pose. He cites that the two most important treatment approaches that have been tried with child molesters are group therapy and behaviour modification (213). Quinsey describes the various therapies that have been applied to child molesters, with “group therapy remaining the most widely used” (214). Discussion of aversion therapy included a description of the use of “classical conditioning” processes which involve covert sensitization and operant conditioning techniques. These techniques involved the use of slides and pictures, fading in appropriate visual images and using aversive conditioning techniques such as “electric shock” (214) with inappropriate material in an “orgasmic reconditioning procedure” (214). These techniques were used in conjunction with phallometric readings or penile circumference responses, described as “objective measures of sexual preference” (217) used to chart the patient’s progress and treatment efficacy. A newer form of therapy being identified then was social skills training. In this case the pedophile was taught by therapists appropriate ways of interacting with potential adult partners. In the case of homosexual offenders, “members of the gay community were used as models of

appropriate homosexual behaviour” (216). Presumably, there were no gay therapists to model such behaviour!<sup>1</sup> One of the more salient tropes that exist in the medical literature on the treatment of pedophilia is the induction of a framework for normalisation from which pedophilia is measured against. Implicit notions of family structures and those individuals who exist within them are invoked in order to chart progress for a pedophile’s attempted cure.

### **The Contemporary Pedophile in Medical Science or, Alice in Wonderland**

Since Quinsey published his overview of the state of the science of pedophilia in 1977, North America has witnessed increasing attention to the discourse of the pedophile. Its profile has emerged in high relief. It is impossible to open a newspaper, watch television, go online, or listen to the radio without the lurid and sensational reports of yet another pedophile in our midst.<sup>2</sup> Media reports of pedophiles, priest and teacher scandals,<sup>3</sup> and the trumpeting of the vulnerability of the child to sexual threats has continued apace. The inauguration of child pornography laws in Britain and the U. S. (occurring simultaneously in 1978), and in Canada in 1993, have had an amplification effect on the identification and surveillance of alleged pedophiles who are increasingly produced as a threat operating through clandestine channels and over the Internet (see

---

<sup>1</sup> Matthew Stadler, a gay novelist from the U.S. brilliantly satirizes these psychiatric practices in his utopian/dystopian-political novel, *The Sex Offender* (New York: Grove Press, 1994).

<sup>2</sup> My personal project to archive news related items on child pornography and pedophilia after the child pornography law came into effect in Canada in 1993, may serve as a benchmark for the hyper-attention that pedophilia related stories in the press have had. After approximately two years of assiduously collecting newspaper stories, I gave up over the sheer number of reports and stories that appeared. I would joke with my friends that I would have had to hire a part-time librarian or archivist just to keep up!

<sup>3</sup> For analyses of recent Canadian cases of scandals involving female teachers and students see: Sheila L. Cavanagh, “Sexing the Teacher: Voyeuristic Pleasure in the Amy Gehring Sex-Panic” *Social Text* (forthcoming, 2005) and Sheila L. Cavanagh, “Upsetting Desires in the Classroom: School Sex Scandals and the Pedagogy of the Femme Fatale” *Psychoanalysis, Culture and Society*, (forthcoming, 2005).

Lynch, 2002). Medical science has increasingly embraced the opportunity to study the pedophile in an attempt to provide methods of cure, containment and prevention. The sexual offender treatment and clinical research of pedophilia is now a well established industry, with Ontario being a preeminent site for research at facilities such as the Clarke Institute of Psychiatry. I will turn now to what the Cohen and Galynker article sets out for us in terms of the current state of assessment, diagnosis and treatment of pedophilia and related issues.

Lisa J. Cohen and Igor I. Galynker, both of Beth Israel Medical Centre in New York, have published an overview of the current scientific status of pedophilia. This article was published in the *Journal of Psychiatric Practice* in September 2002. Cohen and Galynker tackle five main areas of research: clinical features of pedophilia, pedophilic subtypes, psychiatric comorbidity, etiological factors, and treatment regimes.

The clinical features of pedophilia have not changed markedly over the past 25 years in the literature, at least in terms of types of acts committed and the profile of the frequency of offenses or prevalence of offender types. What has begun to emerge is new clinical directions for research which is couched in more medically inflected language, such as notions of “age of onset” (Cohen & Galynker, 2002: 278). Cohen and Galynker suggest that pedophilia appears in adolescence, yet they also point to an emerging category of “child sex offenders who molest other children” (278) as a category that suggests early onset. Another strong trend emerging in the literature is the co-investigation of other psychiatric disorders existing alongside and implicated with pedophilia: “[r]ecent literature on paraphilias and hyper-sexual disorders,” Cohen and Galynker write, “has suggested that pedophilia may fall into the obsessive-compulsive

spectrum or may reflect impulsive-aggressive pathology” (279). Another new trend in the clinical manifestations of pedophilia is the advent of “cognitive distortions” (282) as an entrenched feature in clinical observations. This attribute is often invoked in court cases with sex offenders of children. It is characterized as a propensity for pedophiles to “routinely deny and minimize the deviant nature of their behaviour and its destructive impact on the children involved” (279), as well as a “generalized propensity to distort reality” (282).

Pedophilic subtypes represents a continuation of what has become fairly common in the literature at this time. The concern to classify and identify various sub-grouping of pedophilia in the literature continues apace. Essentially, the classifications attempt to deal with differences in behaviour, object-choice and situational contexts. Cohen and Galynker outline the criteria for division as follows: pedophiles can be categorized as having exclusive versus nonexclusive sexual contacts with children; distinctions are made between incestuous and non-incestuous offenders; there is a concern to divide offenders into exclusively homosexual, heterosexual or bisexual preferences; and finally there is an attempt to discern “true” pedophiles from non-pedophilic child molesters (280-81). It is not clear what these divisions accomplish. Ostensibly, the aim is to formulate a way of predicting higher risk offenders, yet it is not clear what kind of solutions are being offered, and how these divisions relate to the broader research design. As such, this classificatory scheme produces a teleological model of offender types. The ends themselves are already implicated in the design: one can discern the moment when teleology and tautology are synonymous in these classification schemes. Cohen and Galynker pose the pivotal questions that undergird the research agenda: “Are all people

who sexually molest children actually pedophiles? Can perpetrators of child sexual abuse be differentiated according to the centrality of pedophilic arousal?" (281) After establishing the importance of this classificatory scheme, "as possibly the most important distinction regarding assessment and treatment" (281) they continue: "[T]hus we might conclude that distinctions between 'true' and 'opportunistic' pedophiles are meaningful but far from conclusive and that they need to be clarified" (281). These classificatory schemes recall the nineteenth century scientific taxonomy of homosexuality which attempted to classify homosexual "patients" into those who displayed attributes of congenital "inversion," versus those who were afflicted with an ostensibly mutable "disease of the will." These overriding concerns in contemporary science to establish a marker of biologically-based desire, linked to foundational identity claims, becomes the (gendered) organizing principle around a set of scopical and measuring practices which centres the medical technology known as penile plethysmography. I will have more to say about this below.

By the time the DSM-IV (1994), and its revised text edition DSM-IV-TR (2000), appeared, the definitional criteria for pedophilia became characterized as "recurrent, intense sexually arousing fantasies, sexual urges or behaviours involving sexual activity with a prepubescent child or children (generally age 13 years or younger)" which persists for a period of at least six months. Such fantasies or behaviour cause clinically significant distress or functional impairment (Cohen, 276). In addition, explicit age-related categories were expanded and elaborated as "[T]he person is at least age 16 years and at least 5 years older than the child or children in Criterion A" (DSM-IV-TR, 2000: 572). Additionally, a note appears which excludes "an individual in late adolescence involved

in an ongoing sexual relationship with a 12- or 13-year-old” (572). The diagnostic criteria for pedophilia catalogues three further specifications: by sexual attraction to males, females or both; if limited to incest; and exclusive or nonexclusive types (572).

Richard Green, writing about the evolution of the diagnostic category of pedophilia in the DSM, describes it as a “trip through Alice’s Wonderland” (Green 2002: 469), especially the important subsumption of pedophilia under the general paraphilias which are not considered a mental disorder unless they are associated with distress, impairment or a “significantly increased risk of suffering [or] an important loss of freedom” (470). As such, the pedophile who is not distressed over being a pedophile, except in response to public condemnation, would not qualify for a disorder, *unless he acts on these fantasies*. As such, Green asks what becomes of the pedophile who does not act on the fantasies or urges with a child? Where does the DSM leave us? “In a logical ditch” (470), Green replies. The architects of the DSM seem to be saying that an individual’s psychopathology is manifested only when that person translates thought into action, thus countering the usual framework for how other disorders such as schizophrenia and obsessive-compulsive disorder, for instance, have been produced within a set of psychiatric diagnostic criteria.

Pedophilia as a diagnostic category was approached with caution in 1977 in the medical literature. Twenty-five years later it has become central in diagnostic practices. How has this change occurred? What was not identified as a possible discursive and medical reality in 1977 has mutated into one where the certainty of its existence is lent coherence and reiteration (although not without contradictions as we will see below). Moreover, new classifications have emerged and are being studied as possibly co-existent

with the presence of pedophilia (as if being diagnosed with pedophilia was not enough). Cohen and Galynker cite a growing literature that examines the existence of “Comorbid Axis I” and “Axis II” disorders. Comorbid Axis I disorders include affective, substance use and impulse control disorders (281). These disorders also include the presence of other paraphilias such as frotteurism, voyeurism, exhibitionism, and sexual compulsivity. Axis II pathologies include the study of “psychopathic traits, impaired assertiveness and Cluster C disorders (i.e. obsessive-compulsive, dependant, or avoidant personality disorders)” (282).

A marked presence in the literature at this time is research into the etiology or cause or origin of pedophilia. Cohen and Galynker outline research being conducted on histories of childhood sexual abuse, sexual arousal patterns, and neuroendocrine and neuropsychiatric functioning. Cohen and Galynker suggest that an “abused-abuser theory” (282) for pedophilia is warranted, due to an “elevated rate of child sexual abuse in the history of pedophile offenders” (282). Yet, at the same time they cite the fact that this evidence is extremely confounded by “cognitive distortions” (283) and the exigencies of the judicial system, which may lead offenders to “overstate histories [of child sexual abuse] in order to gain sympathy” (283). Several commentators have cast doubt on the “cycle of abuse” theory, in part for the simple reason that the majority of reported child sexual assaults are directed toward young females and, as such, we would expect to see a plethora of female perpetrators emerging (Okami, 1990). In addition, a new terrain in research in pedophilia is emerging in the area of neurobiological abnormalities. This approach enters the highly technical and murky waters of neuroscience, in which some studies have attempted to look at “cortico-limbic

functioning” (283) and “frontal impairment and its relationship with behavioural disinhibition” (284). These investigations are inconclusive and remain speculative, they also contradict many other studies which suggests that pedophiles have little or no marked difference to “healthy controls” when it comes to personality disorders or psychopathology (Gebhard, 1977; Taylor, 1981; Wilson & Cox, 1983; Bernard, 1985; Feierman, 1990). Cohen and Galynker posit their own theory on the cause of pedophilia which combines the “cycle of abuse” model with the neurobiological hypothesis about which I will have more to say below.

Finally, Cohen and Galynker turn to treatment issues which have not changed much over 25 years except for the increasing use of pharmacotherapy and specifically, anti-androgens, as standardized treatment regimes. Cognitive-behavioural treatments which attempt to increase “age-appropriate sexual and affiliative behaviour, and to strengthen inhibition of pedophilic behaviour” (285) continue, as do the older methods of aversive conditioning, covert sensitization as well as plethysmographic biofeedback which attempts to “extinguish desire through masturbatory satiation” (285). There is no mention of electric shock, or the use of emetic substances, but Cohen and Galynker are not shy about advocating more physically coercive measures “in cases where internal motivation is lacking, external restraints, such as surveillance networks or threat of incarceration, are used to bolster inhibition” (285). They conclude that pedophilia is a “serious, chronic, and probably life-long psychiatric disorder, with significant comorbidity with other paraphilic disorders” (286). Effective treatment would need to be “intensive, long-term, and comprehensive, possibly with lifetime follow-up” (286).

\* \* \*

In synthesizing the major currents of change in the medical literature on pedophilia, I wish to highlight some important issues. First, the medical and scientific ministrations of pedophilia point to an almost exclusive construction of a subject category positioned entirely within expert knowledge production provided by psychiatry, medicine and criminal law. New technologies in the rationality of psychiatric practices, as exemplified by the discipline of neuropsychiatry, have amplified the technocratic language in the diagnosis of pedophilia, effectively isolating the social provision of pedophilia from the broader community or alternative social provision. In this way, knowledge that counters the discursive framework of the pedophile as congenital pathology has been effectively banished, and prevented from emerging. When they do exist, these narratives remain outside of respectable discourse, suspicious and marginalized. Minor and subjugated discourses that counter the dominant production of knowledge about pedophilia remain largely untellable, relegated to a vanishing discursive space. And this disappearing space for alternate narratives and arguments is often reductively characterized as “apologias for pedophilia” and their interlocutors are brought under suspicion, and at times, severe sanctions.<sup>4</sup> One wonders whether even academic critical discourse that attempts to destabilize the dominant knowledge production and

---

<sup>4</sup> For examples of legitimate research and scholarly work which has come under legal, judicial and even parliamentary attack consult: Sonnenschein, 1987 and Levine, 2002. For an analysis of the scandal that erupted over Rind, Tromovitch and Bauserman’s 1998 article, “A Meta-Analytic Examination of Assumed Properties of Child Sexual Abuse Using College Samples,” published in the American Psychological Association Journal, *Psychological Bulletin*, 124(1), consult, *Sexuality and Culture, Special Issue*, Spring 2000, 4(2).

social practices of imagining pedophilia (as I am attempting here) may be pronounced as “cognitive distortions.”

The medical and expert discourses which constitute and consolidate our knowledge about pedophilia are all-encompassing, and are linked with and mutually constituted by other specific discourses (hegemonic understandings of child sexual abuse, families and child sexuality). These interlocking discourses experience little or no legitimate challenge or resistance to its general assumptions.<sup>5</sup> The inscriptive and impositional powers of these discourses are very strong, mutually constituting and hence, very effective, enabling psychiatry to self-generate its own constitutive “inside,” as it were. This effect is given greater power through the contemporary trend to link the diagnosis of pedophilia with other psychopathologies, thereby multiplying and fortifying the definitional base of the disorder. There is a wide open road ahead, as it were, and the prevailing discursive winds are coming from behind this engine of psychiatry, speeding up its direction, facing no substantive obstacles and thereby sustaining an arch confidence

---

<sup>5</sup> There has been and continues to be organized resistance to the dominant medical and psychiatric model of pedophilia. Such resistance is underground and manifests itself as a loose connection of individuals who form a supportive network of “boylovers” and “girl-lovers”, usually via the internet and other web-based chat rooms and internet sites. Historically, (or at least before the internet) groups of self-identified pedophiles or “boylovers” have formed supportive and clandestine groups which offered support and shared information pertinent to its members. The North American Man-Boy Love organisation (NAMBLA), founded in the U.S. in 1978 by Tom Reeves and David Thorstad is one of the more famous of these groups, having attracted much police and negative mainstream media attention over the years. In the U.K. PIE or the Pedophile Information Exchange, had about 500 members and a leading member, Tom O’Carroll, a former teacher, who engaged in public debate as an self-identified pedophile. Tom O’Carroll’s book, *Pedophilia: The Radical Case*, remains one of the few articulate and political documents from someone who could be construed as a “native speaking” subject. In Holland, Denmark and the Netherlands the history of the lesbian & gay movement has always incorporated pedophilia into its structure. Since the beginnings of the COC in the Netherlands, a pedophile sub-committee has been an accepted part of that nation’s gay and lesbian movement. For more on this astonishing history (to a North American lens of perception especially) refer to Brian Taylor (ed), *Perspectives on Pedophilia*, London: Batsford Academic, 1981 & Theo Sandfort, et al. (eds) *Male Intergenerational Intimacy: Historical, Socio-Psychological and Legal Perspectives*. New York: Haworth Press, 1992. See also Kelly, 1979, Bearchell, 1978, Geraci, 1997, Brongersma, 1984, 1987, Reeves, 1996, Praunheim, 1980, Rossman, 1979.

in the certainty of its final destination. And this psychiatric engine refuels itself at every rest-stop with the apparent success of its unimpeded travels. This may be a suitable metaphor for the changes wrought by scientific discourse and its relation to changes in the culture at large—an age of hyper-optimism about science and technology. The science of pedophilia remains an instance of these changes.

Secondly, I wish to point to the growing positivism in psychiatric science as evidence by the rise of a new “biologism” with respect to the treatment of mental disorders and psychopathologies. My analysis of the two articles have uncovered, I believe, a marked shift away from social and contextual factors in the diagnosis, treatment, and assessment of pedophilia. Whereas Quinsey and others writing in his day, could conceivably gesture toward social contingencies in the interpretation of pedophilic outcomes, contemporary science occludes social and contextual factors by subsuming them under an interpretive framework which privileges positivistic and biological discourses surrounding brain functioning, hormonal abnormalities, neurochemistry, and what can be described as an arch-positivistic phenomenology of the body (i.e. interpretations of physical manifestations of deviant arousal patterns and desire) (see Cohen & Galynker, 282-5, *passim*). This new trend is also evidenced by the general rise of pharmacology and the standardization of psychotropic and anti-androgen drugs in the treatment of sex offenders.

Nowhere is this new behaviourism more emblematic than the testing practices involved in the clinical industry of sex offender diagnosis and treatment. A convicted sex offender or pedophile who has been ordered by the court to undergo treatment is inducted into a set of practices in which the technologies of penile plethysmography testing figure

significantly. A brief description of this process is helpful. The patient is tested in a phallometric laboratory which is equipped with a volumetric plethysmography device, that is, an apparatus that measures penile blood volume change rather than penile circumference. The volumetric device is considered to be more accurate at low levels of response than the device that measures penile circumference.<sup>6</sup> The device itself is composed of a glass cylinder and a rubber tube attached to the cylinder that isolates the air inside the tube from the outside atmosphere. The cylinder is connected to a pressure transducer which converts air pressure changes to voltage-output signals. The apparatus is calibrated so that known quantities of volume displacement correspond to voltage output. The patient puts the glass cylinder over his penis and sits in a reclining chair which faces projection screens, and wears a set of headphones. During the test, the patient's face is monitored by a low-light video camera in order to detect avoidance strategies such as averting one's eyes from the test stimuli. The stimuli used are audiotaped narratives that are accompanied by slides "which simultaneously show the front view, rear view, and genital region of a nude model who corresponds in age and gender to the topic of each narrative" (Blanchard et al, 2001: 121). The narratives are about 100 words in length, and are all "written in the second person and present tense" (121). Below is a sample narrative which is, we are told, typical in tone and style:

You are babysitting a five-year-old girl for the evening. She is taking a bath before she gets ready for bed. Through the open bathroom door, she calls you to come in and scrub her back. You strip off your clothes and get into the tub with her. Your naked bodies slide against each other in the hot, soapy water. You take

---

<sup>6</sup> The opportunity for satire abounds with respect to these measurement devices. Sylvère Lotringer in his investigative research on sex offender treatment clinics in the U.S., asked one of the attendant clinicians if he has ever tried the phallometric test on himself, his reply was incredulous astonishment: "On myself? Never. Are you crazy?" (Lotringer, 1988: 63). Lotringer describes the laboratory enterprise this way: "...it shows the behaviourist's mind at work, alert, resourceful, expedient, impatient with drawn-out therapies and unencumbered by theoretical elaborations, brushing away in one single stroke two thousand years of Western civilization; it finally affords a telescopic vision of the kind of sexuality that is in the offing" (10).

a washcloth and gently begin to rub the smooth, dimpled mound between her legs. She asks for the washcloth, and you let her soap up your penis and testicles (Blanchard et al, 2001: 121).

The particular study, conducted in the Clarke Institute of Psychiatry, from which the above information was taken, was conducted to examine the particular sensitivity and specificity of the phallometric testing practices for individuals contesting accusations of pedophilia during court proceedings.<sup>7</sup> Phallometric testing has been regarded as inconclusive and problematic, other researchers have pointed to gross underlying assumptions that there is a “natural operational linkage between stimulus-specific penile arousal patterns and overt sexual acts” (Simon & Schouten, 1991: 76). Available evidence is far from providing unequivocal support for the hypothesized relationship between sexual arousal in the laboratory and overt sexual acts (77). The “truth” about the offender’s desire devolve onto the minute changes in blood flow that occur during arousal in the penis; the vagaries of penile tumescence become the synecdoche for a

---

<sup>7</sup> Some of these studies have a curious way of exhibiting statements which place their working premises in doubt while at the same time engaging in rhetorical practices that are intended to shore up their internal authority. Here is an example of one curious statement in the article from the researchers from the Clarke Institute: “There is no reason to assume that pedophilia is really such an all-or-none condition. It may well be that pedophiles, hebephiles, ephebephiles (persons most attracted to postpubescent adolescents), teleiophiles, and gerontophiles (persons most attracted to the elderly), represent points along a continuum rather than discrete taxa, or that some individuals simply do not discriminate between sexual objects of different ages. These possibilities are of obvious theoretical as well as practical clinical importance, *but they do not pose a serious problem for the present research*” (Blanchard et al, 2001: 125, emphasis added). First, the long list of Latinate sexual categories include this curious category, *teleiophile*, which is explained earlier in the article to be an adult person who is most attracted to other adults. The obvious multiplication of sexual categories are noteworthy, (I have never been able to determine the difference between a “hebephile” and an “ephebephile” except for the missing “ep”). It is unclear why these factors do not pose a problem for the existing research since they tend to undermine the very rationale for the determination of exclusive offender types, as they rely on discrete and identifiable differences that are marked out as qualitative beyond a certain identifiable and critical threshold of scores on the “Pedophile Index.” For a better analysis than I am capable of that troubles the classificational accuracy with respect to internal and external validity of the scores on the “Pedophilic Index,” consult (Simon and Schouten, 1991: 84-88). It would be interesting to see studies which compared the efficacy of the polygraph tests to the penile plethysmography ones, since both testing devices have largely been described as unreliable. “The polygraph is not admissible in Canadian courts, although police may use it to sort out suspicions of criminality. The polygraph is also unacceptable to the American Psychological Association because it turns

regime of scientific rationality of diagnosis and predicative analyses. The body is taken as authoritative text; the patient's narrative is subsumed beneath the "incontrovertible" truth to be extracted from the body. David Lyon, writing about the new technologies of surveillance manifested by identity cards and new scopic regimes of the body and its links to governing practices, puts it this way: "[i]t is data from the object of the body rather than speech from the acting subject that is to be relied on in the last analysis" (Lyon, 2001: 306). He situates these changes within a social matrix in which the rise of the information economy coupled with the reliance on computerized databases has given a functional legitimacy to a multifarious set of practices that he describes as "biosurveillance" (Lyon, 299). This interpretive regime of scientific rationality arrange the "facts" about the productive discourses of the body and about its techniques of surveillance, and situate them in a positive valence that regards the subject's own narrative accounts as unreliable and therefore inadmissible. Moreover, this political technology of knowledge production is largely invisibilized and lent legitimacy as the normalized rationality of "scientific method" which privileges the vectors of immediate observation, and "raw" or independent, non-subjective data.

One way of accounting for this discursive move, as it were, is to map out how investigations of difference, criminal behaviour, and mental disease pathology have increasingly acquired a cast of biological reductionism in the culture. The fantasies of truth imprinted within the body bear the hallmarks of the nineteenth century discourse of eugenics and the social relations of racialized science, recapitulated onto the social terrain of the late twentieth and early twenty-first century. We can see this occurring, for

---

up an unacceptable number of false positives" (Lyon, 2001: 298). Interestingly, the polygraph is used in conjunction with the phalometric test, in order to "score the erections" (Lotringer, 1988: 30).

instance, in the search for the “gay gene” which lends a medical legitimacy to the consolatory moves that encompass sexual identity and social and political legitimation. It offers the promise of a foundational legitimation for sexual orientation, a fantasy of truth, authenticity, and the security of a firmly anchored identity. This is why gays and lesbians themselves can be found among the proponents of the “gay gene” theory of sexual identity. Jennifer Terry points to a sea-change in the relationship that feminists and queers had to biological determinism; from a radical skepticism in the 1970s to one which paradoxically embraces the “seductive power of science” in the 1990s. Changes in the relation of scientific knowledge to society generally, underpin this paradoxical accommodation to science which gays and lesbians themselves participate in (Terry, 1997: 281). In terms of the expansion of psychiatry into everyday distress and the parallel concretization of the science of pedophilia, the cast of biological foundations to identity structures are produced as incontrovertible and inherently malign. The regime of scientific rationality which pursues a foundational desire of the “true” pedophile can be conceived as the “dark side” of identity politics. This positivistic quest for the “truth” embedded in a “naturalized” model of sexual orientation organizes offender types in highly suspect ways, paradoxically attempting to ground problematic sexualities at the same time as the epistemological status of foundational identity claims has come into crisis.

A third observation about the two aforementioned articles illustrate the changes wrought by a new positive valence in medical sciences vis-à-vis an etiological model proposed by Cohen and Galynker. Toward the end of their article, Cohen and Galynker propose their own etiological model on pedophilia. Their conception combines the theory

of “abused-abuser” cycle with neuroscience, on the basis of their own “preliminary imaging findings” (Cohen & Glaynker, 284). They posit a model of pedophilia in which “childhood sexual abuse leads to aberrant cortical development. Specifically, abnormalities develop in temporal regions mediating sexual arousal threshold and erotic discrimination” (284). Paradoxically, this model is described as “highly speculative” (284), such as a “significant fraction” (284) of child molestation may be related to a “larger pattern of sociopathic and exploitative behaviour etiologically unrelated to childhood sexual experiences” (284). Nevertheless, in a flow-chart diagram (285) they illustrate the stages of development from the original sexual abuse, to an outcome of abuse perpetrator. They link original sexual abuse as the foundation for aberrant cortical development in the victim which then gets linked to deficient erotic differentiation and sexual hyperarousal. This event then leads to deviant sexual arousal toward prepubescent children which then becomes inflected through personality pathology leading on to a perpetuation of sexual abuse. The victim becomes the perpetrator in a tautological development of immense proportions. Incredibly, in case we have not grasped the logical flow clearly enough, they include a dotted line leading directly from the top of the model, the original sexual abuse, circumventing all the stages, to connect directly to the perpetration of the sexual abuse.

Etiological questions were subsumed in the Quinsey article in 1977. The major concerns cited then were how to assess “levels of dangerousness” in child molesters which admittedly, posed tremendous difficulties for analysis, and the effectiveness of various modalities for treatment. An allusion to the “cycle of abuse” discourse is evident when Quinsey discusses the propensity for child molesters in therapy to “[a]dopt the

language of the therapists to account for their offences ... explanations which included references to early childhood experiences, psychiatric terminology, and personal inadequacies” (Quinsey, 210). What has been approached with caution and given a contextual skepticism in 1977 becomes entrenched as an etiological model in the Cohen and Galynker article. What is curious is that despite reservations in the literature which attributes childhood sexual abuse as an underlying cause for pedophilia, the authors reinstate their adherence to this causal model, now combined with neurobiology. It is unclear what role speculative findings should have in a discipline which claims to represent the rigour of the natural sciences, and as such no answer is offered in this article. What this suggests is an acceleration in the pace of research vis-à-vis a mutation in scientific rationality. This is a strategy of knowledge production which seeks to recombine inconclusive and problematic research into new positive agendas for future research, circumventing critical thresholds for evidentiary findings. This new mutation in scientific rationality that takes pedophilia as its object of study is but one instance in a larger trend which parallels developments toward internally generated and technocratic language—the language of administrative and managerial experts. I will have more to say about this below.

Foucault indicates that a discursive regularity is marked by the persistence of its enunciations and a proliferation of linked statements, concepts and thematic choices which operate together to produce “systems of dispersion” (Foucault, 1972: 37). The apparent coherence lent to the scientific discourse on pedophilia seems to be enhanced by these unstable epistemological practices. The proliferation of diagnostic categories constitutes one of the strategies whereby a discursive practice reproduces its own

authority through repetition. We are on an uneven terrain of peculiar science; one where inconclusive studies become fodder for further investigations and inconclusive categories elide into practicable modalities. It is the elision of these categories and how, taken together, they envision a present and future of governmental processes and prophylactic practices which is of analytical interest.

There are important similarities between the creation of detection technology for homosexuals serving in the U.S. army during WW II and the immediate postwar era, and the surveillance and diagnosis of pedophilia. Both methods attempted to locate “objective” physical imprints of pathology on or within the body; both methods appealed to the infallibility of its methods as a functional imperative, and both instances of surveillance appealed to the broader social importance of its task. Jennifer Terry reminds us that during the Cold War in the U.S., “[H]omosexuality, associated popularly with both gender inversion and sexual perversion, symbolized a dangerous affront to the idealized image of the perfect home and family. Not surprisingly, anyone who disturbed the foundations of the family and the gender roles that underpinned it came to be regarded as a threat to the nation’s security” (Terry, 1999: 332). Similarly, pedophilia is marked as a disorder to the hegemonic family, increasingly since the threat continues to be framed, in popular and, to a large extent in expert discourse, as extra-familial.

In the Canadian context, there exists manifest institutional continuities between the surveillance and medicalization of homosexuality in the 1950s and 1960s and the science of pedophilia today. Aversion therapy and other techniques used to treat pedophilia were widely practiced on homosexuals in Canada and the U.S. during the 1950s and 1960s. These subjects were inducted through the courts and through self-

referral into a clinic, founded in 1956 under the leadership of Dr. Peter Thomson, that would eventually become the Clarke Institute of Psychiatry. Two experts who treated homosexuals during that time, Johann Mohr and R. E. Turner, were also instrumental in early research into pedophilia, publishing their research in 1964.<sup>8</sup> As homosexuality increasingly became recognized outside of the categories of perversion and deviance, admissions to the Clarke for homosexual related concerns declined to about fifteen percent by 1963, a decline from about eighty percent in the previous decade (Kinsman, 1987: 132).

I wish to end this section by gesturing toward some links between the science of pedophilia and the way the research subjects are currently inducted into the legal system. Although space prevents me from elaborating on this important link, it would be consequential to investigate how the legal and expert discourse on child pornography, mutually constitute the way pedophilia is imagined and fortified together as an illness and a crime. Specifically, it would be interesting to surface the links between child pornography investigations and the status of evidence found at the “crime scene,” with the way pedophilia is investigated and how its diagnosis is produced as mutually constitutive evaluative and epistemological practices. When we consider the vaguely defined and broadly-based definition of Canada’s child pornography law, and the fact that the politics of its representation are often defined as nothing other than “crime scene photographs,”<sup>9</sup> we can begin to appreciate how the new mutation in the optics of

---

<sup>8</sup> See Johann W. Mohr, R. E. Turner and M. B. Jerry. 1964. *Pedophilia and Exhibitionism: A Handbook*. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press). Information on the early history of the Clarke Institute comes from Gary Kinsman, 1987, pp. 129-138.

<sup>9</sup> This is how Dr. Peter Collins, a forensic psychiatrist who works for the Clarke Institute of Psychiatry in Toronto and the Ontario Provincial Police, describes child pornography in a CBC Radio One interview on the program *The Current*, on 18 June 2004.

scientific rationality, and the evidence produced during child pornography investigations, partake of an absurd reductionism and a radical elision of difference. For instance, Police Chief Julian Fantino, during the mass arrests of gay men in London, Ontario in the mid-1990s, was fond of describing visual images, referring to video or photographic evidence of child pornography, as unadulterated and transparent truth: "Pictures don't lie, pictures tell it all" (CBC transcripts, 1994: 12).<sup>10</sup> These discursive strategies elide the speaking subject, indeed the very social space for plural narratives, for an effect which seeks to produce a positive valence for veridical discourse, lending authority to practices of governing the "ungovernable" subject of pedophilia.

### **Managing the Monstrous: Risk and the "Ungovernable" Subject**

I would like to situate the present practices of psychiatry vis-à-vis pedophilia within a social history of psychiatry in order to highlight more recent changes in the links between psychiatric power, knowledge and the law. General changes in the context of psychiatric practices in the West since WW II would help illuminate some current trends in the relationship between psychiatric practices and criminal law. Since WWII there has been an increase in the reliance on medical expertise within clinical settings where research is conducted. Psychiatry has been influential as a repressive and custodial project for the control of social deviance, enabling the move away from the segregation of patients, as was common before the war. After the war, proposals emerged to replace a carceral psychiatry with a prophylactic and therapeutic endeavor co-extensive with the community itself, exerted as a push toward de-institutionalization. Practices of

---

<sup>10</sup> For more on the important links between the policing of pedophilia and child pornography investigations see Cossman, 1993; Cossman et al, 1997; Bell & Couture, 2000; Persky & Dixon, 2001; and Hannon, 1995.

community psychiatry were struggled with, as its definition and social practices were often at odds. The rise of a radical anti-psychiatry movement in several countries signaled a new militant push for patient rights coupled with a wholesale critique of psychiatric practices and institutionalization.

Miller and Rose (1986) advocate that psychiatric practices be studied without the conceptual encumbrances that accompany some of the radical or anti-psychiatric literature. They surmise that these doctrines, although well-intentioned, deflect from view how new productive relations of psychiatry are multiplied, form productive links with other aspects of social life and continue to proliferate psychiatrically defined problems designed to keep corresponding solutions within its own jurisdiction. Nikolas Rose writes, "rather than seeking to explain a process of de-institutionalization, we need to account for *the proliferation of sites for the practice of psychiatry*. There has not been an extension of social control but rather *the psychiatrization of new problems and the differentiation of the psychiatric population*" (Rose, 1986: 83, emphasis in original). The increasing attention that pedophilia has commanded within psychiatry not only stands as an instance of the proliferation of psychiatric practices, it is also visible in the tendency of psychiatry to construct multiple diagnostic categories, as well as the way diagnostic categories are assembled lending authority to its own practices of knowledge production.

Although Foucault speaks about a heterogeneous system of dispersal of statements, what may be in evidence in the particular case of the development of the scientific discourse on pedophilia, and which the Cohen and Galynker's article illustrates, is a forced coherence, an elision of questions, a bracketing of difference and a side-stepping of critical analysis which increasingly builds on its own internal productions of

knowledge. This may be one of the particular discursive strategies that is unique to the phenomena of the scientific investigation of pedophilia. Foucault has certainly accounted for such operations of power; what may be striking in the science of pedophilia is how the expert practices exhibit a marked tendency toward a scientific colonization of its subject.

The social significance of the work that is accomplished in the assessment and diagnosis of pedophilia has certain congruent features with practices of normalisation. The history of the rise of psychiatry as a discipline highlights the gradual shift away from carceral models toward ones where psychiatry has attempted to gain increasing authority and legitimacy by allying itself with general medicine. Rose (1986) points out that the gradual move away from a carceral model was not motivated out of humanitarian concern, as much as the development of new technologies and pharmacology enabled psychiatry to extend its reach and authority into areas of human mental distress more than before. Post-war economic realities, the rise of the welfare state, developments in professional sectors outside psychiatry and the rise of new pharmacological treatments, all extended psychiatry's reach and its ability to make connections with other agents of social provision.

The psychiatric apparatus can be described as an assemblage of practices, codes, technologies, technical expertise and knowledge production that have a governing effect. The notion of governmentality initially set out by Foucault (1991) includes an understanding of governance which is decentred, dispersed and produces knowledge in concert with multiform operations of power. Governmentality is at once internal and external to the state, since its tactics are what make the "boundaries" of the state shift and

constitute the changing distinctions between the public and private spheres. Foucault's essay "Governmentality," outlines the shift from a mode of sovereignty based on outside authority to one where the sovereign legitimates its own authority from the population it governs. This is a fundamental change. As such, the economy, understood as the government of the family or household, becomes the target for governance in the form of surveillance and control over the wealth, health and behaviour of the population, becoming the new justification for rule. Thus the family as a unit of the economy has taken on greater importance in modernity as a "ground" for ruling practices and a measurement of health, wealth and normality. Foucault writes, "[t]he family disappears as a model of government, except for a certain number of residual themes of a religious or moral nature" (Foucault, 1991: 91), a state of affairs which has mutated into an especially reified form of moral normalisation, where the family's structure and function stand as a powerful norm. As I explored earlier, tropes of the heteronormative family are used as a backdrop for assessing the normalization of pedophiles inducted into treatment modalities.

The dispensation of authoritative statements on human distress and mental illness that psychiatry has been able to obtain, is crucial to our understanding of how pedophilia has become an object of interest. Psychiatry is routinely held to have the final authority on the "truth" about mental illness. Its authority on diagnosis and the treatment of maladies is often invoked in juridical contexts. Since the way pedophiles are inducted into psychiatry's ministrations are often through the courts, the mutually constituted links between the legal system and the psychiatric provision of pedophilia is of major interest.

Some recent commentators have pointed to a significant shift in the induction of a new class of intransigent criminality and the operations of power and knowledge that occur in managing these subpopulations. Jonathan Simon (1998), writing about sex offenders and the new penology, signals significant changes in the social meaning of punishment. Where rehabilitation, aided by the scientific/medical ministrations of criminal populations was the emphasized goal in juridical contexts, there has been a major shift toward retribution and deterrence. A new class of the “sexually dangerous offender” has been emblematic of this juridical/psychiatric shift. Simon outlines four broad patterns in the changes in the targets, practices and strategies in the discourses of the penal establishment.

First, the priority of the individual as a responsible agent for criminal acts, is being replaced by an operational priority toward groups, categories and classes. “In some senses,” writes Simon, “this returns to a concern with ‘dangerous classes’ that preoccupied criminal justice in the nineteenth century” (Simon, 1998: 453). An important aspect of the operations of knowledge production is the priority given to the language of risk in the administration of justice. This aspect of risk profiling, and the assessment of levels of dangerousness figure prominently in the articles I analysed earlier on the psychiatric research into pedophilia. This forms one of the major axes whereby the new practices of psychiatry and the law construct a dangerous offender on statistical knowledge. This assemblage of past experiences, risk profiles and group characteristics are produced as databases, enabling a move toward what is known in recent criminological literature as “actuarial justice” (Simon, 453). Individual characteristics

and social contingencies drop out of the picture, instead, the predicative analysis of offenders and their future “career” are based on this mass of accumulated data.

A second major shift in the new penology is a de-emphasis on the transformation of the individual as a rehabilitative ideal toward one which seeks to manage high-risk populations. A guiding discourse here is the emergence of a “pragmatic pessimism” (Simon, 454) that sees a class of offender in which little can be done to transform them towards community standards. Thus an increasing reliance on incapacitation in the form of powerful drugs which extinguish desire in sex offenders, coupled with long-term or indeed life-long surveillance and case management emerge as strategies of containment of sub-populations. This new regime of governance seeks to manage a class of offenders through intensive and life-long intervention. Indeed, Cohen and Galynker, reflecting this trend in psychiatry, conclude their review of pedophilia advocating for “intensive, long-term, and comprehensive [treatment] possibly with lifetime follow-up” (Cohen & Galynker, 286) as prudent case management strategies. A set of epistemic practices divest this population from any semblance of self-generating control or rehabilitative potential. Pedophiles are produced as “ungovernable” subjects, ideal candidates for a system of totalized management.

A third shift can be detected in the “displacement of evaluative norms rooted in real communities” (Simon, 454) toward one where these guidelines are internally generated by experts and couched in administrative and technological language. In reference to pedophilia research, this distancing of the practices and knowledge of social punishment from the community is inflected by psychiatry in its general movement toward specialization. Thus, research on pedophilia is increasingly directed toward the

grammars of specialized medical sub-disciplines as exemplified by neurobiology. While the community is increasingly distanced from the professional, administrative and operational circuits of power within which pedophilia is officially managed, it is given the semblance of community control with the establishment, for instance, of community notification and sex offender registry laws. These laws create the legal fiction of community safety and control over sex offenders, but they were largely created from the spur of fear and punitiveness masquerading as protection of children. They provide almost no protection against sex offender recidivism, while allowing the state to shift responsibility for subjects deemed “ungovernable” back onto the fictive control of communities.<sup>11</sup> These peculiar constructions of the fiction of protective legal mechanisms are responsible, in part, for producing the unruly discursive space between community vigilance and vigilante justice, or “populist punitiveness” (Simon, 1998: 457; see also Vikki Bell, 2002), spaces exploited by the media and which become the scenes of public rage and other extreme emotions.

### **Concluding Remarks**

These investigations have pointed to a terrain where strange practices are occurring. These practices are what we usually refer to and valorize as science. The underlying movement that we witness is how a complex social phenomenon becomes translated into starkly biological terms. It seems that as psychiatry becomes progressively invested in more and more of everyday human distress and disorders, it produces itself in more narrow terms as the authoritative measure of the dysfunction of the human brain.

---

<sup>11</sup> Of course violent cases of pedophilia, which result in the murder of the victim are extremely rare, yet it is these exceptional cases which figure prominently in media reports, inflame popular fears, and which often

All corresponding solutions, to complex social problems then become transmuted into a focus of brain functioning, bending expert discourse toward more specialized areas as exemplified by the discipline of neurobiology.

Why is it so difficult to make this strangeness visible? It is often noted that science has “advanced” and that we can now laugh in a self-satisfied way about the silliness of, for example, nineteenth century phrenology as a mode of diagnosis of criminal types. Yet, very few would dare to laugh at the science of pedophilia. It is much too serious and much too invested in our current modes of social regulation.

Yet, we need to continue to ask questions about the causes and consequences of a medical inquiry into the etiology of pedophilia? How has this mode of scientific inquiry into pedophilia and the social effects it produces contributed to making pedophilia socially marginalized and at the same time symbolically central? As such, what investigations are neglected and obscured by the knowledge/power operations of a science for identifying and curing pedophilia? What knowledge count and are deemed suitable and which ones are deemed unsuitable or beyond the pale? What (de)formations of scientific processes are used, adapted and molded to the single-minded positivistic quest for knowledge in the service of surveillance and cure? Why do we believe that this scientific quest, with its authoritative knowledge, its medical experts and standardized methods of induction of objects of study will help us find a way of improving the lives of children and young people, which is the purported intent. What connections exists between science’s reductive accounts of the body’s processes, new regimes of social control and the reification of perversity?

---

serve as politically expedient means to push through retrograde legislation.

What other modes of inquiry are occluded or suppressed by the hegemony of psychiatric knowledge and its practices? How can the knowledge of children themselves be heard? What frameworks for acceptable truth-telling have adults constructed which interfere with listening to children? Judith Levine, for example, has sharply critiqued the monotonous drama of the calls to protect children, unmasking the production of the pedophile panic as an effort

to fortify the nuclear family by fomenting suspicion of strangers [which] fractures the community of adults and children; it can leave children defenseless in abusive homes. Projecting sexual menace onto a cardboard monster and pouring money and energy into vanquishing him distracts adults from teaching children the subtle skills of loving with trust and discrimination (Levine, 2002: 44).

What is the relationship of the discursive regularities that exist in the medicalization of pedophilia to other discursive formations? What might a comparative analysis of these discourses reveal about the nature of the current epistemic moment? We see corresponding changes among other discursive formations such as law, the penal system, and the family, yet the way children and youth are inducted into social guardianship also figure prominently. It is to the topic of our social guardianship of the child, the social construction of the family, and its crucial role in the drama of pedophilia that I now turn.

## CHAPTER THREE

---

### **Discourses of Innocence and Protection: The Social and Moral Regulation of Children and Youth**

In Chapter Two I have explored how the discursive construction of the figure of the pedophile and the danger it evokes is contingent and contested within the realms of its discursive “centre” in medicine and science. Moreover, the pedophile’s configuration in scientific discourse betrays stark hierarchies of gender and sexual orientation which participate in its social construction as individual pathology. Here, I will explore further how the spectacular “success” in the production of this unitary and specific discourse is accomplished. How does our sharply mobilized “knowledge” about the pedophile implicate the various positioning of children and childhood? Conversely, how are contemporary discourses of the family, in part, simultaneously produced by and produce the various ways in which the pedophile is invoked and its management attempted? How far does our narrative of this threat authorize ideas and actions about the status of children and protection strategies through a terrain of governing practices anchored in notions of the family? Moreover, particular discourses of children’s innocence and vulnerability mask the functioning of heteronormativity, and thus contribute to a set of hierarchies upon which child protection strategies are mobilized. I will continue my genealogical investigations by taking up the way the “child” is produced by the threat the

pedophile signifies. I hope to uncover how particular constructions of the child make specific images of the pedophile both possible and necessary: the two figures coexist in a grave symbiotic melange of fears, denials, dangers and eroticism—displaying the features of what Deborah Britzman calls “[t]he passionate work of denial and disavowal” (Britzman, 1998: 65). My overall aim is to uncover how the social construction of the family is integral to how the pedophile is produced as a threat, as such I will set out by examining recent sociological literature on moral regulation as a lens for my investigations.

Moral regulation entered the sociological lexicon in the 1970s and 80s as a way of broadening and disinterring a more incisive analytic regarding the way socially orchestrated fears and anxieties circulate through discourse. Accounts of moral regulation attended to how specified categories of the “norm” are grounded in institutional networks, setting boundaries on acceptable representation. Stuart Hall and his colleagues, in a seminal work, on the topic of moral panics involving crime, consider the image of crime, in this case mugging, to be an “ideological conductor” (Hall et al., 1978: viii). Specific constructs of crime, Hall contends, attempts to mask, in coded form, a crisis involving the state, law and order and a fragile consensus around such issues. The term or label that evokes strong reactions attempts to assert a whole “field of associations and references, which lend meaning and substance to the term” (Hall et al., 27). The concept of “moral panic” has its utility in describing the particularly intense periods of crisis in which a fairly predictable set of state and non-state actions conjoin (such as police, social services and the media) together to create an amplified and usually unpredictable set of social, moral and institutional effects. These intense conflagrations are usually short-

lived, in which the “quality and quantity of deviance is exaggerated” (Doyle & Lacombe, 2003: 288), and where sharply defined scapegoats usually appear and take on amplified significance.

Drawing on these specific effects, Gayle Rubin has provided a classic definition of moral panics within a context of sexuality:

Sexual activities often function as signifiers for personal and social apprehensions to which they have no intrinsic connection. During a moral panic, such fears attach to some unfortunate sexual activity or population. The media become ablaze with indignation, the public behaves like a rabid mob, the police are activated, and the state enacts new laws and regulations. When the furor has passed, some innocent erotic group has been decimated, and the state has extended its power into new areas of erotic behaviour (Rubin, 1984: 297).

Yet, there is a sense in more recent sociological work that the concept of moral panic should be developed in order to arrive at a more coherent perspective of social anxieties which seem always already present, and which are continually “bubbling,” as it were, but which become intensely visible at different times, under differing circumstances, producing disparate effects. Moral regulation evolved from a conception of “moral panic” which was deemed “too conspiratorial” or narrow to describe ongoing social anxieties and the complex ways that social control occurs (Doyle & Lacombe, 2003: 288). Regulating the social through the imputation and policing of what constitutes the “normal” is a part of an integral strategy of governance of populations.

Moreover, the concept of moral regulation is more amenable than the sociological concept of “moral panic” in locating a form of regulation of the “normal” which participates in the periodic intensities that we come to describe as moral panics. This perspective provides a theoretical understanding of the pervasiveness of moral regulation and the historical construction of the present as effects of that regulation. Conceptions of

moral regulation, for instance, would be able to account for the social regulation of parenting as the exclusive “moral” preserve of heterosexuals, and why fears of gay and lesbian parenting may be an instance of intense “panic” when, for instance, parents and school officials struggle over the inclusion of queer curriculum materials. Such discourses of fear, when invoked in these specific contexts, borrow from and reinforce already existing regulatory discourses that construct the viability of children’s tutelage and social guardianship as radically separated from queer social realities. Such amplified instances of fears and moral regulation that accompany the issue of pedophilia, then, emerge in a continuum of discursive strategies of moral regulation in other spheres of activity.

### **A Genealogy of Modern Childhood**

The category of the child is an embattled discursive space. The notion of childhood is mobilized by discourses ranging from practices of child-rearing, age-appropriate behaviour, censorship, sexuality, schooling, developmental psychology and other “psy” disciplines, which together lend and ratify meanings about the “child” in multiple institutional sites. These discourses are heavily freighted with moral injunctions of varying intensities. The figure of the child generally, and its sexualized image specifically, is pressed into service in the West for a breathtaking range of purposes—advertising, images of security, purity, entertainment, pleasure and nostalgia. In many of these cases, the child is constructed in ways that conform to adult needs and expectations.

Modern childhood is discoursed as a “staged” world which is marked off from the rest of society and the world of adults. Furthermore, childhood stands in a paradoxical relationship to the adult world. Children are both set off from adults and yet are inextricably entwined in the everyday life worlds of adults. The centrifugal force of the family shapes children’s social worlds and operates, in part, by regulating (domesticating) the discursive links to the wider social, legal and political realm. Official discourses are translated into everyday forms, such as the inducement to produce successful students within the school system. This process is continuous, practically enforced, subverted, renegotiated or contested within families and often struggled over by the children and youth themselves.

It is important to understand the extensive mythologization of childhood and of children occurring in modern cultures. In the years after the Second World War, intense concern with the position and behaviour of the young was produced as a result of a range of social and economic changes. The image and symbol of the child is largely an adult construction, a symbolically central discursive construct, constitutive of adults themselves and of their own needs and projections. Kincaid argues that the underlying definitional category of sexuality is fundamental to the binary of adult/non-adult (Kincaid, 1992: 70). Puberty is often demarcated as the borderline between childhood and adulthood; its basic content being the time when menarche in girls and seminal emissions in boys manifest. Such logic requires that the child be thought of as non-sexual in a delimited horizon which denies a process-oriented model, substituting a sudden, specific and dramatic advent. Among several binaries that accompany the image of the child are innocence/maturity, incapacity/capacity, emotion/reason, and non-sexual/sexual. Yet the

sexuality binary is constructed as fundamental, mutually constitutive of the other binaries listed above. Pointing to the sexual discourses that become attached to the social anxieties surrounding youth, Mary Louise Adams suggests that “many people understood the tone of adolescence to be set by ... changes associated with puberty [figuring] the discursive construction of youth as a sexual category” (Adams, 1997: 52). It is perhaps for this reason that challenges that attempt to disrupt these binaries over the meaning and significance of childhood are particularly intense. The sexualization of young people, and the social anxieties over sex generally, served to frame social concern over youth delinquency, for instance, creating a potent brew where the *sexual* meanings of youth became amplified and entwined with the “state of youth” generally (Adams, 52).

Jacqueline Rose, in a study of children’s fiction and its images of an “all-too-perfect presence of the child,” traces the development of the cultural myth of Peter Pan. Rose argues that Peter Pan locates “[t]he innocence of the child and a primary state of language and/or culture in a close and mutually dependent relationship” (Rose, 1984: 1, 9). This image mutually reinforces an amorphous and blank image of the child with a transparency of language enforcing a stable mooring for both language (systems of representation) and sexuality (systems of desire and libidinal economies). Claudia Castañeda suggests that the image of childhood as a discrete “stage” is constitutive in the making of specific worlds of nature/culture, participating in the “generative circulation” of cultural imperialism. These cultural tropes act as a “crucible of potentialities” for local and global transformations (Castañeda, 2002: 1). These images of the child suggest that the child is produced as symbolically central in Western culture with its production of evasions, mythologizations and cultural certitudes. Its over-determined semiotics enables

powerful counter-images to be produced whenever dominant tropes of childhood are perceived as being under threat.

A host of images, meanings and representations in our modern culture radically decontextualizes the child and childhood. It becomes a powerful referent of universal utility, mobilized for a range of purposes. The constitution of such images of the child severs it from specific, local and material grounding, a universalist mold which “[d]enies the very different life chances that exist between children born of different genders, classes, ethnic groups, family-households, religions and nations” (Gittins, 1998: 3). Historically, children have never played such a “sacralized” role within systems of representation. The preciousness and protectedness of the world of childhood, replayed endlessly in media and films, are composed of adult projections, recasting adult yearnings and meanings for modern consumption. It is not clear why the image of the child has played such a psychologically potent role in modernity. In an age when growing uncertainty, anxiety, and the collapse of any assured linkage between reason, knowledge and progress has entailed a gradual devolution of notions of the stability of the “nuclear” family, consequently, the image of childhood uncorrupted by society has become increasingly important, as a kind of “psychological balm.” Lee Edelman suggests that one reason for such potent images is the “future-orientation” that childhood represents for maintaining heteronormativity, anchored in the “heterosexual narrativity of liberalism and its commitment to reproduction as the basis of social continuity” (Edelman in Bruhm & Hurley, 2004: xiv). These notions of childhood uncorrupted by the social have important implications for how familial incest and pedophilia are jointly configured and mobilized. I will have more to say about this below.

Changing legislation has continued to produce children's social experiences, containing them within certain parameters, and variously allocating child protection responsibilities between state and family guardianship. Commenting on the array of welfarist legislation directed toward children in the late nineteenth and twentieth century in the West, Rex and Wendy Stainton-Rogers point to a dynamic such that "by both exclusion and specific design, [the legislation] also delineate the segregation, to greater or lesser degrees, of children from the life world and experiences of adults: from work, from voting, from legal liability, from sexual activity" (Stainton-Rogers & Stainton-Rogers, 1992: 73). Legal regulatory legislative measures, often enacted from within local crises in various countries, have variously figured protectionist schemas which shifted the relative powers and positions of legal responsibilities and jurisdictions between the state, social agencies, parents and family in a chain of relative obligations and responsibilities. These legislative efforts stretch from The Prevention of Cruelty to Children Act of 1889 (England), with its amending Acts of 1894 and 1904, up to the Child Protection Act of 1978 (U.S.). Each have continued to produce a foundational category of the child as residing within the care of the parent or guardian. At times, state agents were prescribed to act on behalf of, or in capacity as parents—*in loco parentis*. Other times, it is the parent who is positioned as agent of the state, charged with raising children on the state's behalf. Not until the England and Wales Children Act of 1989 did legislation exist which purported to listen to the child's wishes, taking some tentative steps toward enshrining the rights of a child as legal subject. However, this new law has come under criticism, as its provisions, while allowing children a right to independent hearing before the courts (as in parental custody, care and control after divorce), can effectively trump the child's

testimony as contrary to their best interests. Thus, even this law maintains parental prerogative, effectively enshrining judiciary exclusion of human rights extension to children. These legal provisions call upon the discourses of child development and liberal notions about capacity and the ability for rationality, “unencumbered by the passions.”

Yet, the way children and youth are discourses continue to be complex and contradictory, with lived realities that evade and trouble the way they are produced as minors within official discourse. The images of innocence and purity, of incapacity and vulnerability, run alongside other images and realities—of child labour and economic and social exploitation, compulsory schooling, child neglect, abuse and contempt. This collection of images produce jarring inconsistencies. For instance, how are we to interpret the reality within which British children, only a small proportion of whom were actual orphans, were shipped to the colonies without parental consent or overseers? Joy Parr writes: “Between 1868 and 1925 eighty thousand British boys and girls were sent to Canada to work under indentures as agricultural labourers and domestic servants. All were unaccompanied by parents, although only one-third of them were orphans. Most were not yet fourteen” (Parr, quoted in Kincaid, 1992: 75). Victorian society saw tensions between the bourgeois domestic ideology of women and children in the protected sphere of the home, where children (and women) were marked off as vulnerable and pure, and the grim realities of poverty, social disenfranchisement and the labour that poor children performed in order to sustain themselves and their families.

Of course, working-class and middle-class families, both then and now, are important sources of emotional comfort, support and the shared human intimacy that buffeted some of the worst excesses of working life under capitalist industrialization.

Jeffrey Weeks (1981), commenting on the dual character of freedom and regulation that inhere within the dynamics of bourgeois Victorian families, describes it essentially as a “paradox, [being] both the privileged location of emotionality and love, the only source in respectable ideology where it could be tolerated, and simultaneously an effective policeman of sexual behaviour” (Weeks, 1981: 31). Weeks further elaborates that,

[C]hildhood sexuality posed a particular challenge, and was met by simultaneous (and of course, contradictory) denial and control. The family, in other words, succeeded both in exalting sexuality, via the indispensable marriage bond, and in severely regulating it. The paradox was that the more ideology stressed the role of sex within conjugality, the more it was necessary to describe and regulate those forms of sexuality which were outside it (Weeks, 1981: 31-32).

Conversely, because of the intense crucible of human relations and emotional work that the family was induced to provide—Foucault refers to the family as a site of “extreme sexual saturation” (1990: 46)—it is also a vulnerable site for exploitation and physical, sexual and emotional danger. Stephen Pfohl (1977), relates how the problem of child abuse was “discovered” in the 1870s when it was put into discourse as a dire social problem for the first time. Although ill treatment of children had long preceded this discursive event, a new accounting of the problem framed the issue in specific ways. The definition of the problem, its causes and its authorized remedies were discursively enabled in highly specific, contingent, and differentiated ways. A set of expert disciplines arose, led by middle-class individuals charged with identifying potential problems and authorized to act on the newly defined problem of child abuse. Their remedies and professional social practices often conformed to a set of moral injunctions, values, priorities and unacknowledged assumptions inflected by class, race and gender—a set of responses displaying an “[i]ncreased obsession with the overall condition of the ‘race’ and the nation’s well-being as symbolized by its children” (Gittins, 75). While middle-

class professionals regulated the public work of children (through social purity campaigns and moral exhortations), the child labour performed by poor and working-class boys and girls as agricultural workers and domestic servants in middle-class homes went unchallenged (Gittins, 64). It was the urban, poor, public (visible), and largely male occupations which were targeted for “moral reform.” Appallingly exploitative working conditions existed for all workers including children, who were seen as a supply of cheap labour on which immense profits depended. What is interesting for my examination of the question of pedophilia as moral regulation is the fact that “the initial target of state intervention and middle-class outrage was on the most visible and dirty of children’s occupations: chimney sweeping and coal mining” (Gittins, 62). These occupations were viewed as dangerous to children’s innocence because they brought together adults and children under conditions of close physical proximity where, due to the intense heat, a minimum of clothing was worn.

Foucault (1990) has outlined how the production of child sexuality figures as one of the “four great strategic unities” (103) of how sexuality was deployed as a production of knowledge/power anchored within specific “targets” around which sexuality was productively discoursed. Specific techniques of power that operate in productive, intimate and capillary form cohere in such targets as illustrated by the “pedagogization of children’s sex,” as schematically outlined by Foucault. The eighteenth and nineteenth century war on masturbation, for instance, was a paradigmatic example of discourses that were not designed to curtail a practice so much, but to produce new local centres of power-knowledge. These were described by Foucault as “lines of penetration” (42) that allowed more intimate surveillance of children and their guardians in the home and in

public institutions. The extraordinary attention paid to children's onanism, Foucault notes, is a "task that was bound to fail lead[ing] one to suspect that what was demanded of it was to persevere, to proliferate to the limits of the visible and the invisible, rather than to disappear for good ... power advanced, multiplied its relays and its effects" (Foucault, 1990: 42).

Importantly, Foucault maintains that the incitement to child sexuality, configured through the war on masturbation, specifically lent its appeal to bourgeois families and guardians, with working-class children largely free of these social-moral injunctions. These social injunctions were framed as a concern to prevent "degeneracy" and "moral dissolution" in the potentialities that young bourgeois (male) bodies would signify for the future of the nation. If these discourses were powerfully bent in the direction of bourgeois families, they were also inflected through nationalist, class, and entrepreneurial organizational practices that informed the nineteenth and early twentieth century social reform movements (Parker et al, 1992; Moon, 2004). Located in specific discourses of class, race and colonial relations, these reform movements circumscribed notions of the family dependant upon corporate and nationalistic values, "promoting [a] particular notion of self-making, of simultaneous self-mothering and self-fathering, that it takes over from capitalist culture" (Moon, 49). If attention to the bodies of children organized a set of scopic regimes around the body of the masturbating child, these knowledges were produced as ambivalent responses that located blame for transgressions. As such, a panoply of experts bent their gaze on manifestations of blame for the child's "dissipation of energies," attention which more often fell to those marked as stereotypic others.

### **Regulating Children's Sexuality and the Production of the Racialized Other**

Narratives of children and childhood evoke strong currents of biologisation and naturalized metaphors. Children are often figured in ways which highlight their affinity or closeness to the "natural" world. This highly symbolic discursive construction permits the anchoring of a conception of children and childhood which serves moral regulatory agendas, underlining normative and conservative notions of parenting and social order. These discourses function as an active barrier to envisioning specific constructions of the child in contexts as individuals, or the culture of childhood as a class or aggregate. Configuring the social management of children within the family has turned on conceptions of danger and threat, produced as existing outside the family, taking on distinct features. This social construction effects, among other things, how we come to tell stories of child concern. I will elaborate more on this below.

Threats and danger to family relations, configured through the conduit of the child, have been produced through a multiplicity of discourses that turn on the dangers of "internal enemies," of class, sexual and racial origin. Discourses of childhood sexuality, functioning within a frame of bourgeois universality, are inherently unstable and participate in the class and racial exclusions that exist at the centre of nationalism, and as Ann Laura Stoler writes, finds "symptomatic resonance in the colonies" (Stoler, 1995: 149). The colonies to which Stoler refers and which organize her investigations are primarily drawn from the history of the Dutch East Indies. However, she maintains that a wider application can be drawn and comparisons made in some "fundamental ways" to other settings and locales (Stoler, 10).

Ann Laura Stoler (1995), drawing upon and extending Foucauldian thought, troubles and expands his insights into the arena of colonialism and subject bodies, describing how the pedagogy of children's sex is jointly produced and symptomatically inflected within colonial discourses. Effects of this colonial discourse served to amplify fears attendant on children's bodies and the child's relationship to others. Rather than a production of an assemblage of discourses and practices which sought to prevent children from touching themselves, concern was directed outwards, such that it became important to identify "those bodies that should not touch them" (Stoler, 149). The stereotypic others were usually identified as the "lower-orders," the servants, nursemaids, and wet-nurses who were constructed as cultural intrusions, threats and as potential disrupters of family organization. More specifically, as Stoler documents, they were constructed as the sources of "sexual arousal, moral deviance, misguided reason and the objects of control" (149).

But these representations were also ambiguous and ambivalent, since native servants were also figured as lascivious and sexually available, occupying a dangerous sexual terrain where white colonial bourgeois desires could be vicariously practiced and also disavowed. Mapping these colonial and race relations onto the twentieth century Arabic Orient, Joseph Boone similarly describes how the sexual discourses of a "decadent and lawless East" offered encounters which put into crisis assumptions about male sexual desire, masculinity, and heterosexuality that are specific to Western culture, such that the "other" is often perceived through the amplified registers of "danger and desire" (Boone, 1997: 20). The way children were engaged through tutelary discourses reveals the lineaments of adult political imperatives, and consequently, its stress on the

evacuation of social risk and the emptying out of social difficulty and conflict. "What is striking," Stoler writes, "is how much the middle-class impulse to prescribe children's social and specifically sexual behaviour was based on a racialized language of class difference" (Stoler, 1995: 151). These discourses participate in the creation of a space of "noble purity" as a cultivation of the self-governing European, that turn on the identification of social manifestations which threaten this figuration. The bourgeois family took on greater significance as a "crucible" for this prescribed self-development, breeding the self-discipline and correct training of children. In marked contrast to the narrative of colonial others who were seen as a site of unruly social practices, the European bourgeois family was configured as vulnerable "where a child's sense of personhood, citizenship, and sexuality could be subverted, perverted, or well-formed" (152). Ann Stoler documents the ongoing prescriptive cultural, social and political work that was done in order to maintain white European bourgeois identities, identities that were at once "vulnerable, unstable and susceptible to change" (163). Protection from the fear of mutability, and the unraveling of these carefully controlled cultural inducements for the maintenance and reproduction of bourgeois selfhood and its accoutrements of power "demanded a rerouting of desires, a displacement of eroticism, and externalization of arousal to a native or mixed-blood surrogate self" (163).

The sexual and moral danger attributed to servants transformed as the colonial relations which supported a system of servant-classes declined. New forms of danger to white European bourgeois self cultivation were in the offing, underwritten by the same set of racial, national and sexualized images. Hence we can witness the coterminous attention paid to prostitution and homosexuality and other sexual deviations, configured

as “outside” the family, and mutually implicated in its internal dynamics. The dynamics of the family and internal disruptions to its social construction as a harmonious bourgeois entity, authorized, in part, the contours of the pedophile figure. It is to these important divisions that we now turn.

### **Discoursing Incest and the Construction of the Dangerous Other**

Configurations of incest within the family have important implications for the way pedophilia is discursively produced. In the following brief sketch, I will show how the dominant construction of the pedophile regulates how incest is made an object of knowledge, thereby legitimating and enabling specific ways of regulating the phenomenon of adult-child sex and child sexual abuse. Crucial aspects of the discursive phenomenon of pedophilia underwrite claims of the child and the family, that I briefly sketched above. These claims produce the pedophile as a unique and amplified threat, largely located “outside” the family and regulate how incestuous relations are “taken up” and become an object of knowledge for disciplinary power that regulates the family through other discourses and institutional practices. In taking up these investigations I will pursue how incest has been set out by Foucault, and also how feminists have critically intervened in the problem of familial incest.

Foucault has set out a specific analysis of incest in the first volume of his *History of Sexuality*, passages which represent some of his more complex analyses of the deployment of sexuality. Foucault’s analysis of incest incorporates the two major strategies of power that Foucault outlines as the deployment of alliance and the deployment of sexuality. The deployment of alliance is understood as the way sexuality

was organized through kinship bonds as it pertains to rules that surround marriage, inheritance, descent and patrimonial relations, often tied to feudal systems exhibiting a strategy of power Foucault terms the juridical-discursive. The deployment of sexuality, in contrast, is a system of techniques of power that took the body, its pleasures and intimate social relations between them as the locus for new ways of measuring, evaluating and disseminating knowledge and truth claims about subjects through an intricate web of discourses about "sexuality." The modes of power in these two great systems also differ, with the deployment of alliance relying on the power to check, "defining the permitted and the forbidden, the licit and the illicit," whereas the deployment of sexuality "operates according to mobile, polymorphous, and contingent techniques of power," a disciplinary power that "engenders a continual extension of areas and forms of control" (Foucault, 1990: 106).

Foucault analyzes these two great discursive strategies of power locating their crucial contest within the family. The family became a pivotal site for the emergence of the deployment of sexuality at the same time as this emergence was framed within the system of alliance anchored in the juridical-discursive power relations. Foucault writes, "the family was the crystal in the deployment of sexuality: it seemed to be the source of a sexuality which it actually only reflected and diffracted. By virtue of its permeability, and through that process of reflections to the outside, it became one of the most valuable tactical components of the deployment" (111). These interlocking and complex relations between these two forms of power coexist, Foucault argues, in imbricated form, not as a complete development of one form over another. Vikki Bell suggests that, for Foucault, the unique character of incest, "is an irresolvable point of tension between the two

systems” (Bell, 1993: 95). This tension is played out between the tendency for the deployment of sexuality to incite new productive arrangements of knowledge about sexuality, as in the production of the masturbating child, with the sovereign power of final interdiction in the form of the taboo, the power of “thou shalt not.” Thus, new sexual knowledge and interests are produced within the ambit of family relations as experts bent their gaze on the family, and the family was induced to “broadcast its long complaint of its sexual suffering to doctors, educators, psychiatrist, priests and pastors, to all the ‘experts’ who would listen” (111). A vast array of productions of sexualized knowledge within various disciplines occurred, finding their locus in the family, enabling the advent and predominance, for Foucault, of psychoanalysis (Foucault, 1990: 112-14). For Foucault, the family is a pivot for how an array of new technologies of sexuality both reference and consolidate the family as a point of origin and a point of departure. However, by remaining a very abstract discussion, it tends toward a latent functionalism, insofar as the non-specified parts to its dynamic are obscured within an analysis that tends toward global strategies of power located within a wide temporal arc. This lack of specification is elaborated by feminists who seek to engage with Foucault’s thought on the problem of incest, family violence and sexuality.

Feminist analyses of incest and domestic violence have grouped various abuses under a “continuum” of male violence. Such a concept has enabled feminists to make connections between various forms of abuse from rape to sexual harassment. These notions arose to describe the volume of behaviours that constrain women’s lives. Yet, there has been concern not to overextend the term “violence” by collapsing distinctions between force, injury and the operations of power and authority that can work more

subtly (Bell, 1993: 59). This perspective expands our understanding of the social relations of coercion that fall short of actual physical violence. Familial incest, as such, has been understood as occurring as a consequence of the existence of conjoined relations of power and authority that organize adult male power, paternal authority and gender relations in the family. Gender dominance and the relative powerlessness of girls and the discourses of mothering, all contribute to the dynamics of familial incest (Bell, 1993; La Fontaine, 1990). These analyses of incest have helped dislodge incest from the traditional sociological and anthropological emphasis on transcultural taboo, and as individual pathology. Feminist analyses help to resituate the problem of incest within a larger dynamic that sees incest as an extension of prevailing forms of gender dominance and its extension into the familial realm such that “incest cannot be regarded as *asocial* at all, but has to be analyzed instead in direct relation to the social structures which are continually produced and reproduced as ‘normal’” (Bell, 1993: 3, emphasis in original).

Feminist analyses of incest have entered into contestation with Foucault over the two important organizing issues of gender and power relations. First, Foucault’s analysis fails to specify how continuing disparities in the social relations of gender, contribute to a pervasive and systemic domination of men over women. In the case of familial incest, this is particularly important since the social relations of hegemonic families structure male authority as consistently implicated in the positioning of girls, women, and mothers.

Secondly, feminists have critiqued Foucault’s analysis of power on the basis that his stress on heterogeneity and the specificity of each situation disallows broader patterns of domination to emerge (Bell, 1993; Hekman, 1996). For feminists taking up Foucault’s work, it is difficult to locate and ground a social system of persistent and asymmetrical

power relations between men and women that support the feminist argument of women sharing a common oppression. This diffuse form of power, which closely examines the operation of power as subtle and contingent, is resistant to more general analyses of macrolevel social relationships. Other feminists have sought to resolve this issue by allowing Foucault's analysis of power to enable examinations of multiple sites for the operations of power. The shifting social contest revealed by these multiple microanalyses of power, allow one to grasp the contingent and malleable nature of social relationships. These kinds of specific investigations, by thinking through the contingency of power relations, may not necessarily traduce our ability to name "familiar patterns that emerge" and the ability to name domination "[as] a state of perpetual asymmetry" (Bell, 41).

Bell (1993) relates how feminist analyses of incest illustrate two forms of power described by Foucault: the juridical-discursive and disciplinary power. Bell argues that it is important to hold on to both accounts as they are useful for uncovering the gender dynamics within hegemonic families. Families are inscribed by both the sovereign power of male (paternal) authority at the same time as a system of diffuse power surrounds the strategies of normalization and surveillance. An analysis of disciplinary power enacted within incestuous relations reveals that forms of hierarchical surveillance and normalizing judgements recur in these contexts. These strategies of power position the girl within discourses of the conventional family as pliable, subordinate, aligning her own needs with male expectations. Bell argues that incest can be understood as a "ceremony of power" in which the "daughter is subjected to and subjectified through the abuse in ways that continually attempt to place her within prevailing familial and gender relations" (Bell, 71).

Feminist analysis and Foucauldian thought have, in different ways, critiqued the dominant discourse of the “dangerous other,” arguing that familial and “private” relations are also saturated with power. Various strands of feminism have analysed gendered family relations as a preeminent site for the enactment and abuse of power, and for the production of hierarchies along the lines of male/female and parent/child axes. Both non-Foucauldian feminism and Foucauldian thought have pointed to how dominant discourses have disorganized other ways of knowing about incest and familial violence.

The discourses of the pedophile bear the hallmarks of disabling discourses of outside threat. Threats to the child are consistently produced as emanating from outside the family, with parents and family relations frequently invoked as guarantors of the child’s safety. These discourses of outside threat are also produced within expert discourse which bends its normalizing gaze onto suspect bodies, enrolling parents within a framework for surveillance.

The manner in which Foucault has discussed the discourse of the “dangerous individual” helps to shed light on the family as a site of normalizing gender relations and surveillance. Foucault outlines a system of technologies of power which rearrange the way psychiatry produces knowledge about everyday social and emotional distress. Foucault writes that psychiatrists “justified their right to intervene not by searching out the thousand little visible signs of madness that may accompany the most ordinary crimes but by insisting—a preposterous stance—that there were kinds of insanity which manifested themselves only in outrageous crimes and in no other way” (Foucault, 2000a: 183). We can witness, as I have explored in Chapter Two, the way the pedophile is produced as an instance of individualized pathology in medical and psychiatric literature.

Feminist researchers/writers suggest that dominant approaches to child abuse invisibilizes gender relations within the family. The evacuation of the family as a site of abuse is an important component of how incest is configured and how the pedophile is produced as an external threat.

Moreover, pedophile discourses reroutes our understanding of the phenomena of adult-child sex, incest and abuse as existing outside “reason,” as a version of an inexplicable crime, with mysterious origins located deep within the body and psychology of an individual perpetrator. These strategies of knowledge and power as operations of truth claims about human sexuality, authorize a panoply of specialized optics that interrogate and attempt to disinter the “truth” of an individualized desire, resulting in a new “species” of a sexually dangerous subject. In addition, following Foucault’s insights into the social construction of the “dangerous individual,” we can witness the emergence of a category of sexual pathology which bears strong affinities to the nineteenth century personage of the “homicidal maniac.” This version of psychiatric patient which developed out of important changes in the modality of power exercised by psychiatry, defined the insane person as an individual that transgresses all the laws of society and nature. In addition, this patient is inhabited by a form of insanity that remains “invisible until it explodes, that only the trained eye can forecast” (Foucault, 2000a: 185).

### **Heteronormative Childhood and the Discourses of Vulnerability and Innocence**

I wish to discuss the special significance that the discourse of “innocence” has on the lives of children and how this is anchored in a conception of the hegemonic heteronormative family, reinforced by patterns of schooling, parenting and binary gender

performances. These discourses produce particular understandings of children's eroticism. Moreover, these discourses partake in the exculpatory impulse which shields the hegemonic family from acknowledging and addressing threats from within, casting pedophilia as the ultimate threat from outside. The mobilization of discourses of vulnerability have become central strategies in the management of the relationship between the child and the social through the conduit of the family. Hegemonic constructions of the vulnerable child are annexed to biological capacities which reinforce the "natural" preserve of families to authorize strategies of protection.

A fundamental assumption in modern Western societies is that childhood should be a "special" or "protected" space, in which "'outside' influences are kept to a minimum" (Christensen, 1999: 40). This fixes childhood and the space of the family as the archetype of privacy and vulnerability and consequently generates the need for protection, a protection which is, nonetheless, ambivalently configured. This assumption deflects investigation of the social and historical (material-discursive) regulation of families and it naturalizes the contingent cultural construction of familial subject positions: child, parent and guardian.

The hegemonic family's need for a stable mooring for its hierarchical construction situates child abuse and homosexuality as radically external, symbolically connecting the two in order to shore up its own visions of agent-less, vulnerable, asexual, (or proto-heterosexually-inclined) children. "From the perspective of the family fortified under the aegis of compulsory heterosexuality," Kevin Ohi writes, "child abuse and homosexuality register as the same disruption to representation and meaning, and their indistinguishable erring can, as pathologized breaches, be brought into service of

heterosexuality and stable meaning” (Ohi, 2000: 200).<sup>1</sup> These hegemonic strategies continually recur in the form of media warnings directed to parents of potentially dangerous strangers, brochures sent by educational authorities to families regarding children’s security at school, nation-wide missing children campaigns, and even inserts in local utility bills warning of pedophiles on the Internet.<sup>2</sup>

Children, adolescents and adults (and their roles as students and teachers among others), exist in heavily symbolized heteronormative cultures which mandate certain patterns of gender and sexual behaviour. These cultures exist with particular potency in schools, as the cultural construction of children as “future-oriented” casts a veil of heightened awareness on the “development” of children toward highly specific and regulated notions of gender and sexual competency. An ambivalent space is created in schools since the erotic/sexual component of children’s own sexual cultures are denied, amidst a discursive space which normalizes children in innumerable ways as heteronormative actors often coded by collapsing gender and sexuality together. “Proper” gender deportment is policed by teachers and by children and youth themselves. Strong inducements exist for children to produce themselves within hegemonic gender performances. Differences in boys’ and girls’ gender comportment, or those who “failed or chose not to access hegemonic” (Renold, 2002: 425) gender discourses in this regard,

---

<sup>1</sup> I am indebted to Sheryl Nestel for bringing this important article by Kevin Ohi to my attention.

<sup>2</sup> As a case in point, during preparation of this thesis I received as part of a mass mailing an insert in the Bell Telephone bill as part of the Media Awareness Network. This seems to be an effort jointly funded by Microsoft and Bell Communications. The insert depicts a shadowy image of a greasy older man communicating online in a presumably fictitious website called “kidchat.ca.” The caption below the image reads, “To 12 year old Lisa, he was simply 11 year old Jenny.” The information on the back, addressed exclusively to parents, reads in part: “While its benefits are great, the Net can be dangerous for kids. In fact, 25% have been asked to meet someone they’ve only met online. Startling, yes. But you can take control.” The insert then lists 8 steps parents can take to protect their kids, all of them except one encourages parental control and surveillance. Point number 6 which is more redolent of a commandment than an

brings with it a variety of social sanctions. These hegemonic constructions of gender binaries are collapsed into heteronormative constructions of sexuality produced through schooling practices, curricula, teacher's talk and by the students' own cultures. As recent studies in sexual harassment among primary school age students suggest, differences in gender accomplishments marginalize some as targets for harassment which become coded by students and teachers as a failure to "[project] a coherent and abiding heterosexual self" (Renold, 2002: 417). This is one of the ways that sexual and gender differences in schools are regulated and which reinforce heterosexual hegemony in both families and schools.

Thus, relegating children to the arena of "innocence" ignores the organization of sexual and gender cultures within which children are always already embedded. Moreover, the discourses of "innocence" naturalizes the formation of dominant heteronormative identities and oppressive binary gender accomplishments, while its invisibilization removes it from the sphere of public accountability. These specific developmental discourses of sexuality attempt to preempt homosexuality as an outcome. At the same time, this move can be masked since the sexual development of children can be denied, producing children as "naturally" accessing heterosexual outcomes. Attempts to address and problematize the heteronormative discursive practices of schooling, for example, are often met with fierce resistance. This resistance can be witnessed, for example, when children's books that address gay and lesbian parenting are resisted by local school authorities and parents' groups. These "debates" turn on a conception of a "perturbation of the natural"—as an "outside" interference. A conception of childhood

---

effective inducement to open dialogue, reads, "Make sure they understand they can talk to you about anything—openly and honestly."

sexuality is cast, paradoxically, as outside the sexual, at the same time it is embedded in discourses which assume a form of autogenic heterosexual predestination. The discourse of danger in which the threat of the pedophile and the queer participate in emerges here in high relief as conjoined in homophobic discourse—as a perturbation, as “unnatural,” and as an “interference” in a process best left alone.<sup>3</sup> It is not surprising, then, that materials marked as queer pedagogy often get cast as a form of “interference”; marked as an active subversion of a system of heteronormativity that nevertheless remains hidden, vulnerablizing homosexuality as an unwarranted violation of a “natural” and depoliticized social space.

The liberal notion of the public/private divide is often invoked in order to disassociate sexuality from the “public” institution of the school. Moreover, when the arena of contestation is the primary school a double enclosure is erected by pointing to children as not ready for sexuality education. Yet, as Debbie Epstein and Richard Johnson point out, “[i]n schools ... sexuality is both everywhere and nowhere. Indeed, schools, we will argue, are important sites for the production and regulation of sexual identities both within the school and beyond” (Epstein & Johnson, 1998: 108). Dominant gender accomplishments and heteronormative practices are inscribed within institutional sites and embedded in childrens’ own cultures as normalizing practices. A polarization is established around the trope of childhood innocence: a cultural drama which is played out with recurring intensities and which forms the ground upon which struggles for queer equity issues are intensely resisted within the domains of the family and the school.

---

<sup>3</sup> I will mention that some of the effects of the ideology of childhood innocence and this impulse to leave the “children alone” is evidenced by the appalling lack of effective HIV prevention education in the school system which fails to go beyond basic facts and biology and situate sexuality in a social context. Moreover,

The energies mobilized around the figure of the “child,” the “pedophile” and the “queer” participate in discursive regularities which pre-figure the potent role that concepts of “innocence” play. As Kevin Ohi writes in the context of the links between child abuse discourse and homophobia, “[t]hose who rally to the cause [of childhood innocence] and guardianship can cast themselves as morally upright within the realm of a nurturing sexuality, and the inevitable problems and disruptions that occur around this fetishized innocence, these contents can be downloaded onto the queer and the queer’s desire” (Ohi, 2000: 197). That children may have desires, and furthermore, desires outside of heterosexuality, is cast as problematic, situating these “aberrant” desires as originating invariably in a seduction. That “innocence” is cast as the absence of sexuality and of knowledge (as ignorance) virtually sets up the scenario that the “blank slate” is “aggressively” written over by a the “sexualized pen” of a “perpetrator”—an absolute polarization of “innocence” traduced by a “guilty” knowledge that is heavily coded in the binaries of homo/heterosexual: “[t]he rhetoric of molestation is so powerful that those who do not join in its *danse macabre* are often accused of participating (either literally or figuratively) in the abuse” (Ohi, 197).

These discourses of containment and fear underwrite the most spectacular scenes of polarized agendas and public denunciations attendant on equity-seeking strategies for queers whenever these intersect with parenting and pedagogy. Current studies have attempted to uncover how both official administrative regulations and unofficial regulations help to disorganize and disavow queer sexualities from the school setting. Didi Khayatt (1995), for example, has conducted an institutional ethnographic analysis of

---

the existence of “abstinence only” sex education which is predominant in many U.S. jurisdictions is nothing short of murderous.

schools where she identified how schooling practices occlude lesbian adolescents from virtually all areas, including peer relations, curricula content, teaching practices, and administrative procedures. These layered absences, she argues, compound a state of affairs where “compulsory heterosexuality is inscribed in a range of schooling practices” (Khayatt, 1995: 162). Her concern extends to the Provincial Ontario legal apparatus, where she diagnoses a disjunction between formal legal recognition against discrimination and the persistent and pervasive schooling practices that continually undermine full equality for queer people. Khayatt explains, “although the Province of Ontario has added sexual orientation to its list of areas of prohibited discrimination in 1986, this does not guarantee equal rights of access to quality education for queer youth” (Khayatt, 1995: 161). This state of affairs is compounded by the invocation of the discourse of pedophilia when we look to children and primary grades. In Britain, the link between queer pedagogies and “child molestation” or seduction strategies are explicitly stated in recent legislation existing in Section 28 of the Local Government Act which “prohibits local authorities from ‘promoting homosexuality’ as a ‘pretended family relationship’” (Renold, 2002: 430n1).

There is a complex interweaving of discourses that produce how the pedophile is configured as a threat. The discourses of pedophilia are organized by constructions of childhood sexuality and hegemonic patterns of incest and family relations which, in turn, impact non-normative sexuality. These discourses inform, and emerge from, multiple social and discursive hierarchies in modern Western societies. These hierarchies are ones that are inscribed within multiple institutional sites, such as schools, families, and professional discourses and are constitutive of notions of race, class, gender and

sexuality. The effects that pedophile discourses produce are symptomatic of deeply embedded social and discursive hierarchies, and they help to sustain and legitimate ongoing hegemonic organization of gender, sexuality and family relations.

In the final chapter I will take a closer look at the complex issues that arise when the subject of adult-child sex comes under scrutiny within the theoretical terrain of Foucauldian thought and its challenge by feminist thinkers.

## CHAPTER FOUR

---

### **Troubling Subject, Troubling Theory**

My investigation of the discourses of pedophilia, their production and social effects have attempted to uncover the complex making of this figure. I have traced the pedophile in the social organization and discursive configurations of the child, the family, gender, age and hierarchies of exclusions and divisions upon which these social categories are constituted. The principal theories within which I attempt to unpack the figure of the pedophile are theories that can be grouped together under the rubric of post-structuralism, inflected by critical feminist, Foucauldian, post-colonial and queer theories. These theories, grounded in critical analyses of difference and the dynamics of power as constitutive of the social coherence of subjectivity, contest foundational claims by pointing to the epistemic violence underlying the discursive coherence of ongoing hegemonic social organization.

In this chapter I will look more closely at contemporary critical discourse that has taken pedophilia as a subject for examination. Specifically, I will explore how Linda Alcoff, a feminist scholar, has taken up Foucault and critically re-appraised his thought in her substantive analysis of the problem of pedophilia.

Contemporary critical feminists have engaged with Foucault's work in an attempt to elaborate and extend his important analysis of discourse, power and the subject. Important work by some feminist scholars have outlined how Foucault's thought has

tended to neglect important dimensions of the constitution of the gendered subject in modern Western societies (Hekman, 1996; Sawicki, 1991). In this chapter I will examine Linda Alcoff's discussion of Foucault. I chose to look closely at Linda Alcoff's work because she takes up a Foucauldian inflected perspective on discourse, sexuality and the constitution of the sexual subject, yet she interrogates Foucault's discussion of children's sexuality and pedophilia. My thesis is an attempt to understand the constitution of the pedophile in discourse as a site of sexual and moral regulation within the general parameters of Foucauldian-based thought. Alcoff's article, "Dangerous Pleasures: Foucault and the Politics of Pedophilia," is not only an important contribution to critical scholarship in this area, it is also a good illustrative example of some feminist uses and criticisms of Foucault.

### **The Danger of Child Sexuality**

While adhering closely to a Foucauldian approach for understanding how sexuality is produced through power relations, Alcoff outlines some of her disagreements with Foucault's understanding of children's sexuality, pedophilia and the age of consent. Alcoff focuses on two major sources of information which we have about the topic of children's sexuality and pedophilia in Foucault's work. One is the "village idiot" incident in the first volume of *The History of Sexuality* (1990) with related discussions about the regime of control to which children's sex has been submitted. A second source is a published transcript of a panel discussion on the topic of children's sexuality and the age of consent broadcast on French Culture on April 4, 1978 (Lotringer, 1996). Michel Foucault, Guy Hocquenghem and Jean Danet were the principal panelists on a radio

broadcast which was convened to discuss a recent petition in France for the abrogation of several articles of the law including the age of consent.

Before launching in to a detailed examination of Alcoff's representation and criticisms of Foucault on the subject of children's sexuality and pedophilia, I will set out the points made by each, starting with a look at the French radio interview on children's sexuality and the age of consent. This radio interview was held in order to discuss critical issues that arose from a French Law Commission looking at penal reform whose task was to revise a number of fundamental articles in the penal code. Foucault and his associates were involved in an effort, in the form of a petition, to critically intervene in the process, demanding the abrogation of a number of articles in the law. The one they focus on in the panel discussion revolve around the concept of "indecent" and "indecent assault," as well as those concerning the decriminalization of relations between adults and minors below the age of fifteen. The petition, we are told, was signed by people who occupy "a wide range of political positions" (Lotringer, 1996: 265), and who adhere to diverse political sympathies, from middle-of-the-road liberals to Communist Party members. As I had briefly discussed in Chapter Two, panelist referenced the 1977-78 reaction in the United States to gay and lesbian civil rights, fomenting fear through the specter of child pornography, particularly the campaign spearheaded by Christian fundamentalist activist, Anita Bryant (264).

A central focus of the discussion is about the legal and expert regulation of the domain of the social. The panelists refer to a collapse in the distinction around social practices and discourse pertaining to child sexuality. Foucault discusses the shifting domain of the legislative system, the penal system and psychiatry in the emergence of the

figure of the dangerous individual. He traces this shift from the nineteenth century in the laws concerned with “inciting minors to commit immoral acts” (266), and in the production in medicine and psychiatry in concert with jurisprudence, a definition of the “pervert.” These official discourses produced the rationale for intervention into the domain of the social, with specific legislation pertaining to the sexual sphere under the rubric of defending decency, (*pudeur*) (266-7).

In the modern context, Foucault invokes the regime of the regulation of the child’s sexuality, first in juridical terms, cast as a vulnerable population, a “high-risk population” (267). Next, he suggests that a whole body of psychiatric and psychological knowledge continues to be generated, producing a specific sexuality of children, “with its own forms, its own periods of maturation, its own high-points, its specific drives, and its own latency periods” (267). These expert discourses on the child’s sexuality, he suggests, have become formalized and used as a justification for the mobilization of intense sites of regulative practices. The figure of the pedophile, as an anchor of regulative discourses, is tactically disseminated to diverse institutional sites where the guardianship of children is invoked: schools, families, churches, and so on. The legislative practice of “protecting decency” or “public morals” never defined its target; as such it intervened in places where it could function tactically. Foucault mentions that there was a whole campaign against teachers, then there was a time when it was used against the clergy (267). These social institutional sites that have traditionally operated along the lines of disciplinary power, are now sites for an extension of new forms of social regulation where “subtle forms of sexual supervision would be set up,” operating along the lines of an “[a]pparent freedom that camouflaged these more subtle, more diffuse social controls [that extend]

beyond the field of the juridical and the penal” (266). “What is emerging,” Foucault continues, “is a new penal system, a new legislative system, whose function is not so much to punish offenses against these general laws concerning decency, as to protect populations and parts of populations regarded as particularly vulnerable” (267). Foucault discusses a general shift in legal discourse from the definition of criminal *acts* and the prohibition of *behaviour*, to a state where the law defines a “dangerous individual.” This signals a shift in sexual relations as this specific codification around the figure of the pedophile disseminates into other social relations, Foucault writes, “sexuality will become a threat in all social relations, in all relations between members of different age groups, in all relations between individuals ... and what we will have is a new regime for the supervision of sexuality” (270). An illustration is provided by another panelist, Jean Danet, who cites a case in France in 1976 where “[a] teacher was tried for inciting minors to immoral acts, when in fact what he had done was to supply contraceptives to the boys and girls in his charge” (266). Pierre Hahn, another panelist, speaks of a return of the psychiatric discourse of Cesare Lombroso’s born criminal—the “moral madman” (271) as constitutive of contemporary expert discourses pertaining to the codification of the pedophile.

When the discussion deals with the subject of children’s sexuality and pedophilia, Foucault outlines some difficulties with the issue of children and consent law. First, Foucault wishes to trouble the notion that as far as official discourses go, children are supposed to have a sexuality that can never be directed towards an adult (272). Secondly, children are deemed incapable of talking about themselves, of being insufficiently lucid about themselves. In cases where the child’s testimony is invoked in court cases of adult-

child sex, Foucault explains that the child is deemed incapable of explaining what happened or of giving his consent, deeming these practices as “two abuses that are intolerable, quite unacceptable” (273). Foucault is referring to a fracture in the way children’s discourses about themselves and their value as approaching the domain of the true, is produced within juridical discourse. A child’s ability to engage in a description of what actually occurred, which involves the description of a more complete range of behaviours, feelings, emotions and affective components, is usually held to be inadmissible in juridical contexts which focus instead on the narrower issue of consent (272-73). It may be helpful to quote at length, Foucault’s perspective on children’s sexuality and the regime of discourse by which it is constituted:

This sexuality of the child is a territory with its own geography that the adult must not enter. It is virgin territory, sexual territory, of course, but territory that must preserve its virginity. The adult will therefore intervene as guarantor of that specificity of child sexuality in order to protect it. And, on the other hand, in each particular case, he will say: this is an instance of an adult bringing his own sexuality into the child’s sexuality. It could be that the child, with his own sexuality, may have desired that adult, he may even have consented, he may even have made the first moves. We may even agree that it was he who seduced the adult; but we specialists with our psychological knowledge know perfectly well that even the seducing child runs a risk, in every case, of being damaged and traumatized by the fact that he or she has had sexual dealings with an adult. Consequently, the child must be protected from his own desires, even when his desires turn him toward an adult. The psychiatrist is the one who will be able to say: I can predict that a trauma of this importance will occur as a result of this or that type of sexual relation. It is therefore within the new legislative framework—basically intended to protect certain vulnerable sections of the population with the establishment of a new medical power—that a conception of sexuality and above all of the relations between child and adult sexuality will be based; and it is one that is extremely questionable (Foucault in Lotringer, 1996: 267-8).

The above quotation can serve to summarize the main lines of argument on the topic of children’s sex and pedophilia that the panelists pursue. First, it suggests that there

is an over-arching concern to investigate how children's sexuality is discursively produced and managed through expert medical and "psy" disciplines. A specific form of child sexuality is invoked in the juridical, scientific and popular discourses. This discourse marks out the sexuality of the child as different from that of the adult, to such a degree that there can be no possible continuities between these two erotic-discursive worlds. The dominant discourse on the child also concerns itself with measuring and mapping out the potentialities for children's sexuality in developmental concepts, and also sets itself up as the authority on the topic of trauma and harm that deviations from the sanctioned course of children's developing sexuality would likely produce. Secondly, there is a concern to investigate how the adult is produced within the specifying regime of children's sexuality. The expected role of an adult is to be the "guarantor" of the demarcated sexuality of the child, a "territory" that she cannot enter. The adult is produced as someone who recognizes these incontrovertible boundaries between the sexuality of the child and that of the adult, and manages herself such that these contacts do not occur, whether or not the impetus came from the child himself. Finally, this quote reveals the impetus that new forms of legal and medical discourses lent to new practices of policing sub-populations. These new disciplinary power/knowledge arrangements produced the figure of a dangerous individual: an individual that can be identifiable through expert knowledge and that can be specifically demarcated—through specific psychiatric practices of observation—from the rest of the population.

The panelists close the discussion with an examination of difficulties posed by juridical discourse on the subject of adult-child sex. Hocquenghem states that during the process of drafting the Open Letter to the Commission on penal code review, it was

important to frame their demands for the decriminalization of the age of consent laws by referring to the “indecent act” provisions in the law, making clear distinctions between acts “involving violence” or “the problem of rape” (272). Jean Danet invokes the issue of juridical cases of rape where the judicial presumption is that women have consented to sex and that rape or violence has to be demonstrated. In the case of indecent assault on a minor, it is the presumption of non-consent which is made, a presumption of violence that holds sway (272). Hocquenghem adds that many strains of discourse converge to make it possible to fabricate the notion of crime or offense against “decency,” a major mode of articulation being the development of notions “around what people think they know of the total differences between the world of the child and the world of the adult” (268). He adds that in these juridical cases involving children, the affective components or the non-exclusively sexual relationship that can occur between an adult and the minor remains inadmissible. In the context of the law, Hocquenghem states, “it’s really impossible to express a very complete relationship between a child and an adult” (273), all references to the phenomenon devolve onto the sex act and the formal “contractual notion” (273) of consent law.

The major contours of the discussion above suggest that juridical, legal and medical discourses have produced a specific knowledge on the sexuality of the child. These discourses have also constituted how that regime of sexuality through which the child is inducted and understood, will enable specific forms of management, surveillance and guidance of children, as well as authorizing particular practices when the child’s sexuality is enrolled in specific unauthorized ways by an adult.

### **Interrogating Violence: Alcoff on Pedophilia, Discourse and Power**

In this section I will discuss Linda Alcoff's engagement with, and critique of, Foucault's views on child-adult sex. I hope to locate agreements, as well as places where persistent and important tensions occur. I do not claim to draw any definitive conclusions about their respective positions. Rather, I hope to make visible a formidable complexity which should guard against premature theoretical closures. I hope to work toward the insight that the kinds of tensions that exist in the debate between Alcoff and Foucault are ones that inhere deeply within the encounter between feminism and post-structuralism. Thus, they are significant beyond the debate on children's sexuality, and are complex and not easily resolvable. Perhaps it is precisely here, in the complex entanglements in the debate over children's sex and pedophilia, that these tensions are uniquely pointed, morally freighted and urgent.

Alcoff opens her investigation of Foucauldian thought and pedophilia by signaling a tendency in Foucauldian-based thought to "reject *any* notion to develop a normative account of sexual practices" (Alcoff, 1996: 100, emphasis in original). This concern stems from the shift that Foucauldian-based work has effected in the analysis of forms of domination, particularly as they are produced through knowledge production and normalization. Alcoff suggests that Foucault challenges scholars and activists concerned about sexual violence to reconfigure their work on social and sexual stratification to eschew fixed notions of offenders and victims based on essential identities. Yet, to develop new frameworks for understanding sexual violence has not been easy. As Alcoff suggests that "for many of his feminist readers, Foucault's insightful work in uncovering new mechanisms of domination appears painfully at odds

with his stated positions on sexual relations between adults and children in which he renders such relations 'inconsequential' and 'petty,' and presents the children involved as simply 'alert' or 'precocious'" (101). Feminists have also been challenged as a consequence of how Foucault's approach to social inquiry generally follows a strategy which "declines to prescribe or vindicate, preferring instead to suggest new questions" (100). Following from this, Alcoff is concerned to interrogate Foucault's own insights about the relationships between discourse, power, pleasure and the subject in order to evaluate his claims about pedophilia and children's sexuality.

Alcoff attends to the way children's sexuality is invoked in Foucault's text, *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction* (1990). In particular, she draws our attention to the Jouy passage, otherwise referred to as the "village simpleton" story. In this passage, Alcoff draws attention to how Foucault frames the sexual exchange between a peasant girl and a "simple-minded" farmhand. Specifically, she takes issue with the characterization of the event as "inconsequential bucolic pleasures" (Foucault, 1990: 31), and raises the important observation that Foucault has neglected to interrogate the positioning of the young girl. Alcoff asks "whose point of view is silently assumed when one determines that the prostituting of small girls is a petty and trivial event? For whom are such 'bucolic' pleasures inconsequential?" (Alcoff, 108). She points out that Foucault's strategy of problematizing sexuality as produced through discourse, allows pleasure to be placed aside, "in an almost pure form, innocent and harmless, and on the other side stands discourse, power, and domination" (108). This move, however, is contradicted elsewhere in the text by Foucault's approach to power as productive of those discourses of pleasure. The Jouy story seems to position power and domination in a

binary relation to an unfettered, free space of “simple pleasures,” outside of discursive relations. “For Foucault,” Alcoff continues, “pleasure is a force that can be taken up, used incited, fomented, and manipulated, but it is not itself discursively constituted” (108). This ambivalence about the productive discourses of pleasure and desire are important ones that continue to be taken up by post-structuralist feminists like Judith Butler (1993). Alcoff signals that for feminists engaging with Foucault’s work, they “cannot afford to repeat Foucault’s own disabling ambivalence” (111).

The Jouy scenario is an illustration of Foucault’s theoretical elaborations that just precedes the passage. Here Foucault is concerned with how medical and juridical discourses began to place everyday sexuality under investigation, to produce sex as discourse, “[f]rom the singular imperialism that compels everyone to transform their sexuality into a perpetual discourse, to the manifold mechanisms which, in the areas of economy, pedagogy, medicine, and justice, incite, extract, distribute, and institutionalize the sexual discourse” (Foucault, 1990: 33). Foucault writes about the specific concern over children and adolescent’s sexuality, which became a problem for specialists and pedagogues, a novel turn of events, he suggests, as this pointed concern over children’s sex had not always been regulated or discoursed in the same way: “[t]he sex of children and adolescents has become, since the eighteenth century, an important area of contention around which innumerable institutional devices and discursive strategies have been deployed” (Foucault, 1990: 30). Foucault frames this passage entirely within the perspective of the discursive elaborations of experts which took Jouy as the object of its interventions. Jouy became “an object not only of a collective intolerance but of a judicial action, a medical intervention, a careful clinical evaluation, and an entire theoretical

elaboration” (31). Foucault attempts to juxtapose the developing machinery for the investigation and medicalization of sexuality with the existence of innumerable and diverse sexual practices. He points to the emergence of a system of professional discourse which will channel, guide and produce highly specific and regulated forms of knowledge about the sexual through “the institutions of knowledge and power [that] overlay this everyday bit of theater with their solemn discourse” (32).

Foucault discusses how sexuality is produced as a specific strategy in the political technology of individuals in the modern West. It is a specific discursive strategy located within a larger process in which “[w]e have been led to recognize ourselves as a society, as a part of a social entity, as a part of a nation or of a state” (Foucault, 2000b: 404). Specific forms of discoursing the sexual are integral to strategies for containing difference and canalizing sexual practices, producing desire along predetermined pathways. Alcoff points out how Foucault’s text contains an analysis where “[d]isciplining regimes are proliferated, disseminated, and consolidated through their complicated relationships with pleasure” (Alcoff, 109). However, she argues that Foucault does not pay sufficient attention to the differential relationship that forms of pleasure may take in those positioned as differently as the simple farmhand and the peasant girl would presumably be.

At stake for Foucault here is the way bodies and pleasures are inserted into a regime of sexual normalization. Families were conceived as networks of power and pleasure linked together at multiple points (Foucault, 1990: 46). These were discursively linked to educational and psychiatric institutions which distributed the interplay of powers and pleasures: a state of affairs Foucault points to as demonstrating an

“intensification of the persistency of power and pleasures” (48). Yet, in this example, Foucault seems to make assumptions about rustic sexuality as embedded in rural spaces which are seemingly untouched by modern forms of disciplinary power, especially when he nostalgically refers to the “timeless gestures” of “village sexuality” (Foucault, 31). For Alcoff, what’s at stake in this passage is substantive. She is concerned with the material realities and the organization of village sexuality as spaces which are not innocent of gendered power relations.

Alcoff’s critique focuses on the lack of attention paid to the child in this incident. She suggests that this omission is symptomatic of an aporia in Foucault’s thinking which refuses to interrogate the positioning of children as the recipient of an adult’s sexual attention. This move, Alcoff states, betrays “typical male and adult patterns of epistemic arrogance” (108). Other feminists have located the significance of this narrative in how Jouy was inducted into the medical and legal systems, “held in custody until his death and put through numerous physical and verbal examinations” (McWhorter, 1999: 16). Ladelle McWhorter (1999), for instance, has taken the view that what transpired in the French fishing village in 1867, is one incident among an increasing spiral of surveillance where *both* adults and children “became a matter of intense official curiosity and activity—not because newly enlightened officials cared about the well-being of little girls but because they wanted to learn how to control and administer everybody’s sexual behaviour, including that of little girls” (McWhorter, 236).

Part of the difficulty in engaging critically with Foucault’s text, vis-à-vis this particular passage, is perhaps because the *History of Sexuality* examines broad epochal changes in the discursive regulation of sex and sexuality. It is difficult to develop a

critical understanding of sexuality and power relations with reference to particular and specific individualizing acts, as it seems Alcoff would expect from Foucault. Yet, the extract from Foucault's text affords Alcoff a substantive critique of Foucauldian thought vis-à-vis the politics of pedophilia and children's sexuality. She develops a perspective that draws on a Foucauldian approach to discourse, power and subjectivation while challenging the limits of his emphasis on discourse and its diffuse conception of power. Alcoff's general approach is to "ground" Foucault by exploring the dense play of power in the social relations between adults and children. Alcoff wishes to bring together a critical approach which highlights concern with child abuse and exploitation, disciplinary forms of domination, patriarchy and an anti-homophobic project (119). She pursues a compelling and important line of argument by asking critical questions about how children and adults are positioned through different discursive patterns of the production of knowledge about the self, desires and sexuality. These patterns of asymmetrical discursive arrangements are interconnected with and buttressed by substantive material relations based on economic factors, family dependency, and pedagogy, to name a few. In the Jouy illustration, for instance, Alcoff argues that Foucault's analysis is blind to how little girls are subject to "multiple forms of domination based on their class, race, and gender [and] have very few avenues by which to get their basic needs met" (123-4). "Sexual behaviour," Alcoff continues, "is a common avenue that the dominant structures which favour adult men provide for girls and sometimes for boys as well" (124). She provides a good account of her line of reasoning in the following passage:

Linguistic styles and practices emerge out of lived realities, which are themselves structured and filtered through language. But significantly different lived realities

will correspond to significant differences in the metaphysics and epistemologies embedded in language; this is, the ontological assumptions and patterns of discursive authorization operative in language. Who gets to speak, who will be accorded authority or at least presumption in their favour, what it is possible to express and what ontological objects (such as “desire”) it is possible to entertain will all vary between such linguistic practices as exist among, say, Western scientists, gay Latinos, or lower-class children. These group demarcations can be drawn in multiple ways, as discrete, as overlapping, through the criss-crossing grids that can exist within the complexity of group exchange and relations in multivocal and multilayered societies. But substantive epistemic and semantic demarcations persist among adults, youth, and children (Alcoff, 1996: 125).

Alcoff’s argument is not very different from an understanding of discursive relations which we can draw from Foucault. She wishes to highlight how discursive arrangements are “organized around a different set of strategic rules” (125) among adults and children, toward a view which is not necessarily committed to their representation as “absolutely incommensurable” (125). Like Foucault, she seeks to disinter the “strategic rules by which discursive moves can be made” (125). In the ambit of adult-child sex then, Alcoff argues that in light of these unequal discursive arrangements, adults are predisposed to “incorporate the discourse of children with [their] own” and “translate their desires within an economy of adult sexuality characterized by genital, orgasmic sex” (126). The persistence of these unequal relations leads Alcoff to say that “the only way to avoid this is to leave children alone sexually, and thus allow the development and maintenance of their own sexual differences, either with themselves or with each other” (126).

In the discussion above it is notable that a central area of inquiry raised is the question of subjectivity and agency. How the subject is conceived as acquiring and enacting agency is a central debate with feminist and post-structuralist thought and it becomes particularly pointed when the area under investigation is adult-child sex. The

topic forces us to consider areas of the formation of subjectivity and its crucial links to desire, self-fashioning, and the psychological dimension. Post-structuralist thought will need to develop a more critical and sustained dialogue with psychological motivations and the social construction of desire and repugnance. The collaboratively authored important collection of writings, entitled *Changing the Subject* (1984), is a seminal text on the intersection of post-structuralism and psychology. Here, Henriques et al outline three salient issues which surface as a result of a confrontation between post-structuralism and psychology. First, is a concern with moving toward an understanding about how the content of desires are socially produced. Second, investigating how the psyche operates in terms of those desires, which, they suggest, is not a simple relationship. Finally, investigating how desires are accessed and under what conditions they exist, avoiding the dualist poles of free choice and false consciousness. "Although this approach will not lead us to an analysis of the workings of the psyche," they write, "we can at least speculate about how particular discourses set parameters through which desire is produced, regulated and channeled" (Henriques et al, 1984: 220).

This mode of analysis attempts to serve as a bridge examining in finer detail how social regulation occurs in the nexus between the interpolation of the subject within discourse and the "inside" of subjects within the realm of psychology and economies of desire. Pointing to the discerning optics of more subtle forms of regulation, the authors write, "social regulation can function, not in a sense through overt oppression, but rather through defining the parameters and content of choice, fixing how we come to want what we want" (Henriques et al, 219).

Alcoff is centrally concerned with the question of agency and the discursive positioning of adults vis-à-vis children. Her analysis embraces the complex terrain of embodiment, discourse and power. Alcoff advances the argument that sexual practices are significant modulators of internal experience, she writes that “sexual practices are self-constituting; that is, they affect the constitution of psychic life, the imaginary construction of one’s self, and the structure of internal experience” (127). She further explains that it is not the sex act alone that imparts significance to the development of selfhood, but the “phenomenology of sex itself, which involves uniquely sensitive, vulnerable, and psychically important areas of the body, a fact that persists across cultural differences. Thus, sexual experiences have the capacity to impart crucial meanings concerning one’s body and, therefore, one’s self” (127-8). In the realm of the body, sex and the social, Alcoff is careful not to imply that sexual acts have uniform meanings, but rather that they have “significant subject-constituting meanings” (128) producing “effects” as it were, about ourselves as subjects. Attempting to distance herself from the discourse of “innocence,” upon which many discussions of the sexual violation of children are couched, Alcoff explains that the social effects of children’s experiences are amplified by the “fact that they are more actively and intensely engaged in self-creation and world-interpretation than adults” (131). “Children,” Alcoff continues, “are still in the process of forming their sense of themselves, of sexuality, and of embodied relations with others. This process never stops completely, but it is more significant and dramatic during childhood, with more long-lasting effects” (131). The impact of sexual relations with a child is then telescoped by these discursive arrangements, by a process that Alcoff says is never complete, yet exists in a particularly vulnerable form when one is a child.

For all these reasons, Alcoff is then led to declare “that the dangers of adult-child sex are significant enough to warrant a general prohibition” (129). Furthermore, she advances the idea that the absolute prohibition of adult-child sex will allow children more freedom to develop their own sexuality “free from the economy of adult sexual desire and adult sexual demands” (133). This transformative future of children’s sexuality will be advanced, Alcoff contends, by the “repression of adult-child sex [which] may effect a decrease in the constraints by which children’s own sexual energies are policed, managed, and deflected” (111). Alcoff presents us with a political strategy that would increase regulation and repression, thus reinforcing existing ways in which the problem of pedophilia is put into discourse and managed. Foucault, on the other hand, focuses our attention to how these “protective” strategies reinforce already existing regulative strategies.

Alcoff’s and Foucault’s respective differences in this regard could not be more incommensurable. For instance, when asked about a progressive politics, Foucault responded that a progressive politics is one which “recognizes the historical conditions and the specified rules of a practice, whereas other politics recognize only ideal necessities, univocal determinations, or the free play of individual initiatives” (Lotringer, 1996: 48). A progressive politics, Foucault continues, does not privilege the subject in general as a “universal operator” (48) but “defines the levels and the different functions which the subject can occupy in a domain which has its rules of formation” (48). In addition, these discursive domains exist in a “system of correlations with other practices” (49) and cannot be conceived of as discrete or set apart but must be apprehended in their interconnections. The politics that Foucault is advocating are specific strategies that

mobilize around the specific rules of social practices, in order to introduce tactical forms of resistance within a discursive domain. Here, a subject is not valorized, per se, but a system of dispersal of discourses, mobilized by individuals who exist within multiple sites, which are understood as interconnected, becomes the basis for an *intervention* in the system of social practices and legitimate knowledge. These interventions are not understood in a way which predicates global systemic change, indeed, this political tendency would eschew an ability to predict or advance totalizing forms of social change for one which is located locally, tactically and indeterminately within a complex web of social practices.

Nevertheless, Alcoff produces compelling arguments about the incipient and real dangers involved in adult-child sex. Her analysis of power relations tied to the epistemic and discursive differences which inhere within the worlds of children and adults are important ones. Hers is an argument that can produce ready assent, as an account of power differences between adults and children produce a generally recognized moral consensus. After all, no-one wishes to be cast as an advocate for adults having sex with children. Her mode of analysis, however, casts potential critical interlocutors in the precarious position of seeming to advocate for the adult interest—for the pedophile. The prospect of asking other questions, then becomes difficult, hedged in by suspicion. This tendency comes through especially in one passage in which Alcoff attempts to cast doubt on the character of one of Foucault's associates, subtly suggesting that his position on the matter of adult-child sex is skewed by his own pedophilic desires. Alcoff writes, "[B]ut there are some other passages in the interview that, perhaps, reveal more about the panelists' views (and desires) than the above thematic synopsis, though the last statement

quoted suggests that their primary motivation may not be the protection of children from unfair discursive and sexual subordination” (104). This passage functions, it seems to me, solely to place seeds of doubt in the reader’s mind about the “primary motivation” of one of the panelists, making the not-too-subtle association that he may be speaking from his own self-interested pedophilic desire.<sup>1</sup> It is disconcerting to see here displayed before us a regime of truth whose sole effect lies in its unnamed assumption of using the peril of the “other” as a point of reference for disqualifying a point of view. This type of reasoning, of course, bears the marks of the same modes of denial and disqualification that many other groups have encountered historically. It is precisely to subvert this type of coercive move that Kevin Ohi, in a brave passage, refuses this mode of discourse that relies on non-identification and denial. He writes: “I have therefore avoided equating pedophilia with child abuse, just as I have avoided denying that I am a pedophile” (Ohi, 2000: 195). A refusal to say no is not the same as an affirmative, yet this tightly woven discourse elides these choices into one rigid binary opposition. (You’re either a pedophile or you’re absolutely not one—no in-between; the category itself is taken for granted). I raise this point in a passage that may otherwise go unnoticed by readers in order to highlight the fact that this type of discursive move, to sully the person who is engaging in critical thought or discourse on this topic, with a rhetoric of contamination by association, seems

---

<sup>1</sup> Alcott is referring here to Guy Hocquenghem (1946-1988), a French gay militant, a veteran of the struggles around May 1968 who taught philosophy at the University of Vincennes, Paris. He was a founding member of a militant gay rights organization in France, FHAR (the Front Homosexuel d’Action Révolutionnaire). He is also the author of a classic in gay liberation literature, *Homosexual Desire* (London: Duke University Press, 1993, [1972]). This book is one of the earliest attempts to fuse the emerging literature of the gay and lesbian liberation movement with poststructuralist accounts of the subject and desire. With professor, René Schérer, he wrote two important though often overlooked tracts, *Co-ire, album systématique de l’enfance* (1976), which examines the construction of childhood sexuality from a Marxist perspective, and *L’ame atomique, pour une esthétique d’ère nucléaire* (1986), which argues for a new epicureanism that would liberate play and frivolity as positions of agency within postmodern politics. Much of his theoretical and fictional writing remains to be translated into English.

to be part of an implacable peril surrounding anyone critically considering this issue at this historical moment. If we are to move beyond the present polarized ways of understanding the problem of pedophilia, then we need to move toward ways to develop children's own status as producers of knowledge and experience not only around the issues of pleasure and the erotic but in all other areas of life. Conversely, it is also important to consider that the pedophile himself may be an important resource and a site of the production of knowledge, knowledge that up to now has remained inadmissible apart from the forms that circulate within professional discourse.<sup>2</sup> I raise this only to suggest that such strategies of disqualification preempt further investigation into the phenomenon of adult-child sex. It permanently closes off contributions from adults and children about a wider range of experiences that can normally be heard, channeling these narratives along pre-determined paths of understanding.

I wish to resist the pull of this cynical closure of potential discussion by posing an analytics that counterpoises critical perspectives on Alcoff's own arguments by elaborating on incipient difficulties present within her own account. Alcoff has raised important critical perspectives on the Foucauldian thinking on the topic of pedophilia and children's sexuality. Specifically, her critique challenges how we come to understand the study of sexuality, discourse and power by keeping sexual violence in the picture. Alcoff writes, "[N]o account of sexuality can present itself as inapplicable or irrelevant to sexual violence because each account will influence the way in which sexual violence is conceptualized and identified" (115). Alcoff's focus on sexual violence and power is an important one when looking at adults and children's sexuality and any intersection

---

<sup>2</sup> There exists a precedent for such a case for the forms of knowledge that the pedophile may furnish outside the circuits of medical discourse. Kinsey, although controversial, has included material on one of

between them. There is a long debate among feminists about the relative weight and analytic perspective afforded to sexual violence, danger and pleasure. These debates have emerged, in recent years in the West, most turbulently in the debates around pornography. For instance, Carole Vance, in the introduction to a landmark volume on female sexuality, offers this perspective: “[T]he hallmark of sexuality is its complexity: its multiple meanings, sensations, and connections. It is all too easy to cast sexual experiences as either wholly pleasurable or dangerous; our culture encourages us to do so” (Vance, 1984: 5). Signaling the importance of understanding both the system of sexual hierarchies that organize the lives of women and men, with a state of affairs in which the complexity of experiential sexual knowledge is addled through mechanisms of shame, fear and taboos, Vance advocates a “scholarship increasingly self-conscious about omissions, gaps, and silences, which is willing to qualify and specify findings, if they apply to particular groups only, and to take more aggressive efforts in researching areas and topics up to now ignored” (17).

I believe that Alcoff’s analysis suffers by casting sexual danger within an individualizing framework. This move leads her to divest her analysis of specific forms of violence from other critical areas, disabling productive links with violence perpetuated within families, and other kinds of violence that exist within institutional settings. This analysis is enabled by the tendency for her categories to function as singular, global and uncomplicated terms. For instance, although Alcoff provides an incisive analysis of the discursive disparities which exist between children and adults, her account can be troubled by her uncritical use of the category, “child.” Her account seems to lump a vast array of ages together, making no useful distinctions between the relative competency,

---

his pedophile subjects in his ground-breaking study, *Sexual Behaviour in the Human Male* (1948).

vulnerability and dependency of children from, say, 2 to 5 years of age, with older children, of 12 or 13. At one point her analysis seems to collapse a wide range of ages together, including very young children with older teenagers. Alcoff cites a narrative written by Michael Alhonte (Tsang, 1981), a young man who had begun relationships with adults from the age of 13. He articulately describes his critical reflections on his relationships with older men, citing power imbalances, finances and ageism, describing the forms of negotiations he engaged in with his partner over these issues. Alcoff chooses to describe his series of reflections as “actually supporting many of my concerns” (133) which can be read as a cynical way of minimizing Alhonte’s competencies. By casting Alhonte’s relationship in a cynical light, “such cases might seem to be best-case scenarios, least likely to inflict psychic damage on the youth’s involved” (133), she seems to cast a one-note or singular pall over what is described as a complex, and nuanced relationship, even though she admits that Alhonte is “not a child and is hardly powerless” (133).

Since studies on childhood sexuality remain in an underdeveloped state (Sandfort & Rademakers, 2000), and children exist within strongly gendered and heteronormative cultures (Bruhm & Hurley, 2004), a vast range of childhood sexual experiences, feelings, and sexual thinking remains to be explored. The debate over pedophilia is regulated, in part, by the way we come to understand childhood sexuality, with its silences, evasions, denials and normalized relations. Alcoff’s analysis mirrors a tension between a salutary impulse to protect children from adults who have more resources to manipulate consent and situations for their own ends, and an analysis which remains potentially open to exploring the multiple contingencies and specificity of situations in which the

phenomenon of adult-child sex occurs. In a style more reminiscent of Foucault, Alcoff writes, “[W]hat are the kinds of historical occasions that prompt desires between adults and children? This questions calls for an exploration of the interconnections between adult-child sexual practices, discourse and power, or a genealogy of particular occasions of pedophilia” (122). Although Alcoff emphasizes that children are “disempowered relative to adults in both discursive and extradiscursive ways ... and positioned differently than adults and subject to more strenuous and invasive techniques of domination” (122), she also acknowledges that disparities in the language and discursive terrain between adults and children are not “absolutely incommensurable” (125). Overlapping and shared epistemologies between children and adults may occur. Indeed a system of pedagogy, training and the social regulation of children depends on forms of shared epistemologies and discursive strategies for enrolling children within institutional structures. This is a process which is never smooth or uniform and admits of contestation from children themselves. The work of raising children could not be accomplished otherwise. Yet, it seems to me that an emphasis on how children are tutored within heteronormative and gendered social institutions is a crucial aspect of the problem which Alcoff has little to say.

Another tension which emerges in the Alcoff-Foucault “debate” is the problem of epistemic and institutional forms of violence and the way children are produced by normative gender and sexuality discourses. Alcoff, and to some extent, Foucault, fail to address more substantively how childrens’ futures as social and sexual subjects are regulated through heteronormative discourses anchored in institutional sites. These practices are also significant modulators of internal experience. Heterosexuality becomes

thoroughly naturalized and the accession to sexuality is always already a suspicious process, burdened by developmental notions, which posit children as needing to be left alone to a “natural” process of development. The existence of a persistent and entrenched heteronormativity as an un-named marker for the organization of children’s social relations powerfully police any deviation from that norm as a “corruption” of a “natural” developmental process. This powerful normalizing discourse structures the lives of heterosexual, queer, or proto-queer children and youth very differently, since the significance attributed to child sexuality, unwanted touching, or indeed child sexual assault is given a much more malevolent cast when the perpetrator is same-sex. Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick elucidates how professional discourse, under the rubric of the helping professions, has focused ambivalent attention on gay or proto-gay children and nonconforming gender comportment. Under the aegis of psychotherapy and psychoanalysis, practitioners, responding to the concerns of parents, are engaging in a “renaturalization and enforcement of gender assignment” (Sedgwick, 1993: 75) as a remedial strategy for unhappy parents and presumably unhappy young people faced with nonnormative or nonconforming gender comportment. Sedgwick’s analysis pays attention to how psychological practices and discourse are deeply embedded within the binary of nature/culture debates about the homosexual body. These are practices which instantiate the social engineering trends inevitably contained under the biologizing rubrics of “deficiencies,” “imbalances” and “excess” (79). These strongly gendered tropes of new “maladies” of the soul invite the intensification of professional discourse within the social domain of children’s behaviour. This remains one contemporary example of how professional scientific discourse effects the social regulation of children

and adults alike, intervening in the process early on, in order to effect specific social outcomes in the adults that children are to become. In this sense, Alcoff's tendency to suggest that adults "leave children alone sexually" (126) effects a radical closure, giving credence to the notion that children develop sexuality independently, without "interference"<sup>3</sup> or "on their own." By pivoting the discussion toward the individualizing acts of potential and actual perpetrators, Alcoff neglects the broader dimensions of sexual regulation that effects both children and adults, especially within the realm of non-normative forms of sexuality. Alcoff's claim to produce an analysis that vitiates homophobia is a weak one then, since she has failed to address the disorganizing discourses of heterosexism, and their complex productions within various social and institutional sites that effect children and adults alike.

Alcoff's framing of her concern toward individualizing acts of violence may contribute to her assertion of a "general prohibition" (129) or toward strategies of "repression" (111). This is a curious position, since it seems that there *already exists* a general prohibition on adult-child sex. There are laws which set an age-of-consent to sexual activity, along with statutory rape provisions. Concern about child sexual abuse and molestation has never gained so much popular and expert attention. The figure of the pedophile is increasingly invoked and institutionalized means for his detection, "screening," and surveillance is codified. Conversely, children are being taught ways to

---

<sup>3</sup> I wish to emphasize here how heavily "loaded" the word "interference" is for my investigations. In legal and popular discourse it takes on the cast of sexual harm, touching, molestation and rape, usually committed by someone who, depending on circumstances, becomes identified as a pedophile. This individualizing pole of the term also works to suppress the way children are "interfered" with socially, systemically and often, as well, especially for queer or proto-queer kids with very traumatic and, at times, fatal outcomes. These forms of social "interference" of children, underwritten by developmentalist notions of "correct training" are almost completely invisibilized and normalized. Coercing children to attend church services, for example, is a form of interference, which can be a significant modulator of internal

say “no” to sex and to identify “good” touch and “bad” touch; parents are being instructed on how to “street-proof” their kids; schools and day-cares are central sites in the detection of early warning signs of abuse; greater regulation in print, media and cyber-space is being enacted to protect children from “online predators.” Alcoff adds that the “repression of adult-child sex may effect a decrease in the constraints by which children’s own sexual energies are policed, managed, and deflected” (111). Yet, this strategy doesn’t inquire about how this repression will be accomplished. How will these strategies be enacted and by whom? How will the problem of adult-child sex be framed, identified, and codified? What forms of authoritative knowledge will be produced by this effort? What kinds of actions will be authorized in an effort to mobilize various institutions and actors in an effort to repress adult-child sex? Furthermore, will these repressive strategies help disentangle and ameliorate the tight knot of familial sexual violence and incest? These are all questions that this thesis attempts to explore.

Alcoff is responding to specific legal changes that Foucault and his associates advocate through the petition to abolish the age-of-consent provisions. Foucault advocates an intervention in the legal system, as a tactical intervention in the domain of legal discourse. These legal actions, however, raise further difficulties that are not explicitly addressed by Foucault and his associates. Although Foucault persuasively problematizes the distinction between adult and child sexuality, one cannot it seems, also argue that no distinctions can be made. This move merely raises a host of other questions about the nature of sexuality and its discursive constructions across the age span, and how these are “taken up” by multiply positioned actors. Furthermore, Foucault fails to

---

experience, with potential long-lasting effects, influencing their own sense of their self, sexuality and personhood. I am indebted to Gerald Hannon for this pithy illustration.

address the ramifications of his legal intervention on a broader discursive field in which children exist. Surely, Foucault would be the first to agree that tactical interventions in discursive domains are not isolated events, since discourses are linked and mutually constitutive. If the age of consent were abolished, then some adults might insist that the child consented when in fact she did not. This would enroll the child in a set of legal procedures which would situate her in the “same legal position as the woman in the rape trial” (Bell, 1993: 157). Yet, Foucault fails to discuss, for instance, what other discourses would bear upon the ability for the child to handle herself within such legal situations in which she would be cross-examined and her sexual conduct scrutinized. Although Foucault advocates that “listening to a child, hearing him speak, hearing him explain what his relations were with someone” (Lotringer, 1996: 273) are important and salutary ways of respecting children, he neglects to analyze the conditions and discursive arrangements through which children are able to speak and adults are able to hear and generally engage equitably with children. Surely, pedagogical and legal systems, parental authority, gender relations, and family systems all affect how children understand themselves as speaking subjects and effect their ability to produce truth claims and have them heard.

To conclude then, I wish to suggest that the Alcoff-Foucault debate on pedophilia raises formidable questions. These difficulties are described by at least one other interlocutor as “even impossible” (Bell, 1993: 150), maintaining that “whilst feminism cannot answer these queries satisfactorily, neither does Foucault” (150). While we can resist the appeal to final answers, we can hope to discover new avenues for research, thinking and reflection on the productive and difficult questions that are raised by this

debate. We can both trouble the discursive positioning of children and adults while also attending to an approach that stresses the mobility of discourse and subject positioning that suggest, like Chris Weedon has, that individuals are the “site” for “conflicting forms of subjectivity [that] is precarious, contradictory and in process, constantly being reconstituted in discourse each time we think or speak” (Weedon, 1987: 33). This perspective engages the possibility that discursive constructions are always susceptible to change, positioning people within a complex and highly regulated terrain. Weedon reminds us that

individuals are both the site and subjects of discursive struggle for their identity. Yet the interpellation of individuals as subjects within particular discourses is never final. It is always open to challenge. The individual is constantly subjected to discourse. In thought, speech or writing individuals of necessity commit themselves to specific subject positions and embrace quite contradictory modes of subjectivity at different moments (Weedon, 1987: 97).

Taking this state of affairs seriously is then to ponder on the largely unpredictable nature of social change in the tactical intervention in discourse. As such, social change always involves risk. But so does acquiescence and solutions which leave normative structures and discourses unchanged. Interventions, such that Alcoff and Foucault are both advocating, but which are bent in radically different directions, always carry a degree of risk, as outcomes cannot be predicted with any certainty. It may be that children’s relative situation may worsen by Foucault and his associates’ actions, or it may be that new unforeseen salutary effects may materialize and serve to strengthen children’s relative social standing. One primary effect, however, of the discourses of protection and regulation of children, is to position the social utility of *risk* that always accompanies

social change, in an ever diminishing calculus of legitimacy with respect to improving the lives of children.

## CONCLUSION

---

We are living in times of violent event-scenes, where none of the fictional unities can be put together again because we have finally recognized that they never existed, that all the big referents, from the family and gender to sexual identity, were always purely perspectival products, policed frames, produced by a power that would be hegemonic. The will to purity is everywhere, and it's getting uglier all the time because of its impossibility.<sup>1</sup>

In this thesis I have discussed the ways that pedophilia has been constituted as a problem, through an interweaving of knowledges and practices located in different social sites. My investigation of the discourses by which pedophilia has come to be understood has been enabled by genealogical investigations. Genealogy, as set out by Foucault, is a way of disinterring the complex ways that objects of knowledge have come to be constituted through complex social histories. Genealogy is an effective way of reading past and troubling the seemingly coherent “face” that contemporary phenomena present to us. The easily recognized “face” that pedophilia presents to us is susceptible to closer examination, just by virtue of the fact that its social production and reiteration in popular and expert discourses appear too “neat,” untroubled and authoritative. This public face of pedophilia attempts to enroll us in its certainties, and as such, relies on this ready assent to forestall closer and critical examination. Objects of knowledge are anchored in

---

<sup>1</sup>Arthur Kroker & Marilouise Kroker, *The Last Sex: Feminism and Outlaw Bodies*. Montréal: New World Perspectives, 1993, p. 13.

institutional sites where a panoply of discourses are rehearsed, and through complex reiteration, made to appear cohesive, lending themselves truth value. Forms of knowledge and social practices cohere together within various documents spanning, for example, legal writs, scientific articles, court documents, parliamentary debates, official institutional documents, and so on. Foucault has spoken of this contest of truth and how social practices anchored in circuits of power/knowledge participate in “the play of true or false and constitutes [social phenomena] as an object of thought” (Foucault, 1988: 257). One of the social effects of the veridical discourse of “objects of knowledge” is the manner in which they authorize social regulatory practices, which inhere within the way such social phenomena comes to be understood.

This thesis aimed to trace a wide arc, locating the various discursive sites from the late nineteenth century to contemporary debates, in which pedophilia becomes configured as an object of thought. The contemporary discursive notion of the pedophile is a very recent social phenomena. My investigations have traced how the pedophile figure is virtually nonexistent before the 1970s in the West. However, the late nineteenth century and the post-war years are important benchmarks for how the discourses of sexual danger and the configuration of sexuality and identity have been increasingly medicalized and acquired an amplified cast of deviance. These nineteenth and mid-twentieth century machinations of medicine and science have contributed to the creation and amplification of a “new species” of sexual danger, inhabited by malign sexual identities that produce the “truth” about the “dangerous individual.” These new characters of dangerous sexuality were produced as homosexual deviance in the nineteenth century and the “sexual psychopath” in the post-war years, also coded as the homosexual male. These

figures of sexual danger were produced through specific alignments in science and medicine, as they were consolidating their authority and extending their reach into the social regulation of populations. The social effects and regulatory practices which emerge from this period are coterminous with massive social changes in familial, economic and other social conditions, in which gender roles were shifting and emerging homosexual cultures were brought under increased scrutiny.

The productive knowledge-making enterprises of psychiatry, medicine and social science enroll discourses of the “other.” These discourses are productive of a panoply of social effects, reflect national aspirations, discourses of race and colonialism, and the hierarchies within which gender, sexuality and age are inscribed. These expert discourses and the social effects they help to instantiate participate in a system of moral regulation where definitions of normality are produced and whose boundaries are policed. The terrorizing effects of the “sexual psychopath,” in the post-war years, for instance, produced normative ways of self-fashioning such that its inculcation in schools and in the family, for example, was rarely challenged. Individuals who were far from the direct policing effects of the “sexual psychopath” were, nevertheless, affected by the discourse of normalization. For instance, expert discourse which drew upon a crude psychoanalytic perspective on the origins of homosexuality, induced middle-class mothers to police gender difference in the family, especially among boys, as a way of preventing “deviance” and subsequent future perpetrators.

Contemporary productions of the pedophile in science and medicine also participate in a system of exclusions and hierarchies, which inhere deeply within the assumptions and methodology of psychiatric practices. My investigation into the

contemporary scientific discourse of pedophilia, at a system of definitions, classifications, methods of assessment, and systems of treatment and management, betray processes of hierarchical divisions and exclusions. These divisions and exclusions produce and authorize a specific image of the pedophile as an illness and a crime. The categories that are constitutive of the way pedophilia is produced in expert discourse, reflect and enhance divisions along the lines of familial and non-familial perpetrators, sexual orientation of perpetrator, and are embedded in differential risk assessment strategies. These divisions mask ongoing social hierarchies which promote the image of pedophilia as autogenic pathology, severed from social and institutional contexts. The production of this scientific knowledge severs ameliorative social discussion on the role of gender relations, family dynamics, paternal authority, and child sexuality, all heavily inscribed within normalizing relations, as constitutive of the phenomenon of adult-child sex.

The amplification of the authority of science operating as a “seductive power” of interpretative legitimacy, isolates complex social phenomenon and attributes social behaviour increasingly within the circumscribed domains of biologically inflected specialized knowledge, such as neurobiology. These marked shifts in the authority of science, partake in specialized grammars of intelligibility increasingly divorced from everyday social understanding. As a consequence, this specialized language of science elides critical discourses which has taken up issues of child sexuality, heterosexism, and sexual identities, for instance, within the critical perspectives of feminism, queer theory, anti-racist and post-colonial studies.

I have also attempted to uncover how psychiatric knowledge is mutually constituted by how pedophilia is inducted into the legal system. The discourse of the “sex offender” and “sexual predator” that is ubiquitous today, attempts to reconfigure scientific knowledge about crime toward a pole of pathological behaviour which requires “totalized” management. Psychiatric science and criminology together participate in the construction of a sub-population which is increasingly deemed unable to govern itself. These discourses produce the image of an unruly and unpredictable individual who requires ongoing, comprehensive, and invasive management. The scientific rationality required for this new configuration of technologies of surveillance and assessment, partake in the social grammars of risk management, computerized compilation of criminal and psychiatric dossiers, and an increasingly centralized management of observation which displaces the role of primary practitioners “upwards,” along a chain of authority that is removed from the traditional immediacy of the doctor-patient encounter. As an enlarged domain for critical studies on the social production of science and medicine has gained academic currency (I’m thinking of the challenge that post-structuralist thought represents to the imperialism of science), there exists a reflex action, broadly speaking, in which science, increasingly under attack, has attempted to buttress its own authority by amplifying its measuring systems in more positivistic directions and into increasingly complex and differentiated domains of expertise. The science that produced the expert knowledge of pedophilia remains an instance of these changes, in the neo-liberal era.

My investigations have also paid attention to how notions of the “child” are jointly configured by the discourses of pedophilia. The child’s presence is nominally

maintained, through the registers of violation and strategies for her protection are enabled. Yet, assumptions about the child are significantly produced by how the pedophile is conceived, primarily as the “dangerous other.” Dominant and normative configurations of the child are anchored within the pedophile discourse. Specifically, notions of children’s tutelage and training, have called upon the identification of “others” to whom responsible parents must shield their children from. Initially, discourses of the “colonial other,” underwrote how bourgeois families managed the care of children, and turned on the notion of internal dangers of class, sexual and racial origin.

Children’s sexuality and the intersection between adult and child sex continues to be debated within academic discourse. The issues that the “Alcoff-Foucault” debate raise are difficult ones, and carry a preponderance of significance for social theory and its links to everyday practice. The significance of power, pleasure, gender, the body and discursive systems of subjectification, highlight differences in the “continual contestation” that encounters with feminist and Foucauldian thought signify. Important discussions on the production of the significance of sexuality and its relationship to moral, emotional and physical harm, embedded in the changing discourses of sexuality and childhood, are far from settled. Moreover, many discussions pertaining to pedophilia seem to immediately authorize a set of closures. Both Alcoff and Foucault, although substantively engaged with problems of child sexuality and pedophilia, nevertheless end up foreclosing further analysis through their different ameliorative strategies they espouse. The debate over pedophilia has a tendency to collapse distinctions between theory and praxis, and as such may serve to unmask other areas of social thought in which such distinctions remain latent and uncomplicated.

We can witness a form of dissemination in the discourse of the threat that the pedophile signifies. In contemporary times, the pedophile is increasingly produced as a threat from within the very centers of authority and legitimacy. Thus we find increasing attention paid, in popular discourse, to pedophiles inhabiting the ranks of judges, doctors, teachers, clergy, and so on. A morbid cultural drama is produced. This drama trumpets the pedophile as everywhere, existing undetected as a form of collective free-floating anxiety. Perhaps, this amplification in the presence of the pedophile parallels a legitimation crisis to which dominant institutions are increasingly subjected. In another sense, a calculus of risk which devolves onto individual responsibility, has produced an increasing spiral of risk awareness and potential dangers, which consequently authorize social practices of surveillance. The figure of the child is increasingly called upon to accomplish an unprecedented intensity of moral regulatory work. The regulation of boundaries that the pedophile effect produces is also a way of maintaining and reinforcing the social stratifications upon which our current hegemonic understanding of children and families are based. What was once a more transparent concern with protecting young people from associations, sexual or otherwise, with adult homosexual individuals, has turned into a cloaked discourse with a wider application. These protection strategies can be read as an attempt to forestall the dissemination of queer realities or resistances within the structures of the hegemonic family and compulsory heterosexuality. I turn now to two illustrations, derived largely from personal anecdote, in which I attempt to highlight the social stakes that surround the pedophile discourse as a vulnerabilizing force that tends to target queer cultures disproportionately.

\* \* \*

*Narrative One*

During the time I was completing my thesis, which happened to fall squarely during Pride Week in Toronto, I spent some relaxing hours sitting on the grass taking in the festivities at the annual Pride Week event sponsored by Supporting Our Youth (SOY) called Fruit Loopz. Supporting Our Youth is a small, yet dynamic social service agency committed to supporting queer, transgendered, and questioning youth. The client youth have a large role in guiding programs and developing outreach strategies, such as their annual event called Fruit Loopz, an arts and performance event which is promoted and self-generated by the youth themselves. SOY and the dynamic bunch that organize Fruit Loopz enable young queers and transgendered people, helping them to produce themselves as spoken word artists, video makers, performers and a sundry mix of cultural provocateurs. Here they participate on their own terms, forming queer culture from the inside out; people who range in age from 13 to 24. I watch and listen, some of the performances are excellent others are merely passable, yet the fact that a young 14 or 15-year-old questioning youth is taking the stage for the first time, pouring out her urgent emotions, and supported by friends, is enough of a recompense for any lack-luster performance. The wonder, delight and exhilaration on the faces of these young queer people fill me with delight, but it can also be somewhat disorienting. Here is a 16-year-old blond youth, dressed up in black clothes, Goth style, who will soon take the stage with synthesizer in hand to croon some original songs he began writing when he was 14.

What is disorienting is the reality that young people, including those we sometimes include in this unreliable and elastic category of "children" are coming out and participating in queer culture. Many in the queer urban communities across North

America are starting to recognize the emergence and growth of queer youth, struggling to make social space available to those who cannot legally enter into the domain of a circumscribed and largely commercialized bar culture. It seems that many in my generation and older (I was born in 1969, the year of Stonewall) have somewhat taken it for granted that queer culture has been produced as an “adult” culture, replete with the attendant privileges and rights of access that being above a certain age allows one. Queer culture is groping toward the inclusion of young people, attempting to reconfigure, sometimes clumsily, the fact that young people are staking claims that parallel “adult” queer culture, but also making incisive criticisms of the paltry and emaciated social provision that is available to queer youth.<sup>2</sup> With the rise and increasing visibility of queer youth/children and queer parenting, the social provision and guardianship of the young is being produced within discursive boundaries that push up against starkly heteronormative models.

### *Narrative Two*

I have attempted to demonstrate that the discursive strategies that are employed to produce knowledge and moral authority with respect to pedophilia, are neither an exhaustive nor a complete picture. This highly regulated picture of the problem trounces our ability to examine alternatives and to uncover other narratives and possibilities. What is signally important to produce is the missing discourse of desire and narratives of sexual

---

<sup>2</sup> What comes to mind here is the growth of punk-oriented queer cultures and the ethic of inclusiveness that has always permeated punk culture with the Do-it-yourself (DIY) supportive ethic and the priority given to gender parity and all-ages in event organizing. These “alternative” queer cultures sprang up around the late 1970 and 1980s, existing as local and interconnected groups and individuals self-producing their own culture through zines, bands and no-budget guerrilla filmmaking. For more on a Canadian context to “homopunk” culture, see my 1999 article in *Broken Pencil* magazine, “Punk-lad love, Dyke-core and the Evolution of Queer Zine Culture in Canada” (Teixeira, 1999).

agency that children and youth exhibit, yet which often go unheard and remain inadmissible.

Dominant ways of understanding children deny them access to sexual feeling, disallow a broad range of human sexual awareness and self-awareness. What happens when we continually attempt to atrophy sensual, erotic and sexual self-awareness in children? There is an increasing gulf between an ideological image of the family that is pressed into service as a ballast for a broad range of socially conservative agendas (coded as “family values”), and the actual conditions and diversity that domestic life is increasingly taking. A discourse of terror such as the pedophile and the sex offender discourse represents, can serve to emotionally anchor, as an easy consensus, various other issues that trail in its wake, vis-à-vis a concern to shield children from “inappropriate” or “harmful” influences. Marjorie Heins, for instance, has documented a vast array of child protection strategies in the U.S. and a persistent, yet infrequently criticized, assumption of the “harm-to-minors” thesis, which she states has been increasingly invoked as a justification for censorship during the 1990s (Heins, 2001; see also Sonenschein, 1984; Stevens, 1995). The regulation of sexuality has its key strategy in the regulation of speech, ideas and representation, hence censorship has always been a central strategy within an array of state and non-state legal and moral discourses that take sexual regulation as its object. The policing of pedophilia betrays a flabby excess in evidence (in the case of child pornography, the overly broad definition of children and vaguely defined “sexual situations”), and a collapse of representation and actual harm, suggesting a conflation of physical harm (acts) with moral harm (representation) (see Johnson, 1997; Stanley, 1987; Stambolian, 1980). Thus, as in the case of censorship, it is the vulnerable

and subordinate communities which usually bear the brunt of sexual regulation. In the policing of pedophilia it is homosexual intergenerational sex which is more likely to be produced as dangerously pathogenic, and where the younger partner's sexuality is more often produced as "damaged."

As an HIV/STI counsellor for ten years, I have had the opportunity to interview gay and bisexual men around issues of safer sex, harm reduction, alcohol and drug use, sexual shame, homophobia, coming-out and a host of other issues. I am struck by the frequency that childhood sexuality would be invoked, without my prompting, during counselling sessions. I would hear from some of my clients sexual activity before they were 14-years of age, with peers and, at times, with older adults freely chosen by them, consensual and sought after. As several of them commented, they knew what they wanted and they went after it: "I knew I wanted to suck cock from the age of nine or ten." Gay and lesbian culture has always admitted a highly open ethic of discussions around sexual activity, including childhood sexual activity.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Here I will relate a little personal anecdote that will help illustrate how common, everyday and normalized the discussions of childhood sexual behaviour are among gay men. During preparation of this thesis I had the following exchange with an anonymous sexual partner, who was older than me, perhaps in his early to mid-forties. In between caresses and oral sex, this is what the exchange sounded like:

Anonymous partner: "I love to suck cock. I've been sucking cock since the age of ten."

Me: "Oh really?"

AP: "Yeah, I remember when I was ten, I used to love sucking off my eighteen year old friend. He was hot. As a matter of fact, me and several of my friends around my age used to grab him and hold his legs down and take turns blowing him."

Me: "Wow!"

AP: "Yeah, it was a game, he liked it."

Me: "Is this guy gay today?"

AP: "Oh yeah, we knew he was gay."

Me: "Well that's really interesting. You know there's a name for this kind of thing." (laughing) "People get into a lot of trouble when stuff like this happens."

AP: "Oh yeah, for sure. Stuff like that can't happen these days. A lot has changed." As it turned out, I didn't tell him I was writing a thesis on pedophilia, I just kept my smiling astonishment over this weird synchronicity to myself and just continued with the business at hand!

Children's sexual experiences run the gamut, of course, from horrible abuse to eagerly sought after fun, along a continuum that admits great variation and mixed, ambivalent and nuanced experiences. However, the putting into discourse of consensual childhood sexual activity has been neglected and actively suppressed. That adults at times realize children's and youth's erotic and sexual desire is prevented from emerging. That children do exercise sexual agency is a story consigned to the untellable and unaskable in the arena of children's social life. The kind of experiences that I relate in my anecdote and that are available to us, largely from only private conversations and adult memoirs, are not merely incidental nor unimportant social experiences. They are ignored, trounced, and dismissed as part of a discursive regime that regulates the sexuality and social life of the child and the adult she is to become. The ability for children and youth to produce located, specific, and experiential epistemologies (in whatever form) about their social and sexual lives is addled. Foucault has discussed the increasing tenor of regulation that children's sex has experienced. From the nineteenth century the image of the masturbating child was an anchor for all kinds of interventions into the regulation of children and family life, in which "[p]arents, families, educators, doctors, and eventually psychologists would have to take charge, in a continuous way, of this precious and perilous, dangerous and endangered sexual potential" (Foucault, 1990: 104). With the emergence of the discourse on pedophilia, this sexual regulation has amplified, I contend, reaching further into an unruly and contentious arena of the sexuality of the young, attempting to demarcate the boundaries of sexual expression through a regime of peril, danger and terror. I also think that we will soon witness (indeed there are some beginnings already) an amplification in the medicalization of children's sex. The

discourses of medicine, when it bends toward the sexuality of the child, will amplify the medicalization of children's sex toward the poles of compulsion, aggressivity, and sexual danger. The arena of children's sex is especially vulnerable to such pathologizing discourses since it, like the pedophile discourse, has admitted very little by way of alternative narratives of the social diversity of its manifestations. Thus we are already seeing the disturbing emergence of the discourse of "child sex offenders," an appellation, no doubt, that the man in my earlier anecdote would have been diagnosed with if his behaviour as a child was discovered today.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

---

- A Space. 1985. *Issues of Censorship*. Toronto: A Space.
- Abel, Gene G., Judith V. Becker & Jerry Cunningham-Rathner. 1984. "Complications, Consent, and Cognitions in Sex Between Children and Adults." *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 7: 89-103.
- Adams, Mary Louise. 1997. *The Trouble With Normal: Postwar Youth and the Making of Heterosexuality*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Adams, Mary Louise. 1997a. "On Children, Innocence and Definitions of Sex." In Lorraine Johnson, ed. *Suggestive Poses: Artists and Critics Respond to Censorship*. Toronto: The Riverbank Press.
- Alcoff, Linda. 1996. "Dangerous Pleasures: Foucault and the Politics of Pedophilia." In Susan J. Hekman, ed. *Feminist Interpretations of Michel Foucault*. Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania University Press.
- American Psychiatric Association. 2000. *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, 4<sup>th</sup> Edition—Text Revision*. Washington, D.C.: American Psychiatric Association.
- Ames, M. Ashley, & David A. Huston. 1990. "Legal, social, and biological definitions of pedophilia." *Archives of Sexual Behaviour*, 19(4): 333-342.
- Ariès, Phillipe. 1962. *Centuries of Childhood*. New York: Knopf.
- Barrett, Michèle & Mary McIntosh. 1982. *The Anti-Social Family*. London: Verso
- Bearchell, Chris. 1978. "I was fifteen, she was forty-three..." *The Body Politic*, (May): 14.
- Bell, Shannon & Joseph Couture. 2000. "Justice and Law: Passion, Power, Prejudice, and So-called Pedophilia." In Dorothy E. Chunn & Dany Lacombe, eds. *Law as a Gendering Practice*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bell, Shannon. 1995. *Whore Carnival*. New York: Autonomedia.
- Bell, Vikki. 2002. "The Vigilant(e) Parent and the Paedophile: The News of the World Campaign 2000 and the Contemporary Governmentality of Child Sexual Abuse." *Feminist Theory*, 3(1): 83-102.
- Bell, Vikki. 1993. *Interrogating Incest: Feminism, Foucault, and the Law*. London and New York: Routledge.

Bell, Vikki. 1993a. "Governing Childhood: Neo-Liberalism and the Law" *Economy and Society*. 22(3): 390-405.

Bernard, Fritz. 1985. *Pedophilia: A Factual Report*. Rotterdam: Enclave.

Blanchard, Ray; Philip Klassen; Robert Dickey; Michael E. Kuban; Thomas Blak. 2001. "Sensitivity and Specificity of the Phallometric Test for Pedophilia in Nonadmitting Sex Offenders." *Psychological Assessment*, 13(1): 118-126.

Boone, Joseph A. 1997. "Vacation Cruises; or the Homoerotics of Orientalism." *Public*, 16.

Britzman, Deborah P. 1998. *Lost Subjects, Contested Objects: Toward a Psychoanalytic Inquiry of Learning*. New York: State University of New York Press.

Brock, Deborah R., ed. 2003. *Making Normal: Social Regulation in Canada*. Toronto: Nelson.

Brock, Deborah R. 1998. *Making Work, Making Trouble: Prostitution as a Social Problem*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Brongersma, Edward. 1987. *Loving Boys*, 2 vols. New York: Global Academic Publishers.

Brongersma, Edward. 1984. "Aggression Against Pedophiles." *International Journal of Law & Psychiatry*, 7: 79-87.

Bruhm, Steven and Natasha Hurley, eds. 2004. *Curiouser: On the Queerness of Children*. Minneapolis & London: University of Minnesota Press.

Bullough, Vern L. 1994. *Science in the Bedroom: A History of Sex Research*. New York: Basic Books.

Bullough, Vern L. 1985. "Problems of Research on a Delicate Topic: A Personal View." *The Journal of Sex Research*, 21: 375-386.

Butler, Judith. 1993. *Bodies that Matter: On the Discursive Limits of "Sex"*. New York: Routledge.

Califia, Pat & Gayle Rubin. 1981. *Gay Community News*, (July 18, August 15).

Califia, Pat. 1995. *Public Sex: The Culture of Radical Sex*. San Francisco: Cleis Press.

Califia, Pat. 1980. "The Age of Consent." *The Advocate*. (October 16 & October 30).

- Canada, Standing Committee on Justice and the Solicitor General. 1993. *Committee Debates on Bill C-128*. (Unedited transcript, Issue 105, June 10).
- Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. 1994. "The Trials of London" *Ideas*, CBC Radio Works, unpublished radio transcript. Toronto.
- Castañeda, Claudia. 2002. *Figurations: Child, Bodies, Worlds*. London: Duke University Press.
- Cavanagh, Sheila L. 2005. "Sexing the Teacher: Voyeuristic Pleasure in the Amy Gehring Sex-Panic." *Social Text* (forthcoming).
- Cavanagh, Sheila L. 2005. "Upsetting Desires in the Classroom: School Sex Scandals and the Pedagogy of the Femme Fatale." *Psychoanalysis, Culture and Society*, (forthcoming).
- Chauncey, George Jr. 1993. "The Postwar Sex Crime Panic." In William Graebner, ed. *True Stories from the American Past*. New York: McGrawHill.
- Christensen, Pia Haudrup. 1999. "Childhood and the Cultural Constitution of Vulnerable Bodies." In Alan Prout, ed. *The Body, Childhood and Society*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Cohen, Lisa J. & Galynker, Igor I. 2002. "Clinical Features of Pedophilia and Implications for Treatment." *Journal of Psychiatric Practice*, 8(5): 276-289.
- Cossman, Brenda. 1993. "How the State Created a Bunch of Pedophiles." *Xtra!*, 12 November, p. 17.
- Cossman, Brenda, Shannon Bell, Lise Gotell, Becki L. Ross. 1997. *Bad Attitude/s on Trial: Pornography, Feminism, and the Butler Decision*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Couture, Joseph. 1995. "London's Trials." *The Guide: Gay Entertainment, Politics, and Sex*. (July).
- Davies, Bronwyn. 1993. *Shards of Glass: Children Reading and Writing Beyond Gendered Identities*. New Jersey: Hampton Press Inc.
- Dean, Mitchell. 1994. *Critical and Effective Histories: Foucault's Methods and Historical Sociology*. London and New York: Routledge.
- D'Emilio, John. 1989. "The Homosexual Menace: The Politics of Sexuality in Cold War America." In Kathy Peiss and Christina Simmons, eds. *Passion and Power: Sexuality in History*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

D'Emilio, John and Estelle B. Freedman. 1988. *Intimate Matters: A History of Sexuality in America*. New York: Harper & Row.

Doyle, Kegan and Dany Lacombe. 2003. "Moral Panic and Child Pornography: The Case of Robin Sharpe." In Deborah Brock, ed. *Making Normal: Social Regulation in Canada*. Scarborough: Nelson Canada Press.

Epstein, Debbie and Richard Johnson. 1998. *Schooling Sexualities*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Feierman, Jay R., ed. 1990. *Pedophilia: Biosocial Dimensions*. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Foucault, Michel. 2000a. "About the Concept of the 'Dangerous Individual' in Nineteenth-century Legal Psychiatry." In James D. Faubian, ed. *Power: Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984, Vol. 3*. New York: The New Press.

Foucault, Michel. 2000b. "The Political Technology of Individuals." In James D. Faubian, ed. *Power: Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984, Vol. 3*. New York: The New Press.

Foucault, Michel. 1998. "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History." In James D. Faubian, ed. *Aesthetics, Method, and Epistemology: Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984, Vol. 2*. New York: The New Press.

Foucault, Michel. 1991. "Governmentality." In G. Burchell, C. Gordon, P. Miller, eds. *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Foucault, Michel. 1990. *The History of Sexuality, Volume 1: An Introduction*. New York: Vintage.

Foucault, Michel. 1988. *Politics, Philosophy, Culture: Interviews and Other Writings, 1977-1984*. New York: Routledge.

Foucault, Michel. 1980. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977*. New York: Pantheon.

Foucault, Michel. 1979. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Vintage.

Foucault, Michel. 1972. *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. New York: Pantheon.

Freedman, Estelle B. 1989. "'Uncontrolled Desires': The Response to the Sexual Psychopath, 1920-1960." In Kathy Peiss and Christina Simmons, eds. *Passion and Power: Sexuality in History*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

- Gebhard, Paul H. 1977. "Sex Offenders." In J. Money & H. Musaph, eds. *Handbook of Sexology*. Elsevier: North Holland Biomedical Press.
- Geraci, Joseph, ed. 1997. *Dares To Speak: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives on Boy-Love*. London: The Gay Men's Press.
- Gilman, Sander L. 1985. *Difference and Pathology: Stereotypes of Sexuality, Race and Madness*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Gittins, Diana. 1998. *The Child in Question*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Gözl, Annalee. 1993. "Family Matters: The Canadian Family and the State in the Post-war Period." *Left History*, 1(2): 9-49.
- Green, Richard. 2002. "Is Pedophilia a Mental Disorder?" *Archives of Sexual Behaviour*, 31(6): 467-71.
- Greyson, John. 1995. *After the Bath*. (film, 55 min. Canada).
- Hall, Lesley and Roy Porter. 1995. *The Facts of Life: The Creation of Sexual Knowledge in Britain, 1650-1950*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Hall, Stuart, Chas Chrichter, Tony Jefferson, John Clarke, and Brian Roberts. 1978. *Policing the Crisis: Mugging, the State, and Law and Order*. London: MacMillan.
- Hannon, Gerald. 1995. "The Kiddie Porn Ring that Wasn't." *Globe and Mail*, 11 March, D1, D5.
- Hannon, Gerald. 1978. "Men Loving Boys Loving Men." In Ed Jackson and Stan Persky, eds. *Flaunting It!: A Decade of Gay Journalism from the Body Politic*. Toronto: Pink Triangle Press.
- Heins, Marjorie. 2001. *Not in Front of the Children: "Indecency," Censorship and the Innocence of Youth*. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Hekman, Susan J., ed. 1996. *Feminist Interpretations of Michel Foucault*. Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania University Press.
- Henriques, Julian, Wendy Hollway, Cathy Urwin, Couze Venn, Valerie Walkerkine. 1984. *Changing the Subject: Psychology, Social Regulation and Subjectivity*. London & New York: Methuen.
- Jenkins, Philip. 1992. *Intimate Enemies: Moral Panics in Contemporary Great Britain*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

- Jenks, Chris. 1996. *Childhood*. London: Routledge.
- Johnson, Lorraine, ed. 1997. *Suggestive Poses: Artists and Critics Respond to Censorship*. Toronto: The Riverbank Press.
- Katz, Jonathan Ned. 1996. *The Invention of Heterosexuality*. New York: Plume.
- Kelly, Beth. 1979. "On Woman/Girl Love or, Lesbians Do 'Do it'." *Gay Community News*, March 3.
- Kemp, Martin & Marina Wallace. 2000. *Spectacular Bodies: The Art and Science of the Human Body from Leonardo to Now*. California: University of California Press.
- Khayatt, Didi. 1995. "Compulsory Heterosexuality: Schools and Lesbian Students." In Marie Campbell and Ann Manicom, eds. *Knowledge, Experience, and Ruling Relations: Studies in the Social Organization of Knowledge*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Kilpatrick, Allie C. 1987. "Childhood Sexual Experiences: Problems and Issues in Studying Long-Range Effects." *The Journal of Sex Research*, 23(2): 173-196.
- Kincaid, James R. 1992. *Child-Loving: The Erotic Child and Victorian Culture*. London: Routledge.
- Kinsey, Alfred C., Wardell B. Pomeroy, Clyde E. Martin. 1948. *Sexual Behaviour in the Human Male*. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders.
- Kinsman, Gary. 2000. "Constructing Gay Men and Lesbians as National Security Risks, 1950-1970." In Gary Kinsman, Dieter K. Buse & Mercedes Steedman, eds. *Whose National Security? Canadian State Surveillance and the Creation of Enemies*. Toronto: Between the Lines.
- Kinsman, Gary. 1995. "'Character Weaknesses' and 'Fruit Machines': Towards an Analysis of The Anti-Homosexual Security Campaign in the Canadian Civil Service." *Labour/Le Travail*, 35: 133-161.
- Kinsman, Gary. 1993. "'Inverts,' 'Psychopaths' and 'Normal' Men: Historical Sociological Perspectives of Gay and Heterosexual Masculinities." In Tony Haddad, ed. *Men and Masculinities: A Critical Anthology*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press Inc.
- Kinsman, Gary. 1987. *The Regulation of Desire: Sexuality in Canada*. Montréal: Black Rose Books.
- Krivacska, James J. & John Money. 1994. *The Handbook of Forensic Sexology: Biomedical & Criminological Perspectives*. Amherst, New York: Prometheus Books.
- La Fontaine, Jennifer. 1990. *Childhood Sexual Abuse*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

- Leahy, Terry. 1991. *Negotiating Stigma: Approaches to Intergenerational Sex*. University of South Wales, unpublished Ph.D. thesis.
- Leahy, T. 1992. "Positively Experienced Man/Boy Sex: The Discourse of Seduction and the Social Construction of Masculinity." *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology*, 28(1): 71-88.
- Levine, Judith. 2002. *Harmful to Minors: The Perils of Protecting Children from Sex*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Lotringer, Sylvère, ed. 1996. *Foucault Live: Collected Interviews, 1961-1984*. New York: Semiotext[e].
- Lotringer, Sylvère. 1988. *Overexposed: Treating Sexual Perversion in America*. New York: Pantheon.
- Lunbeck, Elizabeth. 1994. *The Psychiatric Persuasion: Knowledge, Gender and Power in Modern America*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Lynch, Mona. 2002. "Pedophiles and cyber-predators as contaminating forces: The discourse of disgust, pollution, and boundary invasions in federal debates over sex offender legislation." *Law and Social Inquiry*, 27(3): 529-568.
- Lyon, David. 2001. "Under my skin: from identification papers to body surveillance." In Jane Caplan and John Torpey, eds. *Documenting Individual Identity: The Development of State Practices in the Modern World*. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press.
- May, Todd. 1993. *Between Epistemology and Genealogy: Psychology, Politics, and Knowledge in the Thought of Michel Foucault*. Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Maynard, Steven. 1997. "'Horrible Temptations': Sex, Men, and Working-Class Male Youth in Urban Ontario, 1890-1935." *The Canadian Historical Review*, 78(2).
- McNamee, Sara. 2000. "Foucault's Heterotopia and Children's Everyday Lives." *Childhood*, 7(4):479-492.
- McWhorter, Ladelle. 1999. *Bodies and Pleasures: Foucault and the Politics of Sexual Normalization*. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Miller, Peter. 1986. "Critiques of psychiatry and critical sociologies of madness." In Peter Miller & Nikolas Rose, eds. *The Power of Psychiatry*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Mitzel, John. 1980. *The Boston Sex Scandal*. Boston: Glad Day Books.

- Money, John and J. D. Weinrich. 1983. "Juvenile, Pedophile, Heterophile: Hermeneutics of Science, Medicine and Law in Two Outcome Studies." *International Journal of Medicine and Law*, 2: 39-54.
- Moon, Michael. 2004. "'The Gentle Boy from the Dangerous Classes': Pederasty, Domesticity, and Capitalism in Horatio Alger." In Steven Bruhm and Natasha Hurley, eds. *Curiouser: On the Queerness of Children*. Minneapolis & London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Mort, Frank. 1987. *Dangerous Sexualities: Medico-Moral Politics in England Since 1830*. London and New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Nelson, Joan. 1989. "Intergenerational sexual contact: a continuum model of participants and experiences." *Journal of Sex Education and Therapy*, 15(1): 3-12.
- O'Carroll, Tom. 1980. *Pædophilia: The Radical Case*. Boston: Alyson Publications.
- Ohi, Kevin. 2000. "Molestation 101: Child Abuse, Homophobia, and the Boys of St. Vincent." *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies*, 6(2): 195-248.
- Okami, Paul. 1997. "'Slippage' in Research on Child Sexual Abuse: Science as Social Advocacy." In James J. Krivacska & John Money, eds. *The Handbook of Forensic Sexology: Biomedical & Criminological Perspectives*. New York: Prometheus Books.
- Okami, Paul. 1990. "Sociopolitical Biases in the Contemporary Scientific Literature on Adult Human Sexual Behaviour with Children and Adolescents." In Jay R. Feierman, ed. *Pedophilia: Biosocial Dimensions*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Oosterhuis, Harry. 1997. "Richard von Krafft-Ebing's 'Step-Children of Nature': Psychiatry and the Making of Homosexual Identity." In Vernon A. Rosario, ed. *Science and Homosexualities*. New York: Routledge.
- Parker, Andrew, Mary Russo, Doris Sommer and Patricia Yaeger, eds. 1992. *Nationalisms & Sexualities*. New York, London: Routledge.
- Peiss, Kathy and Christina Simmons, eds. 1989. *Passion and Power: Sexuality in History*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Persky, Stan and John Dixon. 2001. *On Kiddie Porn: Sexual Representation, Free Speech and the Robin Sharpe Case*. Vancouver: New Star Books.
- Pfohl, Stephen. J. 1977. "The 'Discovery' of Child Abuse." *Social Problems*, 24: 310-323.
- Praunheim, Rosa von. 1980. *Army of Lovers*. London: Gay Men's Press.

- Quinsey, Vernon L. 1977. "The Assessment and Treatment of Child Molesters: A Review." *Canadian Psychological Review*, 18(3): 204-220.
- Reade, Brian. 1970. *Sexual Heretics: Male Homosexuality in English Literature from 1850-1900*. New York: Coward-McCann, Inc.
- Reeves, Tom. 2003. Personal communication during his visit to Toronto.
- Reeves, Tom. 1996. "Tom Reeves talks with Chris Bearchell and Friends." *Gayme* 2.2.
- Renold, Emma. 2002. "Presumed Innocence: (Hetero)sexual, Heterosexist and Homophobic Harassment among Primary School Girls and Boys." *Childhood*, 9(4): 415-434.
- Rind, Bruce. 2001. "Gay and bisexual adolescent boys' sexual experiences with men: An empirical examination of psychological correlates in a nonclinical sample." *Archives of Sexual Behaviour*, 30(4): 345-368.
- Rosario, Vernon A., ed. 1997. *Science and Homosexualities*. New York: Routledge.
- Rose, Jacqueline. 1984. *The Case of Peter Pan, or: The Impossibility of Children's Fiction*. London: Macmillan.
- Rose, Nikolas. 1986. "Psychiatry: The Discipline of Mental Health." In Peter Miller & Nikolas Rose, eds. *The Power of Psychiatry*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Rossman, Parker. 1979. *Sexual Experience Between Men and Boys*. London: Maurice Temple Smith.
- Rubin, Gayle. 1984. "Thinking Sex: Notes for a Radical Theory of the Politics of Sexuality." In Carole S. Vance, ed. *Pleasure and Danger: Exploring Female Sexuality*. Boston: Routledge.
- Sandfort, Theo G.M, & Jany Rademakers, eds. 2000. *Childhood Sexuality: Normal Sexual Behaviour and Development*. New York: Haworth Press.
- Sandfort, Theo, Edward Brongersma & Alex van Naerssen. eds. 1992. *Male Intergenerational Intimacy: Historical, Socio-Psychological, and Legal Perspectives*. New York: The Haworth Press.
- Sandfort, Theo. 1984. "Sex in Pedophilic Relationships: An Empirical Investigation Among a Nonrepresentative Group of Boys." *Journal of Sex Research*, 20(2): 123-142.
- Sandfort, Theo. 1981. *The Sexual Aspects of Pedophile Relations*. Amsterdam: Pan/Spartacus.

Sawicki, Jana. 1991. *Disciplining Foucault: Feminism, Power and the Body*. New York: Routledge.

Schmidt, Gunter. 2002. "The Dilemma of the Male Pedophile." *Archives of Sexual Behaviour*, 31(6): 473-477.

Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. 1993. "How to Bring Your Kids Up Gay." In Michael Warner, ed. *Fear of a Queer Planet: Queer Politics and Social Theory*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Simon, Jonathan. 1998. "Managing the Monstrous: Sex Offenders and the New Penology." *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 4(1/2): 452-467.

Simon, Walter T. and Peter G. W. Schouten. 1991. "Plethysmography in the Assessment and Treatment of Sexual Deviance: An Overview." *Archives of Sexual Behaviour*, 20(1): 75-91.

Smith d'Arch, Timothy. 1970. *Love in Earnest: Some Notes on the Lives and Writings of English "Uranian" Poets from 1889-1930*. London: Routledge.

Sonenschein, David. 1999. *Pedophiles on Parade: The Monster in the Media, (Vol. 1) and The Popular Imagery of Moral Hysteria, (Vol. 2)*. San Antonio, TX: D. Sonenschein.

Sonenschein, David. 1987. "On Having One's Research Seized." *The Journal of Sex Research*, 23(3): 408-414.

Sonenschein, David. 1984. "Breaking the taboo of sex and adolescence: Children, sex, and the media." In Ray Browne, ed. *Forbidden Fruits: Taboos and Tabooism in Culture*. Ohio: Bowling Green University Popular Press.

Stainton-Rogers, Wendy & Rex. 1992. *Stories of Childhood: Shifting Agendas of Child Concern*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Stambolian, George. 1980. "Creating the New Man: A Conversation with Jacqueline Livingston." *Christopher Street*, (May): 9-17.

Stanley, Lawrence A. 1987. "The Hysteria Over Child Pornography and Pedophilia." *Paidika: The Journal of Pedophilia*, Issue 2.

Stevens, Sharon, ed. 1995. *Children and the Politics of Culture*. Princeton University Press.

Stoler, Ann Laura. 1995. *Race and the Education of Desire: Foucault's History of Sexuality and the Colonial Order of Things*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Stone, Lawrence. 1977. *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500-1800*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson.

Taylor, Brian, ed. 1981. *Perspectives on Pedophilia*. London: Batsford Academic.

Teixeira, Rob. 1999. "Punk-lad Love, Dyke-core and the Evolution of Queer Zine Culture in Canada." *Broken Pencil*, Issue 9.

Terry, Jennifer. 1999. *An American Obsession: Science, Medicine, and Homosexuality in Modern Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Terry, Jennifer. 1997. "The Seductive Power of Science." In Vernon A. Rosario, ed. *Science and Homosexualities*. New York: Routledge.

Tsang, Daniel, ed. 1981. *The Age Taboo: Gay Male Sexuality, Power and Consent*. Boston: Alyson.

Vance, Carole S. ed. 1984. *Pleasure and Danger: Exploring Female Sexuality*. Boston: Routledge.

Walkerdine, Valerie. 1986. "Post-structuralist theory and everyday social practices: The family and the school." In Sue Wilkinson, ed. *Feminist Social Psychology: Developing Theory and Practice*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Walkowitz, Judith R. 1992. *City of Dreadful Delight: Narratives of Sexual Danger in Late-Victorian London*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Warner, Tom. 2002. *Never Going Back: A History of Queer Activism in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Weedon, Chris. 1987. *Feminist Practice and Post-structuralist Theory*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Weeks, Jeffrey. 1985. *Sexuality and its Discontents: Meanings, Myths and Modern Sexualities*. New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Weeks, Jeffrey. 1981. *Sex, Politics and Society: The Regulation of Sexuality Since 1800*. London and New York: Longman.

Wilson, Glenn D. & David N. Cox. 1983. *The Child-Lovers: A Study of Paedophiles in Society*. London and Boston: Peter Owen.